

MEMORANDUM

TO: Stacie Hoskins, SEPA Responsible Official

FROM: Linda Mueller, Consulting Planner, City of Poulsbo

DATE: May 25, 2011

SUBJECT: Analysis of Threshold Determination under the rules of the State Environmental Policy Act (WAC 197-11). The Optional DNS process being utilized (WAC 197-11-355).

Proponent: Jefferson County Sportsmen's Association
112 Gun Club Road
Port Townsend WA 98368

Property Owner: Jefferson County WA
Courthouse
P.O. Box 1220
Port Townsend WA 98368

Application: MLA #10-297

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Proposal: Proposed is a minor expansion of an existing shooting range, a legal nonconforming use. Applicant proposes to excavate and berm a 200x160 ft. (32,000 s.f.) target area and construct a covered and paved firing line for a competition handgun range.

Property Location: The 44.2 acre site is a portion of Jefferson County closed landfill property, zoned Public Land, "Solid Waste—Essential Public Facility" located at 112 Gun Club Rd. Port Townsend WA .

Legal Description: Parcel # 001083012 Lot 1. 5E1/4, 5E1/4, T30BN R1W WM. The Range is operating under the "License to Use County Property by the Jefferson County Sportsmen's Club", on a portion of Jefferson County Fire Protection District #6 Short Plat as per plat recorded in Volume 4 Pages 39 and 40 of Short Plats, Auditor's File Number 403948, records of Jefferson County, Washington.

Site Conditions: The 44.2 acre, L-shaped property has been utilized as a gun range since 1962. Existing facilities include a pistol range and rifle range, just north of the project development area; an office/classroom and caretaker's home near the entrance at Gun Club Road; a cross-country archery range extending westward from the entrance; and a trap shoot range with clubhouse extend further westward. The site is approximately 60% wooded, including the

perimeter wooded buffer. The elevation ranges from approximately 204 ft. in the existing pistol range to 249 ft. elev. in the western trap shoot range.

Surrounding area:

- North: Undeveloped parcels across Jacob Miller Road, zoning is Rural Residential 1:5.
- East: A residential neighborhood exists east of the proposed development, separated by an existing berm and landscaping; zoning is Rural Residential 1:5.
- South: Residential lots, south of the property boundary, approximately 350 ft. away from the development site and south of the property boundary of the gun range. Zoning is Rural Residential 1:5.
- West: Jefferson County Fire District training facility, on County owned property designated County solid waste—essential public facility.

Required Approvals: Jefferson County building permit for the firing line structure, grading and stormwater management permits for the berm and range construction.

Existing Environment documents:

SEPA Checklist: The application and SEPA checklist were submitted to the County on July 26, 2010.

Adequacy: Staff determined the application to be substantially completed on March 3, 2011. The application is vested under regulations in place on July 26, 2010.

PUBLIC NOTICE: The combined Notice of Application and pending SEPA Threshold Determination was posted on the property by the applicant/representative on March 11, 2011. The same notification also was mailed to the owner of the subject property, to agencies and to property owners within 300 feet on March 15, 2011. Under JCC 18.40.200 and .220, a 14 calendar day public comment period is required. The comment period ended March 30, 2011. Acknowledgement of receipt of the comment letters was sent by mail or email to the commenters.

COMMENTS: Thirty-five public comment letters or emails were received by the March 30, 2011 cut-off date. The comments generally fell into three broad categories: (1) Positive, the range is well run and a benefit to the public providing opportunity for training and practice for use of firearms by members and law enforcement agencies. (2) Negative, the range activities present a lead hazard, particularly to aquifer and stormwater quality; (3) Negative, existing and increasing noise emanating from the range is detrimental to quiet rural lifestyle of neighboring residents; more people are moving into the neighborhood. The attached Exhibit C1 is a summary table, lists names of commenters and presents a snapshot of the range of comments. Exhibit C2 contains paraphrased comments and county response to comments. A copy of the complete collection of letters is attached in Exhibit C3 and will be retained in the permanent project file.

Staff requested review and comments on the application and environmental checklist from the following agencies:

- City of Port Townsend Building/Community Development: No comments received.

