

1

2

3

DENALI NATIONAL PARK
AIRCRAFT OVERFLIGHTS ADVISORY COUNCIL

4

5

December 4, 2008
8:22 a.m.

6

Campbell Creek Science Center
Anchorage, Alaska

8

9

Advisory Council Attendees:

Sally Gibert

10

Charlie Sassara

Erika Bennett

11

Lt. Col. Scott Babos

Joan Frankevich

12

Suzanne Rust

Tom George

13

Nancy Bale

14

National Park Service:

Paul Anderson, Denali National Park & Preserve

15

Miriam Valentine, Denali National Park & Preserve

Jenni Burr, Denali National Park & Preserve

16

Jared Withers, NPS soundscape monitoring scientist

17

Audience Members:

William U. Scoles

18

Eric Denkewalter, Talkeetna Aero

Jay Hudson, Hudson Air

19

Matt Unterberger, Kantishna Air Taxi

Paul Roderick, Talkeetna Air Taxi

20

Dave Worrell, Alaska Tourist Industry Association

Jim Okonek

21

Wayne Fuller, Access Fund

Myron Wright

22

R.D. Russo, Denali Air

Jim Morgan, Denali Air

23

24

Reported by: Leslie J. Knisley
Shorthand Reporter

25

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We're going to
2 call the meeting to order, and we're going to
3 confirm that we have a quorum. So if we could go
4 around the table, Joan, and just maybe do a
5 little bit of introduction saying who you are and
6 the constituency you represent.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm Joan
8 Frankevich with NPCA, National Parks Conservation
9 Association, and I represent both statewide and
10 national environmental organizations.

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Lieutenant
12 Colonel Scott Babos. I'm the Air Force
13 representative to the FAA and the State of
14 Alaska, representing the Air Force and the
15 greater DOD, including the Army.

16 TIM CUDNEY: Tim Cudney, Era
17 Helicopters, concession permit holders. I'm here
18 for operators Denali north.

19 ERIKA BENNETT: Erika Bennett, all
20 other commercial aviation users other than ones
21 that have a tour interest in the park.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: Charlie Sassara,
23 the mountaineering community and treasurer of the
24 American Alpine Club.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Sally Gibert, State

1 of Alaska.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Miriam
3 Valentine, I'm the designated federal officer for
4 the group. I work for Denali National Park.

5 PAUL ANDERSON: Paul Anderson,
6 superintendent, Denali National Park & Preserve.

7 SUZANNE RUST: Suzanne Rust, air
8 tour concessionaires or flight tour
9 concessionaires.

10 TOM GEORGE: Tom George, I'm the
11 Alaska representative of the Aircraft Owners and
12 Pilots Association, in this case representing the
13 general aviation.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And so we did
15 hear from Brian Okonek, Nan, Jim Edwards; they
16 will not be able to make it today. And Nancy
17 Bale will be joining us maybe for half of the
18 day, so we do have a quorum.

19 So with that, I'm going to turn it
20 over to Paul.

21 PAUL ANDERSON: Welcome everybody,
22 and thank you for taking the time to be with us
23 today to participate in an important job for
24 Denali and for the aviation industry as well.
25 I've only been able to attend one of the three

1 meetings that you've had so far, and I found that
2 to be quite interesting and useful. But I
3 thought, having talked to several of you since
4 that last meeting, that it might be useful to go
5 back and review quickly our mission and purpose
6 for this group and how it relates to the
7 Backcountry Management Plan and operations at
8 Denali. In other words, what is it that we're
9 really trying to do here and how do we go about
10 getting that done?

11 Just a little bit of background and
12 the justification for this group that we sent to
13 the Secretary of Interior to get it established.
14 We note that the 2006 backcountry plan and the
15 environmental impact statement concluded that
16 "air travel remains an important means to access
17 remote parts of Denali National Park & Preserve
18 for backcountry users and for others, and that
19 scenic air tours are an important means to
20 provide access to and enjoyment of Mount McKinley
21 and the adjoining glaciers. However, the
22 cumulative impact of these tours, plus the
23 additional aircraft traffic, must be mitigated to
24 protect park resource values and the quality of
25 visitor experience."

1 The backcountry plan found that
2 "the opportunity to experience natural sound is a
3 key component of both the resource values for
4 which Denali was established and for the
5 experience of many park visitors." The EIS also
6 found that "there are major and increasing
7 impacts to the natural sound environment of the
8 park resulting primarily from aircraft, including
9 aircraft associated with general aviation,
10 commercial passenger service, military
11 operations, National Park Service research and
12 management, and air taxi and scenic air tour
13 services for park visitors."

14 So the background, to me, says the
15 Park Service recognizes in the backcountry plan,
16 which is the guiding document for management of
17 the park backcountry, that aircraft use or a
18 variety of uses is important and essential both
19 to management of the park and protection of those
20 resources, as well as to the visitor experience,
21 but that it needs to be managed in conjunction
22 with all of the other responsibilities that we
23 have to make sure that we don't derogate resource
24 values and visitor experience by overuse, I guess
25 would be the right word.

1 So as we go forward in our
2 discussions and debates, let us not get into a
3 debate as to whether aircraft use is appropriate
4 or not appropriate. The fact of the matter is
5 for the purposes of this committee, it is
6 appropriate. It's how we do it, where we do it,
7 when we do it that we need to discuss. And what
8 we're trying to accomplish here is to meet the
9 standards that were set in the Backcountry
10 Management Plan.

11 So the purpose and mission of this
12 group from the charter is to, 1, advise the
13 superintendent through the Secretary of Interior
14 on mitigating impacts from aircraft overflights,
15 to develop recommendations for voluntary measures
16 to meet the desired future conditions established
17 in the Backcountry Management Plan over the next
18 15 to 25 years.

19 When we talked last meeting, I kind
20 of got -- and this is me. It's not maybe
21 completely accurate, but it's just one person's
22 point of view. The impression I got was we were
23 concerned about what's happening today, what's
24 realistic today, what do we need to do today to
25 either -- well, to deal with the things that are

1 happening in the air and on the ground in the
2 park right now. And I think what we really need
3 to do as a group is look more strategically at
4 where does the backcountry plan envision us being
5 in 15 to 25 years? Where are we today? How do
6 we get to where we need to go?

7 The Backcountry Management Plan
8 took over six years to develop. It cost millions
9 of dollars, and probably included one of the most
10 extensive public involvement and public input
11 processes that's ever been conducted in the State
12 of Alaska. This group is not charged with
13 modifying the Backcountry Management Plan. This
14 group cannot modify that plan. The plan has been
15 signed and approved and it is the overriding
16 document that guides what we do for the next 15
17 years, plus or minus, in the park.

18 The group is charged with finding
19 or making recommendations for how we best
20 implement that plan, and we need to make sure
21 that as we go through the conversations here,
22 that that's really what we're focused on. To
23 spend a lot of time talking about, well, we don't
24 like what the plan says is not really going to be
25 productive to the mission and the outcome that's

1 expected of this group. The time for "we don't
2 like the plan and we don't think it's realistic"
3 was before the plan was finished, signed and
4 approved by the regional director.

5 Today we're here to do the best we
6 can to find voluntary measures, not regulation,
7 not law, but voluntary measures that we can take,
8 all of us together, that we agree on that we can
9 take that will help to mitigate over time the
10 impact of aircraft on the park and its resources
11 and values, and continue to allow appropriate and
12 adequate access and experience for park visitors
13 and for others; including military, including
14 general aviation, et cetera, et cetera.

