

1 C. D. Michel - Cal. B.N. 144258  
2 Scott M. Franklin - Cal. B.N. 240254  
(pro hac vice applications forthcoming)  
3 **MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  
4 180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
5 Long Beach, CA 90802  
6 Telephone: (562) 216-4444  
7 Fax: (562) 216-4445  
[cmichel@michellawyers.com](mailto:cmichel@michellawyers.com)  
[sfranklin@michellawyers.com](mailto:sfranklin@michellawyers.com)

8 Attorneys for Proposed Defendant-Intervenor  
9 National Rifle Association

10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**  
12 **PRESCOTT DIVISION**

13 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL ) CASE NO. 3:12-cv-08176-GMS  
14 DIVERSITY et al., )  
15 Plaintiffs, ) **DECLARATION OF CHRIS COX**  
16 vs. ) **IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**  
17 UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, ) **LEAVE TO INTERVENE**  
18 Defendants, and )  
19 NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, )  
20 SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL )  
21 Proposed Defendant-Intervenor. )  
22 \_\_\_\_\_ )

23 **DECLARATION OF CHRIS COX**

24 I, Chris W. Cox, declare as follows:

25 1. I am the current Executive Director of the National Rifle Association’s Institute for  
26 Legislative Action and have held that position since April, 2002. I have worked for the National  
27 Rifle Association (“NRA”) since 1995. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this  
28 Declaration and, if called to testify, could and would testify competently and under oath to these  
facts.

1 2. The NRA is an Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(4) nonprofit corporation,  
2 incorporated in the State of New York in 1871, with principal offices and place of business in  
3 Fairfax, Virginia. The NRA's membership includes approximately 4,000,000 individuals, with  
4 nearly 100,000 members in Arizona alone.

5 3. Article II, Section 5 of the NRA Bylaws states that one of the purposes of the NRA is  
6 "[t]o promote hunter safety, and to promote and defend hunting as a shooting sport and as a  
7 viable and necessary method of fostering the propagation, growth and conservation, and wise use  
8 of our renewable wildlife resources."

9 4. The NRA has been instrumental in the passage of virtually every significant piece of  
10 pro-hunting and wildlife conservation legislation and referenda throughout the nation in  
11 approximately the last thirty years. The NRA has also worked to defeat virtually every  
12 unreasonable anti-hunting law and regulation throughout the nation in the last thirty years.

13 5. The NRA's efforts nationally include developing and supporting legislation in all fifty  
14 states to protect hunters from harassment in the field; protecting and expanding hunting seasons;  
15 passing right-to-hunt amendments to many state constitutions; helping to defeat unreasonable  
16 bans on traditional methods of hunting; and fighting to keep areas open to hunting, among myriad  
17 others.

18 6. In Arizona specifically, the NRA has been actively involved with the Arizona Game  
19 and Fish Commission, testifying before it on deer, elk, sheep and antelope quotas; supporting  
20 pro-hunting appointees to the Commission; and playing an instrumental role in restoring state  
21 wildlife funds that were stripped from the state budget in 2008 and 2009. The NRA also  
22 campaigned against Proposition 201 in 1994 (which threatened to ban all hunting in Arizona),  
23 and has been active in supporting recreational shooting areas in Arizona, as well as an Arizona  
24 Right-to-Hunt bill. In the last three years, the NRA has intervened in three lawsuits seeking to  
25 limit the use of traditional lead-based ammunition, including one in Arizona. All of these  
26 lawsuits were brought by one of the Plaintiffs in the current action, the Center for Biological  
27 Diversity. See *CBD v. BLM*, Case No. 3:09-cv-08011 PGR (D. Ariz.) (The NRA granted  
28 intervention pursuant to FRCP Rule 24(a) on January 30, 2010; Dkt. Doc. 58 at p. 8); *CBD v.*  
*Jackson*, Case No. 1:10-cv-02007-EGS (D.D.C.) (The NRA granted intervention pursuant to  
FRCP 24(a) by Minute Order of April 28, 2011); *Trumpeter Swan Society v. EPA*, Case No.  
1:12-cv-00929-EGS (D.D.C.) (The NRA's unopposed motion to intervene granted by Minute  
Order dated August 31, 2012).


7. The NRA serves as the chair of the Private Sector organizational component to the

1 Federal Lands Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, and Sport Shooting Roundtable Memorandum of  
2 Understanding concerning federal lands in Arizona (which includes agencies such as the U.S.  
3 Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as  
4 well as over forty hunting, shooting and wildlife organizations). Through this position, the NRA  
5 has been involved in making decisions that have protected, opened or increased hunting  
6 opportunities on thousands of acres of National Wildlife Refuge, BLM and National Forest  
7 Service lands, including such places as the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, Tonto National  
8 Forest, and Ironwood Forest National Monument.

8 8. The NRA has been in the forefront of virtually all legislation, regulation, and legal  
9 action concerning the nexus of lead, hunting, and the environment. The most recent example is  
10 in California, where NRA representatives have testified several times before the California Fish  
11 and Game Commission (the “Commission”) on the issue of lead ammunition use and protection  
12 of the California condor. In response to the NRA’s presentation to the Commission on August 8,  
13 2012, the Commission created a joint committee, including NRA, to research what one  
14 Commissioner has referred to as the “psuedo-science” that is being used to link lead-based  
15 ammunition use to health problems experienced by California condors.

15 In accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing  
16 is true and correct.

16 Executed on this 21 day of Sept, 2012, at Fairfax, Va.

17  
18   
19 Christopher Cox

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November, 2012, I electronically transmitted the Declaration of Chris Cox in Support of Motion for Leave to Intervene to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:

Adam F. Keats  
Center for Biological Diversity  
351 California St., Ste 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
415-436-9682  
Fax: 415-436-9683  
Email: akeats@biologicaldiversity.org

Kevin M. Cassidy  
Pacific Environmental Advocacy Center  
Lewis & Clark Law School  
P.O. Box 445  
Norwell, MA 02061  
781-659-1696  
Email: cassidy@lclark.edu

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dustin J. Maghamfar  
US Dept of Justice - Environmental &  
Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, DC 20044  
202-514-1806  
Fax: 202-514-8865  
Email: dustin.maghamfar@usdoj.gov

James Frederick Odenkirk  
Office of the Attorney General  
1275 W Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2997  
602-542-7787  
Fax: 602-542-7798  
Email: james.odenkirk@azag.gov

Attorney for Defendant, United States  
Forest Service

Attorney for Defendant Intervenor, State  
of Arizona

/s/C.D. Michel  
C.D. Michel