- City of Port Townsend Water: No comments received
- Hoh Tribe: No comments received
- Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe: No comments received
- Jefferson County Fire District #1: No comments received.
- Jefferson County Public Health Department: Comments From Marjorie Boyd and Stuart Whitford were received on March 30, 2011, and are addressed in the appropriate section below.
- Jefferson County Public Works: Comments from James W. Pearson were received March 30, 2011.
- Jefferson County PUD #1: No comments received.
- Jefferson County Assessor: Assessor’s Office indicated no comments on this MLA.
- Jefferson County Building Department: No comments received.
- Jefferson County Sheriff Department: Comments attached.
- Olympic Regional Clean Air Agency: No comments received.
- Peninsula Daily News: No comments received.
- Point No Point Treaty Council: No comments received
- Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe: No comments received.
- Port Townsend Leader: No comments received.
- Port Townsend School District #50: No comments received
- Quinault Indian Nation: No comments received.
- Quileute Nation: No comments received.
- Skokomish Tribe SEPA Review: No comments received
- Suquamish Tribe: No comments received
- US EPA Region 10: Comments Attached
- WA State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation: No comments received.
- WA State Department of Ecology, SEPA Review, Stormwater Review: Comments from James DeMay, Toxics Cleanup, were received March 30 2011, and are addressed in the appropriate section below.
- WA State Department of Natural Resources SEPA Review: No comments received
- WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife: No comments received.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENTS:

This section is intended to supplement the applicant’s environmental checklist with information from Development Review sources and comments and to analyze the proposal in order to identify potential environmental impacts. Information available in the environmental checklist is not repeated in this document unless it is necessary to do so as part of staff’s analysis. Proposed mitigation measures are underlined and numbered.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Earth: Soil erosion/slope stability and environmentally sensitive area review: The proposal includes 32,000 s.f. of land disturbing activity. Most of the site in this vicinity has previously been cleared, removal of 2-3 trees may be necessary. Since more than **500 c.f. of earth** will be moved, SEPA review is required.

The Jefferson County Unified Development code (JCC Title 18) requires development proponents for all new development and redevelopment conform to the standards and minimum requirements set by the current adopted version of the Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (SMM) to prevent erosion of land.

The application was reviewed for the potential presence of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) under the provisions of the Unified Development Code (UDC). After an initial Geographic Information Systems mapping review and an investigative site inspection, it was determined that there are no sensitive areas on the site. There are no streams or wetlands found on the overall gun club site nor in the vicinity of the proposed pistol range. Public comment raised concern for potential underlying Susceptible Aquifer Recharge Area and possible lead migration and contamination of the aquifer; however, available mapping provided by the County indicates the recharge area is off-site near the southern boundary of the Gun Club property, some 350 ft. south of the development site for the proposed pistol range.

Reviewing county soil mapping and the USDA soil survey information, the north portion of the site (vicinity of the existing pistol and rifle ranges) is mapped as HuC, Hoypus gravelly loamy sand, 0-15 percent slopes; the remaining property is indicated as CmC, Clallam gravelly sandy loam, 0-15 percent slopes. The Hoypus series soils formed in glacial outwash; they are represented in the soil survey as somewhat excessively drained; moderately rapid permeability in the A Horizon and very rapid permeability in the Bw and C horizons. The Clallam series formed in glacial till over very compact dense glacial till. They are moderately well drained, moderately rapid permeability above the very compact glacial till (A and Bw horizons) and very slow permeability in the very compact glacial till (Cd horizons). It should be noted the NRCS soils mapping is very general, and specific location of soil types is not exact without on-site detailed soils investigation. However, better data are provided with well drilling information from DOE for wells surrounding the area, which indicate an impermeable clay or hardpan layer at variable levels below the surface; and based on well depths some 230-350 ft. below the surface, the aquifer zone (static water level) is at 142-207 ft. below the surface. This would appear to corroborate County GIS mapping that the site is not in an aquifer recharge zone; and the depth to the aquifer presents a low risk of lead migrating through the soil to the aquifer.