15 So as we go forward, please, I hope
16 we'll keep those things in mind and not get
17 too -- what would you say -- well, in order to
18 get where we need to go, we all need to work
19 together towards a common goal and not become
20 isolated or feeling like we have to defend a
21 certain point of view because we're being pushed
22 into a corner. This group won't serve its
23 purpose to marginalize any one user group that's
24 represented here. That doesn't work. It has to
25 be a strategy or recommendation that embraces all

1 of the groups in the room or it's not going to be
2 acceptable.

3 So as we go through this
4 discussion, let us all keep that in mind. We're
5 here to work together, not to -- not to win or
6 lose, but to find a solution that benefits
7 everybody. So, again, I thank you so much for
8 being here, for being willing to take on this
9 task. It's not the easiest job in the world, as
10 everybody knows, but it's a very important one.
11 And I'm confident that with the group we have
12 here that we'll find success that we haven't seen
13 in the past. Thank you. I hope we have a great
14 day. I'm looking forward to it.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you, Paul.
16 You did your work and now we're here for the rest
17 of the day to do ours.

18 So I did want to provide an
19 opportunity for you in the audience to state your
20 name and your affiliations for the record.

21 PAUL RODERICK: Paul Roderick with
22 Talkeetna Air Taxi.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I'm Eric
24 Denkewalter with Talkeetna Aero and Fly Denali.

25 WILLIAM SCOLES: William Scoles

1 with Mount McKinley Princess Lodge and general
2 aviation enthusiast.

3 MATT UNTERBERGER: My name is Matt
4 Unterberger with Kantishna Air Taxi.

5 JARED WITHERS: Jared Withers with
6 Denali National Park & Preserve.

7 JENNI BURR: Jenni Burr with
8 Denali's planning team.

9 JAY HUDSON: Jay Hudson of Hudson
10 Air.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you. One of
12 the things I want to clarify for this -- kind of
13 starting with this meeting. As you know, in the
14 past we've been focusing on gathering
15 information, data exchange. We've had a lot of
16 briefings, a lot of times where I've been sitting
17 in the back with the rest of you. Our forum has
18 been very open, inclusive and everybody can talk
19 and ask questions. Starting with this meeting
20 we're going to be doing less of that and more
21 getting into actual deliberations as an Advisory
22 Council.

23 So with that kind of transition
24 with this meeting, we'll need to run the meeting
25 more tightly where the people that are allowed to

1 speak are at the table. And for you out there,
2 you are there to observe, monitor, and speak
3 during times where we have a number of public
4 opportunities for you guys to speak. And so we
5 want to kind of begin to make that separation
6 because we really do have to work as a group.
7 And it would be -- it gets unwieldy if we -- it
8 isn't a group of 20; it's a group of 12 minus the
9 people that are missing. So it's not a
10 reflection of anything bad; it's just how it is.

11 But I did want to make sure that
12 when we did the information briefings, I wanted
13 to make sure that everybody has the same -- based
14 on understanding could ask questions, and so
15 that's why I was definitely running the meeting
16 more loosely than I really should have been, but
17 I thought it was important to do that. But now
18 we need to focus on ourselves, and you guys can
19 participate in the four or five opportunities
20 here.

21 The other thing I wanted to say is
22 if there's something -- if any of you just had
23 something that was just like you had to get to
24 your constituent representative, for example, if
25 you wanted Suzanne to know something, Suzanne can

1 ask for a break and you can go caucus a little
2 bit if you want to. That's another option.
3 Hopefully in a minimal fashion. We want you guys
4 to have an opportunity to participate, but when
5 it comes to the basic discussion, starting with
6 this meeting it needs to be with the group;
7 otherwise, it's in violation of the charter and
8 the law. But, again, your input is still
9 valuable. We still want to hear from you. We do
10 expect to hear from you.

11 WILLIAM SCOLES: Is that something
12 everybody agrees upon, or is that more your
13 opinion?

14 SALLY GIBERT: It's the law. I
15 mean, we could say there's a consensus
16 recommendation --

17 WILLIAM SCOLES: It's the law?
18 Which law?

19 SALLY GIBERT: -- here that we need
20 to do that, but I don't think we have any choice.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: FACA, there's a
22 charter.

23 WILLIAM SCOLES: But we've been
24 doing it so far and it's gone fairly well.

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: You said this is

1 kind of voluntary, how we're going to make this
2 work. That's why I came. If we're not going to
3 have an opportunity to at least interject
4 occasionally, then what's the point? We might as
5 well wait for the minutes of the meeting and see
6 what went on.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Well, there are a
8 number of places where you can do that. There's
9 three public comment periods. If you want -- if
10 there's a time where you want more, at a break
11 you could ask a member or ask me that you would
12 like to say something. We can modify the agenda.
13 It's not a problem. We want to hear from you.
14 It's just that we want to hear from you -- we
15 can't have a free-flowing discussion with all of
16 you. When we get into talking about
17 deliberations or recommendations, it has to be in
18 this group. That's why the group is set up with
19 representation from all these different
20 interests. So, again, it's not a reflection on
21 any problems in the past or any difficulties with
22 any of you. It's strictly that's what we have to
23 do.

24 ERIC DENKEWALTER: There were
25 supposed to be subcommittees set up early on.

1 There weren't because we were kind of doing it
2 from here. So based on that, you said, okay,
3 this will work. Now you're saying, well, we're
4 not only not going to have subcommittees set up,
5 but we're not going to be able to speak? So we
6 never got that set up because we're doing it like
7 this.

8 TOM GEORGE: One of the things --
9 you're going to see a briefing later that Suzanne
10 was working with, again, some of you all. Some
11 of the recommendations that will actually come
12 out today, one will be to set up a subcommittee
13 to work on some specific tasks. We understand it
14 and this is something we need to get
15 clarification of while we're here today. Again,
16 to stay within the rules of this -- the FACA, the
17 law that we're operating under. I believe in
18 that forum we can actually broaden out and get to
19 exactly what you're looking for. So I'd say, be
20 just a little patient and see if you don't see
21 that develop.

22 SUZANNE RUST: I would agree.
23 That's going to be one of our recommendations
24 today, because Sally asked us to come back today
25 with our progressive measures, what we've done in

1 the past, but also with some ideas. We did come
2 up with some ideas. One is a subcommittee,
3 because that's where we can kind of vet and talk
4 about specific ideas and really get a more full
5 perspective. And it makes us more comfortable,
6 too, as the representatives because we have the
7 support of the constituents and I think that's
8 going to be really important. So I think we'll
9 get to that if you hang on.

10 TOM GEORGE: That hasn't been
11 considered by the whole group yet and obviously
12 that needs to happen, but you'll see a
13 recommendation to go in that direction.

14 SALLY GIBERT: The other thing is
15 that I'm quite sure that we collectively aren't
16 going to be making any irreversible decisions
17 between public comment periods. I think you can
18 see that. We're moving very slowly, kind of too
19 slowly in the eyes of the Park Service, I think,
20 sometimes. But we're moving slowly and providing
21 a lot of opportunities to think between meetings
22 and work with you guys at breaks or between
23 meetings or in subcommittees, whatever it takes.
24 So I don't expect somebody to spring a
25 recommendation on the table that we all say,

1 yeah, let's do it and have it be really
2 problematic to people. That won't happen. It
3 can't happen -- well, it could, but I don't
4 expect it to because that would be a failure of
5 the process. So you will have opportunities to
6 weigh in and we want you to do that. It's more
7 of a discussion dynamic, and so there will be
8 numerous ways for you to be heard from.

9 Any more discussion about that?

10 TIM CUDNEY: A couple of my
11 constituents called me last night and wanted to
12 be notified today when we're going to do our
13 PowerPoint because they flat out say they can't
14 sit here all day long. Even though it is the
15 winter, and I understand that, it's hard for all
16 of us to take a whole day out of work. We're all
17 committed to do this. Again, I compliment the
18 folks for coming in here. We're still busy. It
19 is the winter and the off-season, but we're still
20 busy. I was told flat out, we want to be there,
21 but we need to be here for the important stuff.

22 SALLY GIBERT: One thing is we
23 could schedule -- if there are things we want to
24 schedule for a certain time, we can make sure
25 that whatever else is going on we do that at that

1 time.

2 TIM CUDNEY: I was cautiously
3 optimistic about the turnout on this meeting, and
4 obviously it didn't turn out because we've got a
5 key portion of this group, the environmental
6 community, missing. So I think we're already
7 starting off on a bad foot today, because we have
8 to either all do it together or not at all. Just
9 like Paul said. I'm a little -- I understand one
10 or so, but three is kind of hard.

11 SALLY GIBERT: I mean, it is, and
12 it's also awkward, but it's all kind of coming
13 from similar perspectives.

14 TIM CUDNEY: Sure. Sure.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Well, Nancy is
16 expecting to be here later, so the part of the
17 meeting she's going to miss is going to be more
18 the housekeeping end of it. I'm hoping that by
19 the time we're ready to have more serious
20 discussion, she'll be here.

21 TIM CUDNEY: In defense of our
22 audience, I know we have to follow the charter
23 and follow the bylaws of the working group, but
24 it's the same thing; if they're here, they need
25 to have a voice. Either have a voice by

1 side-barring with us as a representative or have
2 a voice in the committee. Otherwise you're going
3 to see that audience go on from 14 or 8 or 10 to
4 zero. I think that's very, very important.

5 SUZANNE RUST: I would agree with
6 that. I think that's how we've gained a lot of
7 information, and it's been helpful to me
8 representing folks. If the process is we have to
9 break out and have a discussion, I don't know
10 that there should be a process for when there's
11 an important point that I'm going to miss or
12 Tom's going to miss or whomever, we're going to
13 miss something, it would be nice to have an
14 opportunity to get it at that moment.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I would say
16 that any Council member could suggest that at any
17 time, and it could either be -- you can just say,
18 okay, we're going to deviate from our normal
19 format and have a brief discussion on a specific
20 issue. Can we do that? Don't answer the
21 question. (Laughter.) I don't think we can do
22 that, but maybe we can experiment with it and see
23 if that works.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Let's just
25 briefly take a look -- everybody physically look

1 at the agenda and see where there is one, two,
2 three opportunities where the group should be
3 acknowledging the people in the room and saying,
4 okay, you have been hearing the group deliberate.
5 Is there any feedback on that? All this is doing
6 is formalizing the conversation to reach, you
7 know -- from a process perspective. There's also
8 opportunity, as Sally has stated, you know,
9 there's breaks during the day. There's an hour
10 for lunch. You have -- the idea is that you
11 actually have access to the committee members to
12 share thoughts about things. We have also had
13 discussion about the working groups, which
14 Suzanne, I know, had asked about that as well as
15 Joan, and, you know, we said that would be great.
16 We can talk about that more and formalize it
17 maybe after Suzanne makes her recommendation.

18 But I will share with you that the
19 ability for a group to provide guidance to or
20 provide recommendations directly to a federal
21 agency is a very important real deal type of
22 thing. It's not -- you know, we're prohibited
23 from going to one group for -- you know, and
24 getting advice just from one group. It's so --
25 it's supposed to be an open and transparent

1 process. That's why it's so structured, is that
2 we're supposed to -- we have a high level of
3 accountability to it. So putting some structure
4 to this process isn't to lower the voices in the
5 room or shut off who can speak; it's just to make
6 us more accountable to the process itself.

7 I would like us to just try it,
8 because it truly was not working. We had members
9 of the public who had submitted written comment,
10 and I will tell you in other FACA meetings the
11 only thing that gets read is written comments
12 from the public. There is no dialogue like this.
13 Now, that's a very formal way to do it. But we
14 were getting to the point in the meetings where
15 we were not able to have time for those people
16 who took the time to write to us to share that
17 information. That isn't right. So as the
18 designated federal officer, my job is to ensure
19 that we have a process that we can be accountable
20 to, that's fair, but that moves along.

21 We also need to remember the
22 people -- when Sally says this is the group
23 that's been asked to come together to deliberate
24 on the issue, it's the whole process of having
25 folks recommended and selected by D.C. I mean,

1 Paul didn't select the people at this table;
2 neither did the regional director. I mean, we
3 suggest; they go forward; we recommend; it
4 continues to go forward until the Department of
5 Interior, the secretary signs off. Why is that
6 done? It's because your voice is important, but
7 your ability to represent your constituency was
8 considered in that. So Suzanne was considered as
9 being able to fully represent the air taxi
10 concessions. Tim was -- you know, it's a
11 thoughtful process. It's not just putting people
12 in a room to deliberate. It is more formal than
13 that.

14 But I would like us to give it a
15 try. If it needs to be tweaked a little bit,
16 we'll look at that. But it really doesn't work
17 for the National Park Service to have it this
18 informal. That's very uncomfortable considering
19 how accountable we are to the process.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Thank you.

21 TOM GEORGE: Well, Madam Chair,
22 with all this -- with all of the things said and
23 especially the comment Tim made about needing to
24 try and identify a time that maybe some even
25 additional people can join, do you think we can

1 with what we know now -- we have some
2 administrative items to talk about here. And I
3 believe just from one of the e-mails you sent
4 that the place we're going to ask Suzanne to
5 speak in terms of bringing back whatever
6 recommendations or thoughts that she can would be
7 under the other new business; is that correct?

8 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, 10.

9 TOM GEORGE: And I guess what I'd
10 suggest is we pick a time right now, like, say,
11 11:00 a.m. to agree to do that, A, in order to
12 have time to let people know when it would be and
13 have a fixed time for that, followed by in this
14 case lunch, so there's plenty of time to discuss
15 and chew on that after that presentation and
16 before we go back into the afternoon session.
17 Kind of just suspend wherever we are on the
18 agenda up to that point to accommodate that, if
19 that's workable, to address that issue and keep
20 within the structure that we're attempting to
21 live under.

22 SUZANNE RUST: So the discussion or
23 what I was asked to present would not fall under
24 constituent reports?

25 SALLY GIBERT: It could, although I

1 was kind of thinking -- I was assuming it was
2 going to be fairly substantive and directed at
3 our deliberation phase. So I was thinking it may
4 be done there, but if there's things you want to
5 report under constituent reports, it could be
6 there too.

7 TOM GEORGE: I don't care what you
8 call it. Just fix a time.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: If I may. I
10 think that that's the real meat of the discussion
11 and that we should have it earlier in the day so
12 that we can really have the time to consider the
13 what those recommendations might be and try to
14 compress some of this other reporting because
15 it's really not all that useful in a way -- sorry
16 for that judgment -- but getting to the what are
17 we going to do about it stage is why these guys
18 are here and all the rest of us.