However, as indicated in the EPA/BMP manual, lead migration rates through soils to surface water and groundwater is affected by amount and frequency of rainfall, soil permeability, chemistry and pH as well as depth to groundwater. These affects can be managed effectively through soil amendments to bind the lead to soil particles and physical lead removal, as described in the manual and discussed in the Environmental Health section below.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Official Soil Series Descriptions. Available online at <http://ssur.srs.gov/technical/classification/osa/index.html>. Accessed [April 14, 2011].

Air: Aside from temporary minor exhaust emissions from construction activities no significant adverse environmental impacts related to air have been identified, since adequate ventilation is provided in the outdoor range structure. No mitigation measures are proposed. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to AIR is not necessary.

Water:

Surface water: No surface water bodies exist on the site, except the stormwater detention pond, which does not contain permanent storage.

Shorelands and Wetlands: There are no wetlands on the property, and the property is not near the shoreline or within the shoreline management act jurisdictional area.

Floods: The FEMA maps indicate no floodlands on the property.

Groundwater: No groundwater will be withdrawn for this project. The 42 acre property is served by the Port Townsend water supply system.

Water Run-off (including stormwater): Review of stormwater management is provided by the Jefferson County Department of Public Works (Memorandum of March 29, 2011). The proposal will require approximately 35,000 s.f. of land disturbing activity, and will include excavation and filling to construct a berm around three sides of the range. A covered shooters' shed and parking spaces also will be constructed. The project will create approx. 2,500 s.f. of new impervious surface. Existing site drainage and stormwater runoff from the access road and rifle and pistol range is conveyed to an approx. 100 x 200 ft. impoundment on the northerly area of the rifle range. Impounded water infiltrates and does not flow off of the site [see comments regarding soil type]. Runoff from the project site will also be conveyed to this area.

The Jefferson County Unified Development code, Section 18.30.070 Stormwater Management Standards adopts the standards and minimum requirements of the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. The proponent has submitted a Jefferson County Stormwater Site Plan Template dated 7/26/2010 that analyzes stormwater management issues related to the proposed development. The Template includes the elements of a construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The proponent shall implement the best management practices from the template while constructing the pistol range. The Public Works Department has issued standard conditions of approval based on adopted standards for this project, which will be attached to the staff report and Notice of Decision. No further environmental mitigation for stormwater management and erosion control are required for this project beyond adopted standards. However, see comments on Environmental Health related to lead management and water quality as it pertains to stormwater management.

Plants: A critical area review of the site has been conducted and no special plant species have been identified. The proposal is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to plants. No mitigation measures are proposed. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to PLANTS is not necessary.

Animals: An ESA check was conducted and no threatened or endangered species have been identified on the parcel. The proposal is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to sensitive species of Animals. No mitigation measures are proposed. Additional analysis of the

proposal and its effects related to ANIMALS is not necessary. Public comment noted potential threat to animal species on site; however, the gun range has been in operation for 50 years and animals likely have either left the area or have adapted to the noise situation.

Energy and Natural Resources: No impact to solar energy on adjoining properties is anticipated. No negative impacts to energy or natural resources have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES is not necessary.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Environmental Health: Public comment letters indicated concerns about lead in the environment and possible migration through the soils into the environment and the water aquifer. At the request of a local resident, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 are in the process of conducting initial assessments of the Jefferson County Shooting Range. Soil sampling from the initial investigation conducted by Ecology and Jefferson County Health Department revealed impacted soils contaminated with lead and PAHs in excess of MTCA Method A Cleanup levels in several areas of the site and resulted in the property being added to the Ecology's Confirmed and Suspected site database (Facility Site ID 12185). Ecology indicated in its letter of January 20, 2011 (letters attached Exhibit C-4) that a more detailed "Site Hazard Assessment" may be conducted to determine whether further action will be needed.

The EPA's study of the site's existing lead contamination status and possible clean up is still pending and is considered a separate review and timeline from this review of the proposed new pistol range (since this SEPA review is for direct impacts potentially created by the new project). However, range management protocol developed out of that review will extend to the new pistol range by association. This review will consider only the new pistol range and compliance with best management practices appropriate to developing this site.