19 SALLY GIBERT: I'm not assuming
20 that the -- you know, the agenda is this tall,
21 that 10 would start at 4:30. I'm assuming that
22 this first part we'll keep moving and it will go
23 fairly quickly.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: Setting a time
25 for --

1 SALLY GIBERT: Setting a time, I
2 believe, is good. We also have to -- Jared, are
3 you here the whole day?

4 JARED WITHERS: Yes.

5 SALLY GIBERT: So you don't have to
6 worry about trying to go somewhere.

7 Yeah, I think that will work.

8 ERIKA BENNETT: I think that's a
9 great idea.

10 SALLY GIBERT: So we'll start item
11 No. 10 at 11:00 regardless.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That sounds good,
13 but Nancy won't be here until after lunch. Just
14 thought I'd throw that out there.

15 TOM GEORGE: It would be really
16 nice if she was here. She can't make it until
17 after lunch?

18 SALLY GIBERT: Well, she's a school
19 nurse and so --

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Maybe we could
21 call her. She said she could take the afternoon
22 or the morning.

23 SALLY GIBERT: I think her note
24 said that she was having trouble finding a sub.
25 She couldn't find a sub, so she felt if she could

1 stay there for the morning and then there's a
2 possibility she can leave early if she can't find
3 a sub.

4 TOM GEORGE: We certainly should
5 let her know and see if there's any chance that
6 she could make it, because I think for the people
7 here and the possibility of others coming in,
8 trying to do that before lunch, to leave the
9 lunchtime for interaction would really be
10 helpful. I certainly would like her to be
11 present.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Are we going to try
13 and give her a call?

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I can try it.
15 Want me to try and give her a call?

16 SALLY GIBERT: Sure. Shall we take
17 a short break?

18 TOM GEORGE: Sounds like it.

19 (Break.)

20 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. We'll get
21 started again. Joan reports that Nancy will be
22 here fairly soon, hopefully. She's got a sub,
23 introducing a sub to her job, so she'll be here
24 well before 11:00 hopefully, so that's good.
25 Thank you.

1 Our next item is review and approve
2 agenda. In light of our recent discussion, do we
3 want to plan for anymore comment opportunities at
4 this time, or do we want to play it by ear and
5 someone could call for one if we needed one?

6 TOM GEORGE: So long as we have the
7 understanding that whenever Suzanne's
8 presentation occurs, if we don't spill into lunch
9 immediately, that there's a comment period
10 following that. I think that may meet the
11 immediate need.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Next is
13 member reports. We don't need to do these in any
14 particular order. This is just kind of the order
15 they popped up in. The first one is the
16 assumptions document. As you know, the last two
17 meetings we ran out of time to deal with this at
18 the end, so that's why it's at the beginning this
19 time. I'm going to pass out the document here,
20 and there's extra copies for the audience. Just
21 refreshing. Remember, this was kind of our
22 baseline starting point of where we see ourselves
23 kind of framing our issue. It's a lot like
24 something that Paul was saying, a combination of
25 recognition that the aircraft access and air

1 tours and everybody is important, but also
2 there's an issue associated with it that we're
3 trying to address. So it's pretty close. What
4 you see is the stuff in black are things that
5 everybody has been comfortable with. And the
6 edits in blue are edits that have been suggested
7 by various people in e-mail or contacts since
8 last June. So it would be nice to get this tied
9 off so we have a product.

10 Everybody got it back there?

11 Great. I think I'll just go through and read it
12 starting with No. 1. These are working
13 assumptions. "Maintaining and enhancing public
14 safety is an important goal in all of our
15 deliberations and eventual recommendations."

16 SUZANNE RUST: I would actually put
17 essential instead of important. I think it's a
18 primary goal. It's a foundation, where we start.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Okay with everybody?
20 That's good. No. 2, "The Overflights Council
21 recognizes the intrinsic values of Denali
22 National Park & Preserve. These values include
23 habitat and wildlife, scenic mountain landscapes,
24 and wilderness values, including natural
25 soundscapes."

1 SUZANNE RUST: I think that we
2 should add -- and I don't know how to word it --
3 and visitor experience. Something like that,
4 recognizing that that is -- I don't know how to
5 word it.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Would that fit
7 better under 3, Suzanne?

8 SUZANNE RUST: I don't know.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I feel like we're
10 mixing topics if we put it there, or maybe we
11 could add a point.

12 SUZANNE RUST: I'm trying to think,
13 is it a value? That's why I don't know where to
14 fit it.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Well, there's
16 recreational values. That's a value.

17 SUZANNE RUST: Yeah, but I'm just
18 trying to -- but it is an important part of what
19 Denali National Park is. It's the ability for
20 people to have access to it. I think something
21 needs to be stated in here. I don't know if I'm
22 the only one --

23 TOM GEORGE: No, I think it should
24 go probably there. And, again, Paul, maybe you
25 could clarify. The park is both there to protect

1 the wild elements, but also for visitor use. I
2 mean, this is the duality that causes you so much
3 heartburn in the National Park Service.

4 PAUL ANDERSON: It makes the job so
5 much fun.

6 TOM GEORGE: So much fun. So I
7 think to recognize that Paul has to live with
8 that heartburn constantly, you know, I think it
9 probably should go there as one of the values
10 that we are recognizing intrinsically.

11 PAUL ANDERSON: Generally speaking,
12 when we talk about values, we talk about resource
13 values such as the things that you have listed
14 here. Wilderness values, which are more esoteric
15 perhaps than resource values and visitor
16 experience is generally a separate category of
17 its own.

18 TOM GEORGE: Do we have that
19 category reflected in this list?

20 PAUL ANDERSON: As I look at it --
21 I didn't write this. But I look at No. 2 to say,
22 here's the intrinsic values of the park, and then
23 3 is here's the visitor experience, and we need
24 to make sure we don't overlook either one.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Paul, I'm looking at

1 the notebook. Purposes of Denali includes a lot
2 more stuff than we want to -- to protect and
3 ensure that the entire mountain message, to
4 protect habitat for populations of fish and
5 wildlife including but not limited to mountain
6 bears, moose, and to provide continued
7 opportunities including reasonable access for
8 mountain climbing, mountaineering and other
9 wilderness recreational activities.

10 ERIKA BENNETT: Maybe adding
11 wilderness recreational opportunities.

12 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, because the next
13 point appears to be specifically talking about
14 overflights. To me, if we're going to capture
15 this broader essence, it either ought to be in 2
16 or somewhere else.

17 ERIKA BENNETT: We could add it in
18 after scenic mountain landscapes, wilderness
19 recreational opportunities and wilderness values
20 including natural soundscapes.

21 TOM GEORGE: Say what you just said
22 again, please.

23 ERIKA BENNETT: These values
24 include habitat and wildlife, scenic mountain
25 landscapes, comma, wilderness recreational

1 opportunities, comma, and wilderness values,
2 including natural soundscapes.

3 Does everybody seem okay with that?

4 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

5 TOM GEORGE: That sounds good.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. No. 3, The
7 Denali Backcountry Management Plan, expressly or
8 not, acknowledges that overflights and
9 backcountry landings are an integral and
10 necessary part of the range of Denali National
11 Park and Preserve experiences.

12 And we have suggestions to change
13 integral and necessary to some combination of
14 appropriate or important. And I noticed that in
15 Paul's introductory remarks he also included
16 essential. He also mentioned important and
17 appropriate.