Pertaining to the new pistol range, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environment checklist for this proposed new pistol range and has provided the following comments (dated March 30, 2011 which will be included as SEPA mitigations):

1. TOXICS CLEANUP: James DeMay (360-407-6316)
JC Sportsman Association, located at 112 Gun Club Road has been listed in Ecology's database of Confirmed or Suspected Contaminated Sites. Sampling on the site revealed impacted soils contaminated with lead and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) above the State's Model Toxics control Act (MTCA) Method A cleanup levels. The Facility Site Identification number assigned to this site is 12185. Ecology encourages the JC Sportsman Association to follow the best management practices developed by the EPA. Adhering to these best management practices will reduce the potential for contamination from current and proposed activities at the

site. The EPA's Best Management Practices for Lead at Outdoor Shooting Ranges is available at: <http://www.epa.gov/region2/waste/leadshot/>.

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

The Jefferson County Public Health reviewed the proposal and provided the following comments:

- A correction to the response to #7, Environmental Health, of the Environmental Checklist submitted by the proponent: The Initial Investigation with respect to potential lead contamination at the existing range was conducted under the auspices of the Washington State Department of Ecology, not the EPA.
- Jefferson County code 18.20.350(8) sets standards for outdoor shooting ranges and requires that the National Rifle Association's Range Manual be consulted and used in the development and operation for ranges; and that Articles 1, 2, and 3 of the safety recommendations for outdoor shooting ranges be used as minimum guidelines in the design and construction of shooting ranges.
- Jefferson County Public Health recommends the applicant provide additional detail regarding how they plan to implement Best Management Practices outline in the NRA/EPA manual, specifically with regard to design and construction of the proposed pistol range and lead management at the same.

Proposed measures to reduce or to control potential environmental health hazards in the new pistol range:

JCC181.20.350(8)(b) states: "The National Rifle Association's Range Manual shall be consulted and used in the development and operation of ranges; Articles 1, 2, and 3 of the safety recommendations for outdoor shooting ranges shall be used as minimum guidelines in the design and construction of shooting ranges". This does not appear to be a complete or correct citation, and it is noted that the most recently updated manual should be used for design and management of the pistol range. For this general review, The Range Source Book, A Guide to Planning and Construction, National Rifle Association Range Department, Fairfax VA 22030, Revised January 2004 is referenced. Section I, General Information, Chapters 1-7 pertain to development and management of ranges; and Section II Outdoor Ranges, is information specific to outdoor ranges, and it includes sections on outdoor range operation and maintenance and developing a "Range Operations Guide," which includes a safety plan, organizational records, maintenance guide, etc. It is noted this range has been operational for nearly 50 years, and they are in the process of updating their range operations guidelines for safety and to incorporate best management practices from the EPA manual.

Specific to this proposed pistol range are concerns raised by public comment and agencies related to possible lead contamination of soils and groundwater and also noise issues. The

concern for lead in the environment and its potential impacts is not a new issue. Practical mitigation measures are identified in Best Management Practices for Lead at Outdoor Shooting Ranges, EPA-902-B-01-001, January 2001, (in this review also noted as EPA/BMP manual), developed by EPA and the National Rifle Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation and others. This manual will be the standard for this review and is freely referenced. The EPA/BMP manual outlines techniques for preventing lead migration, including monitoring and adjusting soil pH, immobilizing lead in the soil, controlling runoff, bullet containment devices, and removal and recycling of lead. Further, any mitigation, guidelines or protocols developed out of the ongoing review by the EPA of the overall range practices will extend to the subject pistol range and are incorporated by reference.

Following are findings with regard to the pistol range design and the “four-step plan” for lead mitigation identified from Chapter 3 of the EPA/BMPs. Additional required mitigation measures are underlined and italicized and will be included in the permit conditions of approval:

1. Step 1 - Control and contain lead bullets and bullet fragments.

Recommended Finding:

- a. Bullets will be contained in the range by a 25 ft. impact berm located directly behind the targets and 12 ft. high side berms that enclose the shooting area on three sides. This is an acceptable design as discussed in the EPA/BMP manual.
- b. The most advantageous shooting direction is selected. The pistol range is not oriented toward water, wetlands, rivers, creeks or other sensitive environments. The new pistol range is oriented westward, away from residential land uses to the east; away from other uses on the range, and will be by a 22 ft. berm and wooded buffer for some distance from the adjoining fire department use of county property to the west.
- c. Additional mitigation or management practices shall include:
 - The upper 1-2 feet of the constructed earthen berm shall be free of large rocks and other debris, to reduce ricochet potential. This is typically accomplished by sifting of soil prior to berm construction, as described in the BMP manual.
 - Lead and larger rock or debris particles should be regularly removed from the impact area to prevent ricochet bullets. Inspection and scheduling shall be documented in the range management manual retained on site.