18 TOM GEORGE: I'm going to argue for
19 integral and necessary, the original wording,
20 because the more I study this situation, the more
21 I become convinced if you didn't have airplanes
22 providing some of the functions, and helicopters,
23 there today, you would have a whole lot more
24 roads in that park. The climbers aren't going to
25 walk from the road to climb Mount McKinley, so I

1 think actually this is integral in that park. It
2 wouldn't necessarily be integral in some park in
3 the Lower 48 that had good road access.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I would recommend
5 since we're talking about the backcountry plan
6 that we take the wording from the backcountry
7 plan. Paul, maybe you could reread that. You
8 said something that really fit this in your
9 opening remarks, and it sounded like you were
10 quoting exactly from the plan. So why don't we
11 take the wording right from the plan, since
12 that's what we're referring to in point 3?

13 TOM GEORGE: You actually used the
14 word essential because I wrote it down when you
15 said it.

16 SALLY GIBERT: I wrote down
17 important, essential and appropriate.

18 TOM GEORGE: I think important and
19 essential are the two words that I wrote down.

20 PAUL ANDERSON: It says, Air travel
21 remains an important means to access. Scenic air
22 tours are an important means to provide access
23 and enjoyment.

24 ERIKA BENNETT: I don't think
25 necessary was in there because it really isn't

1 necessary. You'd just spend two years doing what
2 would take you three days.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: Here's another
4 piece of legislation that affects concessions
5 operations in the park. In order to authorize a
6 concession operation in the park, we have to find
7 that it's necessary. If it's not necessary, we
8 don't authorize it. By de facto we've already
9 deemed that by the fact that we have concessions
10 where you take air taxis that they would be
11 necessary, but it's not written in here or at
12 least it's not written in what I read. I don't
13 know what I read before.

14 TOM GEORGE: I don't know, but you
15 said it. So how about swapping essential for
16 integral? Joan, is that any better in your mind?

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think if we're
18 quoting the backcountry plan, I think we should
19 use words from the backcountry plan.

20 ERIKA BENNETT: Important and
21 necessary?

22 SUZANNE RUST: What I thought about
23 was the strength of integral is that for many
24 people it is. I mean, it's just part of the
25 experience. There's not a way to have that

1 experience for many without, like, the bus tours
2 for people getting into the backcountry and
3 people having that experience.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: You're reading
5 into the -- you would need to stick to what the
6 Backcountry Management Plan says. We may think
7 it's integral and necessary, but whatever the
8 plan says it is, that's according to the plan.
9 So you can't put more into it than what is there,
10 unless it's inferred because of what's in there.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Since I wrote the
12 original and I didn't take the time to find the
13 right wording, I figured there would be little
14 pieces all over the place. That was my
15 interpretation of the plan, that it's integral
16 and necessary. So that's an interpretation of
17 the plan as a whole.

18 TOM GEORGE: So how about important
19 and necessary? I think it is integral, but I'm
20 not hung up on that word.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I deal so much
22 with ANILCA, ANILCA language, what people think
23 it says. So if you're quoting a document --
24 because maybe we don't know what it means, but
25 five years from now it gets twisted and I feel

1 that it shows what people think they say and they
2 don't go back to the actual document. Since
3 we're saying this is what we're going to do, I
4 think we have to use the wording of the document
5 and the document says important. I think that
6 covers the point.

7 SALLY GIBERT: And I have sympathy
8 with your point of view because I understand
9 that. People can get way in there and different
10 words mean different things to different people.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I understand your
12 point.

13 SUZANNE RUST: I think important is
14 fine, but necessary should be in there, though.
15 It shapes how we deal with the park as
16 concessionaires, that we are necessary.
17 Important, I'm fine with.

18 TOM GEORGE: I printed out some
19 pages from the backcountry plan. Aircraft are an
20 important means of visitor access to remote areas
21 of Denali.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Could we use that
23 sentence?

24 TOM GEORGE: I think we should use
25 this sentence.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I can concede
2 that.

3 SALLY GIBERT: So we have are an
4 important and necessary part of the range of
5 Denali Park and Preserve experiences. And we'll
6 take out expressly?

7 TOM GEORGE: Yeah.

8 SALLY GIBERT: It's not necessary.

9 TOM GEORGE: It's expressly not
10 necessary.

11 SALLY GIBERT: 4, this is going to
12 be interesting. Human-caused sound, or these
13 other alternatives, including the sound of
14 aircraft, can -- and I'll read this in here --
15 exceed the Backcountry Management Plan soundscape
16 standards, and can diminish the experience of
17 park visitors, including the experience of those
18 visitors who rely on aircraft to get to the park.
19 These park experiences, ranging from highly
20 accessible to remote, include wildlife viewing,
21 climbing, hiking, camping and other opportunities
22 for solitude and primitive and unconfined
23 recreation.

24 The issues with this one were
25 mostly related to the term human-caused sound as

1 being awkward and whether or not we reference the
2 Backcountry Management Plan sound standards are
3 the two issues in the past anyway. Let's start
4 with that first term. These alternatives are all
5 options that have come up in previous discussion.
6 Any preferences?

7 ERIKA BENNETT: I like human-caused
8 sound. It's the simplest.

9 TIM CUDNEY: I agree.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Everybody is
11 okay with human-caused sound? Okay.

12 ERIKA BENNETT: I was just going to
13 throw a wrench in the works and see if anybody
14 wanted to change the word diminish to affect, not
15 effect but affect.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: No.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So how does
18 everybody feel about the addition or subtraction
19 of the Backcountry Management Plan soundscape
20 standards?

21 TOM GEORGE: Paul, this is the one
22 comment I wanted to make relative to your
23 opening. I recall, and please correct me if I'm
24 wrong -- well, yeah, the backcountry plan was
25 established. There was discussion leading up to

1 and I believe incorporated into the plan which
2 recognized that those standards that were
3 identified in that plan were identified before
4 you really had much data, and that there was a
5 five-year window to then come back and revisit
6 those standards. So I personally cannot accept
7 that those standards necessarily suit our
8 purposes. I can accept that human-caused sound
9 and aircraft does diminish the experience of park
10 visitors. But right now what I hope that we will
11 do is come up with ways to, where we can,
12 mitigate sounds and then come back and look at
13 the standards and see if what we've done fit
14 those standards or not. I don't want to get
15 wrapped up in fighting a battle about standards
16 right now. But with that in mind, no, I don't
17 want to link exceeding the backcountry standards
18 to an agreement that human-caused sound can
19 diminish the experience. I think those are two
20 separate things and it's best to keep them
21 separate.

22 PAUL ANDERSON: I don't disagree
23 with you, Tom. In fact, the plan says that we
24 will come back and revisit that. But what I
25 think is the message that I was trying to put on

1 the table is that it's not the responsibility of
2 this overflights advisory group to change those
3 standards.

4 TOM GEORGE: I understand and I
5 agree with that.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So it sounds like
7 we're back to the original writing.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Right. And Nancy
9 Bales just showed up. Welcome.

10 NANCY BALE: Sorry I'm late. It's
11 hard to get a sub nurse in the school district.
12 There are not very many of them.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Nancy, we've been
14 working on the assumptions document. We have one
15 left.

16 TOM GEORGE: I'm copying down for
17 her what we've done already so she's got that.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. This last
19 one, Thus our challenge on the Overflights
20 Council is to recommend ways to balance the needs
21 of public safety, public use -- potentially and
22 access -- and protection of natural resources and
23 values in a way that is fair to all parties. Our
24 time frame is 20 years -- projected life span of
25 the existing Backcountry Management Plan.

1 Any comments about this as a whole
2 and whether or not you want to add public use and
3 access?

4 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: I think you
5 need to add the access because public use can be
6 sitting on the border and looking in, and
7 obviously the airplane opens up access in a way
8 that's less obtrusive as opposed to roads. So I
9 think access is an important point.

10 SALLY GIBERT: I think so. Any
11 objections to adding that?

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think it's
13 appropriate.

14 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So this time
15 frame 20 years, is that technically correct,
16 Paul, from your perspective?

17 PAUL ANDERSON: Yes.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Good enough. Close
19 enough.

20 TOM GEORGE: Plus or minus.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So to review
22 the final for our benefit and Nancy's. No. 1,
23 Maintaining and enhancing public safety is an
24 essential goal in all of our deliberations and
25 eventual recommendations.

1 The Overflights Council recognizes
2 the intrinsic values of the Denali National Park
3 and Preserve. These values include habitat and
4 wildlife, scenic mountain landscapes, wilderness
5 and recreational opportunities and wilderness
6 values, including natural soundscapes.

7 The Denali Backcountry Management
8 Plan acknowledges that overflights and
9 backcountry landings are an important and
10 necessary part of the range of Denali National
11 Park and Preserve experiences.

12 Human-caused sound, including the
13 sound of aircraft, can diminish the experience of
14 park visitors, including the experience of those
15 visitors who rely on aircraft to get to the park
16 These park experiences, ranging from highly
17 accessible to remote, include wildlife viewing,
18 climbing, hiking, camping and other opportunities
19 for solitude and primitive and unconfined
20 recreation.

21 Thus, our challenge on the
22 Overflights Council is to recommend ways to
23 balance the needs of public safety, public use
24 and access, and protection of natural resources
25 and values in a way that is fair to all parties.

1 Our time frame is 20 years -- the projected life
2 span of the existing Backcountry Management Plan.

3 Nancy, do you have any concerns or
4 thoughts about any of these?

5 NANCY BALE: Thank you, Sally,
6 for -- I just wrote, when I made notes on the
7 assumptions document, I wrote on the our
8 challenge part: Thus, our challenge on the
9 Overflights Council is to recommend ways to
10 balance the needs of public safety, public use
11 and protection of natural resources and values in
12 a way that is fair to all parties. I just wrote
13 a little note in here: Better to take our
14 purpose directly from charter language. And then
15 I wrote another paragraph saying: The NPS
16 mandate to avoid impairment of natural resources
17 naturally leads to emphasis on certain types of
18 recreation and a certain scale and scope of human
19 activities. It is possible that caps and limits
20 may seem unfair to some users or groups and yet
21 will be the only way to protect resources. For
22 the Council, a solution that is acceptable to all
23 parties may be a more achievable goal, but it may
24 not be in line with park purposes at all times.

25 Now, I don't know where we would

1 go. That's not what I want to be in the -- I
2 don't want that language to necessarily be in the
3 assumptions document, but you see where I'm going
4 with that? The acceptable to all parties
5 standard may not be the standard that the charter
6 is asking us to accede to. They may be asking
7 for a standard that avoids impairment to park
8 resources, but if it avoids impairment while
9 being acceptable to all parties, then --

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It says fair, not
11 acceptable.

12 NANCY BALE: Then, I suppose I'm
13 okay with it as long as the Council understands
14 that I read it as the charter says: The purpose
15 of the Council is to advise the secretary through
16 the director of the National Park Service on
17 matters relating to mitigation of impacts from
18 aircraft overflights. The Council will develop
19 voluntary measures for assuring safety of
20 passengers, pilots and mountaineers and for
21 achieving desired future resources at Denali
22 National Park.

23 So as long as that statement
24 doesn't conflict with the charter language, if
25 the Council all feels like it doesn't, then I'm

1 comfortable. I just want to be sure that
2 that's -- we're really taking our purpose from
3 the charter.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Right. This isn't
5 intended to replace the mission in the charter.
6 It's more how we process --

7 NANCE BALE: How we work as a
8 group.

9 SALLY GIBERT: I would want to be
10 careful -- I would want to avoid adding anything
11 in here that implies that we have specific
12 standards that we need to meet. I don't think
13 that -- we're not the ones that are responsible
14 for making sure that the Park Service soundscape
15 measures are met. So as long as that's
16 understood also, I think we're okay.

17 So do we have a wrap? Okay.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You're okay with
19 it as written, Nancy, or do you want to change
20 it?

21 NANCY BALE: Well, if the Council
22 doesn't see a conflict with what I brought up,
23 then I'm fine. The Council doesn't see a
24 conflict?

25 SALLY GIBERT: Huh-uh.

1 NANCY BALE: Okay. Then I don't
2 either.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Consistent with our
4 discussions earlier about the process, we have
5 Council members that aren't here. So I think we
6 can say that we're comfortable with this as a
7 group, but before we finalize it, that we should
8 make sure that the people that aren't here have a
9 chance to weigh in. And, theoretically, at the
10 next comment period we can hear suggestions from
11 the audience. So for the moment we're
12 comfortable with this. Okay. Great.

13 NANCY BALE: Sally, may I just make
14 a statement about No. 4?

15 SALLY GIBERT: Uh-huh.

16 NANCY BALE: And I apologize that
17 I'm late. I know you already went over this.
18 That human-caused sound can diminish the
19 experience of park visitors. I did make one
20 little addition. And can exceed the standards of
21 soundscape plans, because I think the experience
22 of park visitors is not the only element, but the
23 condition of the soundscape as a whole. So it's
24 okay if we don't include that, but my criterion
25 for suggestions would be the health of the

1 soundscape not just the experience of the
2 visitors, if everyone understands. There's a
3 little bit of a difference there. So even though
4 we may be arguing a little bit on how the
5 soundscape is measured and what the standards
6 will be in the future and all, that that is in
7 the backcountry plan. The health of the
8 soundscape is a primary guiding point not just
9 the experience of visitors. How we would put
10 that in there or if we need to put it in, I'll
11 leave it up to everybody else.

12 Do people feel like it's important
13 to differentiate between the health of the
14 soundscape and the experience of visitors?

15 SALLY GIBERT: For me -- and
16 perhaps I shouldn't jump out as being the chair.
17 For me, I'm less comfortable with representing
18 backcountry standards in this particular context,
19 in part from what Tom said, that they're not
20 magical. They're in place, but it's known that
21 they're not necessarily the end all and we're
22 talking about ultimately the concern of
23 diminishing the park visitor experience, that
24 anything that we do, any voluntary measures that
25 we craft or come up with will automatically help

1 get to those standards regardless of what they
2 are. So I personally don't see a need to mention
3 them, and to me it may muddy the waters a little
4 bit.

5 NANCY BALE: So we would leave that
6 understanding up to the Park Service?

7 SALLY GIBERT: Or maybe we would
8 pick it up later if that's something we want to
9 do relative to the standards.

10 NANCY BALE: Okay. I think there's
11 sort of a healthy soundscape ideal out there that
12 some ears may not recognize, if you understand
13 what I'm saying. Someone from New York, for
14 instance, who is used to very loud soundscape
15 might have no problem with a lot of noise at
16 Denali. But still the Park Service might want to
17 present that person with a certain type of
18 healthy soundscape to try to educate them into
19 that, and I think that's a legitimate goal for
20 the Park Service that may be beyond the scope of
21 our work.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Any other thoughts?