2. Step 2 - Prevent migration of lead to the subsurface and surrounding surface water bodies.

Recommended Finding:

- a. Based on examination of County GIS mapping and well drilling data from Ecology’s website for wells in the area, the pistol range area does not appear to be an aquifer recharge zone, as there is an impermeable clay or hardpan at variable levels below the surface, the wells dug range from 250-300 ft. and the static water level ranged from 142-207 ft. below the surface. Exceptions found were shallow monitoring wells for the Jefferson County Landfill (depth

about 51-58 ft.) and one residential well at 69 ft., located east of the subject site, across Jacob Miller Road.

- b. Stormwater for the new pistol range will be collected and conveyed northward to an existing swale and culvert leading to an existing onsite detention pond. According to the County Engineering and Health Department review, it normally does not leave the site and evaporates and is absorbed into the soil, except possibly for very extreme storm events when water may leave the site and enter a culvert (#133) on Jacob Miller Rd. There is currently no stormwater outlet for the pond. A grading plan was submitted to the county for review, and surface stormwater management will be implemented consistent with the adopted County stormwater management regulations.
- c. Preliminary findings by Ecology and Jefferson County Public Health in their review of the Gun Range as a whole (Ecology file, Facility Site Identification Number: 12185), indicate lead was found in the existing stormwater trenches and detention area to which this pistol range will drain.
- d. At this writing EPA has neither completed its study nor provided specific mitigation measures. The following SEPA mitigation for the new pistol range incorporates applicable mitigation for the gun range as a whole:
 - If it is determined the EPA that the presence of lead is significant enough to warrant site cleanup or other mitigation, their requirements will extend to the subject new pistol range as may be appropriate.
- e. The EPA/BMP manual provides methods to prevent lead migration. These include monitoring and adjusting soil pH, immobilizing lead and controlling runoff. The following Best Management Practices apply to the development of the new pistol range, and a **lead mitigation implementation plan** incorporating these measures shall be submitted to the County prior to certificate of occupancy:
 - Analysis for initial baseline pH and soil chemistry in the berm area and drainage ways by an approved method (or by Ecology), is required prior to construction permit approval to determine appropriate soil amendments. [Applicant has provided baseline information].
 - A JSCS range management plan shall be developed which shall incorporate, at minimum, methodology to
 - (1). Adjust soil pH (e.g., assess soil pH and spread lime) on an annual basis as described in the EPA/BMPs.
 - (2). Immobilize lead (e.g. phosphate spreading) on a regular and documented basis.
 - (3). Add lime and phosphate during the periodic earthen berm rebuilding process, based on soil testing for pH and concurrence with EPA or qualified range design consultant.
 - (4). In the detention area and drainage ditches subject to lead accumulation, periodically remove the upper 1-2 feet of soil, sift to remove lead particles, incorporate prescribed soil

amendments, and replace the soil with reconstruction of the pond and ditches, pursuant to the EPA/BMP manual guidelines and soil characteristics.

- Additional erosion control shall be provided on the berm surface, utilizing planted vegetation and organic ground cover, that will not interfere with lead removal practices.

3. Step 3 - Remove the lead from the range and recycle.

Recommended finding:

Although Applicant has not indicated how or when lead historically has been or will be removed and recycled, it is noted that the Club is actively working on writing a new "Environmental Stewardship Plan". The following mitigations apply to the new pistol range:

- An active lead management program to recover lead shall be developed by the club which, at the minimum, includes annual inspection and maintenance of the berm and impact areas; periodic removal of upper 1-2 feet of the earth berm area, and hand raking and sifting, screening, or other measure to remove lead bullets as discussed under Sec. 3.3 of the EPA/BMP.
- The NRA recommends a frequency of one to five years for lead cleanup. After lead removal the soils may be reused -- replaced and re-compacted into place. The frequency of reclamation is based on lead quantity estimated by the number of rounds fired, use frequency, type of bullet containment, etc. A lead reclamation company may be employed.
- On-site storage and recycling of sorted lead shall be managed pursuant to RCRA requirements (discussed in Appendix D of EPA/BMP) and shall not be exposed to the elements; shall be managed so as to prevent releases to the environment; shall be stored in containers in good condition, with regular inspections of the container condition; and records of inspections shall be maintained and readily available.