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm fine either
24 way. If it's important to Nancy, it sounds good.
25 There were some discussions --

1 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, we discussed
2 this a little bit just at the time you were
3 arriving. Recognizing there is almost a bit of a
4 separate issue, and there were some remarks Paul
5 made at the beginning also that you missed
6 unfortunately about -- we're not trying to
7 redesign the backcountry plan that's in place, so
8 our work is kind of separate to that.

9 SALLY GIBERT: I think we all do
10 recognize that there's an intrinsic soundscape
11 issue that's separate from the visitor
12 experience.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: But this document
14 doesn't say that and I know that's an important
15 point for Nancy. Maybe we need another point.

16 ERIKA BENNETT: It is actually No.
17 2.

18 SALLY GIBERT: It is actually No.
19 2.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. Great.
21 Intrinsic value. Does that cover your --

22 NANCY BALE: Yes. And I'll
23 continue to bring that up as we deliberate
24 because I think that is an important thing to
25 have -- you know, national parks are supposed to

1 be places where people are educated about things
2 they may not know or understand. They need to
3 have some of these intrinsic values in place, and
4 those are values that are hard to protect in a
5 modern society.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Great. Okay.
7 We'll set this one aside for the time being.

8 Constituent reports. Does anybody
9 have any? I've got a small one. Suzanne, do you
10 want to do anything now or do you want to hold
11 until 11:00?

12 SUZANNE RUST: Okay.

13 TOM GEORGE: I'll make a short one.

14 ERIKA BENNETT: I have a short one.

15 TOM GEORGE: Why don't you just go
16 around the table?

17 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. So, Nancy, do
18 you have anything you want to report?

19 NANCY BALE: Not at this time.
20 I've already talked a lot.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Tom?

22 TOM GEORGE: I will just report
23 that there were two meetings that I was involved
24 in with aviation community groups just to kind of
25 let them know about this working group and the

1 work that it's involved in. One was the aviation
2 conference in Fairbanks. Suzanne came up and we
3 both presented there. And then later I gave a
4 talk to the Alaska Aviation Coordination Council,
5 which again is a statewide aviation -- a group of
6 statewide aviation associations and government
7 agencies, including the FAA, just again briefed
8 them with this plan.

9 The one other thing I'll say is I
10 took an attempt at an IOU at the last meeting to
11 look at the question of what GA aircraft might
12 overfly the park. I think somebody raised that
13 as a question. I wasn't really able to come up
14 with any way to quantify that. I did go as far
15 as to look at a report of the 10,000 or so
16 registered aircraft in the State of Alaska, but
17 that didn't tell me -- the summary is 31 pages
18 long, so it didn't look like a very helpful
19 document. I couldn't actually make any
20 correlation between the aircraft registered here
21 versus aircraft flying over the park. There are
22 aircraft outside the State of Alaska that fly
23 over the park; there are many aircraft in the
24 State of Alaska that don't fly over the park. So
25 at this point I think I can report that I drew a

1 blank in terms of trying to quantify that at this
2 point. End of report.

3 SUZANNE RUST: I have something to
4 add. I went with Tom and did the presentation in
5 Fairbanks. I also presented just a general short
6 presentation to the Alaska Travel Industry
7 Association at our board meeting in November.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Are you a board
9 member?

10 SUZANNE RUST: I am. I do serve on
11 the board. I just talked about what we're
12 currently doing and the process. We also had an
13 opportunity to meet with the different air
14 services. Erika was there, Tim, Tom; most of the
15 air services were represented. We had a short
16 meeting and some of the presentation today will
17 be taken from those meeting notes. We came up
18 with some ideas from that, and so that's where
19 that will come from. That's what I've been
20 doing.

21 SALLY GIBERT: I had promised to
22 try and see if I could figure out whether the
23 State had any guidelines about overflights
24 related to wildlife or wildlife harassment by
25 air, things like that. It took a while to get

1 that. I finally got some information, which I
2 will pass out. This is an informal e-mail that I
3 got, and there isn't much. The only thing that
4 is in State regulations through the Board of Game
5 is a definition of harassment, that harassment
6 means to repeatedly approach an animal in a
7 manner that will alter its behavior. So
8 theoretically if a pilot was spotted repeatedly
9 diving or photographing for whatever purposes
10 animals in a way that would cause them to alter
11 their behavior, that they theoretically could be
12 cited by Fish and Game. And that's the only kind
13 of citeable or enforceable offense and obviously
14 that's fairly subjective. So I don't think it's
15 done very often.

16 In terms of general
17 recommendations, similar to the FAA's
18 recommendations, for staying at 2,000 feet
19 elevation above the ground -- or altitude.
20 Excuse me. Anyway, for State game refuges they
21 recommend 500 feet vertical and quarter-mile
22 horizontal above all State game refuges and this
23 is primarily for migratory birds. For mammals
24 the Fish and Game doesn't have any
25 recommendations on State land or State game

1 refuges, but they have recommended to the Forest
2 Service, because the Forest Service authorizes
3 heli-skiing. And so they recommend no-fly zones
4 and another recommendation to maintain a
5 half-mile horizontal for individual goats, which
6 sounds kind of hard to do. How do you see one
7 goat from a half mile away and avoid it? But
8 those are advisories. And that is about it.

9 So there isn't anything other than
10 the harassment regulation from the State's side
11 that regulates overflights relative to wildlife.
12 So that completes my homework assignment.

13 TOM GEORGE: Question for Sally on
14 that. I think in terms of that law, I don't know
15 if you checked with the enforcement side of the
16 house, but I think this is a pretty important
17 statute and I think people do get cited, you
18 know, guides get cited for violating that
19 statute, my guess is, and have been. I think
20 that's a little more than kind of a fuzzy. I
21 think that's actually an enforced, strictly
22 enforced statute.

23 ERIKA BENNETT: I think highly
24 enforced. They have to be observed by the right
25 person.

1 SALLY GIBERT: I wasn't thinking of
2 it in terms of hunting, but you're right.

3 ERIKA BENNETT: Just a quick
4 constituent report. I talked to a few of the
5 commercial operators that habitually find
6 themselves above if not inside Denali National
7 Park. And 90 to 95 percent of the air operators
8 are on IFR flight plans and pretty much just
9 shrugged their shoulders when it came to what
10 we're doing here, because they're not going to
11 change anything unless they're told to by the
12 FAA. The ones that occasionally come down from
13 Fairbanks or go north from Anchorage that might
14 find themselves in the park on a nice day, I
15 haven't talked to anybody specifically about that
16 or what they would do or how they would feel
17 about the voluntary measures. That's the end of
18 mine.

19 TOM GEORGE: I assume the people
20 you're talking about are flying at levels above
21 18,000?

22 ERIKA BENNETT: They're flying at
23 flight levels above 24,000 feet, but they are
24 showing up on the soundscape reports.

25 TIM CUDNEY: I have nothing to

1 report other than what we discuss in the
2 PowerPoint presentation.

3 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: In the
4 military we have a biannual civil military
5 council. We had one in October. Tom George was
6 there. This was actually brought up as a point,
7 and the word is the military has no intentions of
8 encroaching on or near the boundaries of Denali.
9 Hopefully we'll continue to remain a nonfactor in
10 that area of the state. Tom and I talked about,
11 at the next one we'll have in April, Tom and I
12 may get up and give a five- or ten-minute
13 presentation on what this group does to all the
14 military people just so they're aware.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I have nothing.