4. Step 4 - Documenting activities and keeping records.

Recommended finding:

Applicant has not indicated whether documenting of lead management activities such as rounds fired, lead recovery, and soil management measures are employed in its current activities. As noted above, the Environmental Stewardship Plan for the Gun Range currently is being written. It is recommended the applicant pursue the voluntary EPA "Certificate of Recognition," which will certify that they have prepared and intend to implement, or have implemented, a written Environmental Stewardship Plan that is consistent with the EPA Best Management Practices for Lead at Outdoor Shooting Ranges manual, (as outlined in Section 3.7 of the Manual)

- At a minimum, documentation shall be provided citing when reclamation was last conducted; use frequency of range; estimated number of rounds shot; results of soil pH testing and soil characteristics. The documentation will enable determination of timing and effectiveness of mitigation measures implemented through range management.

- In addition documentation of the type of BMPs implemented to control lead migration, the date of service, and who did the services is required. The forms for tracking these activities shall be retained on site with the site's range management plan. Such records shall be retained for the life of the range.
- Prior to each extension of the License for JCSA to use the County landfill property, documentation of implementation of the Best Management Practices, including annual site monitoring, lead management/mitigation and reclamation activities, shall be provided to the County Administrator.

As conditioned, and following the cited EPA Best Management Practices for Lead at Outdoor Shooting Ranges, the relative risk of lead exposure to people and the environment is low.

Noise: Approximately 50% of comments received from the public were regarding existing noise and the expected increase in noise and its impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood; and that since more residents are moving into the neighborhood the use and noise should be limited. Another issue is the apparent expansion of hours of shooting. Review of available data and code requirements found the following:

The County in its resolution No. 67-85 adopted Chapter 173-60 WAC in its entirety by reference. Under 173-60-050 RCW Exemptions are listed:

- (1) The following shall be exempt from the provisions of WAC 173-60-040 between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.;
- (b) Sounds created by the discharge of firearms on authorized shooting ranges.

The shooting range is an authorized use of the County property as evidenced in the recorded "License to Use County Property by the Jefferson County Sportsmen's Club license (Exhibit 8 of the staff report) which is a renewable license terminating December 31, 2015. Further, the shooting range is a legally established use, although nonconforming to the current zoning, which use may continue in its legal status, as provided under JCC 18.20.260.

SEPA Rules under WAC 197-11-660 Substantive authority and mitigation, state that mitigation measures or denials shall be based on policies, plans, rules or regulations formally designated by the agency as a basis for the exercise of substantive authority. Further, that mitigation measures shall be reasonable and capable of being accomplished.

We find it is unreasonable to impose mitigation or conditions of approval (such as requiring the range to relocate or requiring an indoor shooting range) that likely would be economically unfeasible and could not be applied equitably to all legal shooting ranges. Further, requiring an enclosed shooting range would not eliminate the noise generation from the existing operations, nor from off-site shooting out of control of the Gun Club.

The existing and proposed earthen berms to some degree will block and attenuate sound of discharging firearms. In addition the firing line shed will be oriented away from neighboring

residences, and applicant proposes to incorporate a wall into the structure behind the firing line, with “blown in batt or fiberglass insulation fill”. This design will stop or reduce sound going *through* the wall, but it will not prevent the noise from deflecting out of the structure and into the surrounding area. As recommended in NRA range management manual, sound absorbing material or sound baffles inside the structure should be incorporated into the structure, if the range is near residential development (p. I-6-13 and 14). While the sound absorption will not completely eliminate the sound of gunshots, it should at least attenuate or reduce the highest peak pressure [intensity] sounds. Internet review finds there are a number of sound absorbing products available on the market applicable to gun ranges. An important consideration is that the materials should not interfere with lead removal around the structure (i.e., blown-on acoustic material and carpeting are not recommended due to the difficulty of cleaning accumulated heavy metal dust). It may be appropriate to contact an acoustical engineering specialist or talk with several companies to find the most effective (and cost effective) material or method. However, since the County has adopted the State exemption under 173-60-050 RCW for authorized shooting ranges, and the site berms and building design provide some degree of noise abatement, and since the above recommendation will not completely solve all of the noise issues, and this is a rural land use adjacent to a rural residential zone, the above is stated as a recommendation rather than a requirement.

With regard to the noted expansion of hours of shooting, other public comments indicate possible off-site shooting being the source of gunshot sounds outside of normal operating hours of the gun range. If this is the case, the gun range has little control over off-site activities, and county code enforcement is the issue (shooting noise at an unauthorized location is not exempt from Chapter 173-60 WAC). However, as a part of the range management plan, increasing efforts to notify range participants and the general public of hours of activity is appropriate.

SEPA mitigation:

- *Under 173-60-050 RCW, sounds created by the discharge of firearms on authorized shooting ranges shall be exempt from the provisions of WAC 173-60-040 between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Shooting shall be restricted to these hours and may be further limited by club membership. Signage shall be provided at the site entrance, at each building and firing line, and posted on the website clearly indicating hours of operation. Special events also shall be similarly posted and published in the local paper.*

Land and Shoreline Use: The site is on the County Waste Management Essential Public Facility and is subject to an existing Agreement for use as a Gun Club. The gun club use has been determined a legal non-conforming use, since it was legally established prior to adoption of the current zoning and development codes, which prohibits “outdoor shooting range” on public zoned property. Under JCC 18.20.260 expansion of a legal nonconforming use may be permitted through a Type I zoning permit, if the expansion is less than 10%. The **32,000 s.f.** pistol range is considerably less than 10% of the 42.2 acres)

The property is not on or near the shoreline. Zoning and land uses within the context of surrounding properties is as follows:

<u>Comprehensive Plan and Zoning:</u>	<u>Existing Land Use:</u>
Site: Waste Management EPF	Site: Existing Gun Club Facility
North: Rural Residential 1:5	North: Large Residential Lots
East: Rural Residential 1:5	East: Residential Lots
South: Rural Residential 1:5	South: Residential Lots
West: Waste Management EPF	West: County Land Fill and Fire District Training Center

Housing: No residential units are proposed to be constructed or eliminated with this project. There is one existing home on the property for use by the caretaker. Additional analysis of the proposal and its affects related to HOUSING is not necessary.

Aesthetics: No views will be blocked as a result of the proposal. No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with aesthetics have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to AESTHETICS is not necessary.

Light and Glare: No additional lighting or glare will result from the proposal. No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with light and glare have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to LIGHT AND GLARE is not necessary.

Recreation: This proposal will be an enhancement to existing recreational uses. No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with recreation have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to RECREATION is not necessary.

Historic and Cultural Preservation: The proposal was sent to the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe and the Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe for comments. No comments were received. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION is not necessary. However, if in the unlikely event cultural remains are discovered, work shall be stopped, and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Tribes will be contacted as standard protocol.

Transportation: The site is accessed by Gun Club Road, which is a public road. No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with transportation have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to TRANSPORTATION is not necessary.

Public Services: No significant adverse environmental impacts to Public Services have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to PUBLIC SERVICES is not necessary.

Utilities: The Gun Club site is currently served by electricity and telephone and public water supply. No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with utilities have been identified. No mitigation measures are recommended. Additional analysis of the proposal and its effects related to UTILITIES is not necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

Development Review Staff recommends issuance of a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance. Recommended SEPA mitigation measures are attached. *****

Determination of the SEPA Responsible Official:

I have reviewed and considered the referenced proposal, the environmental checklist, public comments, other available material, and the Development Review staff memo and recommendation. I hereby:

_____ issue a Determination of Non-significance

_____ issue a Determination of Mitigated Non-significance

_____ issue a Determination of Significance

_____ determine that I do not have sufficient information upon which to make a threshold determination and direct Development Review Division staff to obtain additional information on the proposal

Stacie Hoskins, SEPA Responsible Official

Date