16 TOM GEORGE: Question for Scott,
17 though. You may not be overflying the park
18 directly, but is your sound?

19 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: That's true.

20 TOM GEORGE: So, I mean, I think
21 each of us as stakeholders and you in specific
22 might want to actually get some of Jared's data
23 and take a look at the timing of your exercise
24 versus, you know, whatever's closest to some of
25 his sound recording sites and see if you can make

1 a correlation going forward.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought that
3 you had told us previously that you try not to
4 use them, but you do have some flight patterns
5 over the south area.

6 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: That is
7 correct. We do have areas over the south from
8 our MOA. Right now we restrict our use. It's
9 not a daily use. We do it more for what we call
10 FDF functional check flights, so we do fly in
11 that area, and we will probably show up on some
12 of his soundscapes. But, like I say, that's
13 something that the military is more than willing
14 to try to reduce that if we're a factor in there.
15 That's not a high use MOA. I can probably get
16 some more figures and show you exactly how often
17 the military is flying in that MOA, so we could
18 see. I think there will be a presence of
19 military jets flying there, and we can continue
20 to look at that and reduce that if that's a
21 factor in affecting the overall soundscape.
22 We've got other areas and we're more than willing
23 to move. Obviously we don't want to affect the
24 national park. I'll take that as a homework
25 assignment to come back and tell you exactly at

1 the next meeting how many times we flew in the
2 Susitna MOA and the frequency of that.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Have you sensed that
4 the amount of use in or near the park has reduced
5 in the last few years as issues of sound have
6 been discussed?

7 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: I would not
8 say we reduced. I would say just maintained what
9 we've done and used that area. Now that this is
10 coming up, the next meeting we will brief this to
11 make sure the rest of the military are aware.
12 We're going to make sure that if they have a
13 choice of going in this MOA or another MOA, you
14 know, obviously in July it would be better to go
15 up to Galena MOA than it would be to go to the
16 closer one. Right now we haven't made any
17 deliberate efforts to try to reduce it. That is
18 something we're open to.

19 NANCY BALE: Scott, at the last
20 meeting I think you said something about
21 sometimes military aircraft are transported
22 between Fairbanks and Anchorage and Anchorage and
23 Fairbanks through the normal transport lanes.

24 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: That's
25 correct.

1 NANCY BALE: And they would be at
2 24, 30,000, something like that?

3 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Well,
4 obviously people go between Eilson and Elmendorf
5 and at times you will have a guy who will cancel
6 and go VFR and then maybe drop down to 17,000,
7 16,000 feet and maybe try to get a little bit
8 closer to look at Denali or something like that.
9 I mean, we watch that pretty closely. A lot of
10 people, as soon as they see that, they know
11 that's not where it is and they make a call to
12 either one of the bases, we will find out and
13 take action, but I'm not going to tell you that
14 it never happens. It does happen, especially
15 people who are TDY up here, they'll say, well,
16 let's cancel and do a pass by Denali. I continue
17 to hope that we continue to enforce discipline on
18 those few people who do step outside the line.

19 TOM GEORGE: And they have some
20 great air photos to prove it. The visitor
21 experience actually peaked at that point. The
22 folks on the ground loved that fly-by. That's a
23 patriotic thing.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Anything more for
25 member reports? Okay.

1 Next one is consideration of a
2 vice-chair position. I put this on the agenda.

3 TOM GEORGE: I'd like to move to
4 the next agenda item.

5 SALLY GIBERT: It would be nice to
6 have someone else as back-up in case I'm not here
7 to run the meeting, but more importantly what I
8 would like is somebody to help me out, to do some
9 of the stuff I do between meetings. The one that
10 came up the last time was the Park Service was
11 asking me to sort of recall the information
12 requests that we had generated from the last
13 meeting and to compile those. We had a lot of
14 stuff coming up through the meeting, so I had
15 really good intentions of doing that, going back
16 over my notes, and I just couldn't get to it. I
17 couldn't spend enough time to do it.

18 So, I mean, sometimes I have time
19 and sometimes I don't. So it would be really
20 good if there's some interest in having a
21 vice-chair to be able to support the
22 administration of this group that would be able
23 to help me out when I get backed up in my
24 workload, as I often do. I know everyone is
25 busy, but just to share the workload a little

1 bit.

2 Any thoughts about that and/or any
3 volunteers? Any thoughts about that in general,
4 about a vice-chair?

5 ERIKA BENNETT: I can help. If you
6 need somebody to step in, I can help you.

7 TIM CUDNEY: If you were to be
8 absent, I think we all could pick up the slack.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. In terms of
10 between meetings to try and delegate something to
11 somebody, try to call Erika or call anybody or
12 send out an e-mail saying can anybody help with
13 this or --

14 TIM CUDNEY: Just raise your hand.

15 TOM GEORGE: I second that.

16 ERIKA BENNETT: We don't need to
17 make it a vice-chair. Call it a secretary
18 position.

19 SALLY GIBERT: It's just basically
20 somebody else to help.

21 TOM GEORGE: Maybe we should refer
22 to our official federal officer. Are there any
23 specifics in the FACA world about that?

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You know, other
25 than the group can select that position, select a

1 chair. I think in Sally's defense she has a
2 tremendous amount of work, so if there was
3 somebody who was willing to help her. It takes a
4 lot of logistics to pull it all together. She's
5 been holding up beautifully, but I think it would
6 be good for the group.

7 TOM GEORGE: I would say call on
8 any number of us to help you. We all want to see
9 this go forward. You can call on specific people
10 for specific things.

11 SUZANNE RUST: I'll be glad to
12 help, if I can, with specific items. I think all
13 of us will.

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Erika, I'll put your
16 name on the top of the list.

17 ERIKA BENNETT: I'm not as well
18 connected in that world as you are.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Call on Erika
20 first, but feel free to send out an e-mail to
21 everybody. I tend to take notes. I can serve as
22 a resource for what we said. Feel free to ask.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Maybe in
24 terms of a vice-chair, if for some reason I'm not
25 here, you guys can decide who can run the meeting

1 that day.

2 TOM GEORGE: We're just going to
3 check the meeting schedule based on your
4 availability. That's all.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: In your absence,
6 does it have to be one of us? Could it be
7 Miriam?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It shouldn't. I
9 prefer that the group select someone.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I find that when
11 you're in deliberations, it's hard to observe the
12 meeting and run it. So I don't want to lose
13 Sally or whoever is acting as chair as a
14 participant because they are watching the
15 meeting.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: One of the
17 things we'll talk about when we get to the
18 superintendent reports is maybe the need for a
19 facilitator, an outside facilitator to come in
20 who would not chair the meeting, but move it
21 along so that, like in your position, Sally would
22 have more of an opportunity to participate and
23 wouldn't be so concerned about the actual
24 process. That's something we'll want your
25 feedback on for consideration.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Consideration
2 of alternates. We've been talking over time
3 about whether we could assign alternates or
4 invite alternates if we're not here. I just kind
5 of wanted to close that off. I think there are
6 some limitations and we can finish the discussion
7 on that. My sense is that over the course of the
8 last three meetings and now this one, that trying
9 to identify sort of back-up alternates is
10 problematic both from the standpoint of the
11 charter and the time it would take to try and do
12 that.

13 It's sort of giving ourselves
14 permission to not be here when we really need to
15 focus as a group. At this point I think we
16 should all sort of dedicate ourselves to being
17 here as much as possible and not relying on
18 alternates just because of the group dynamics and
19 the history that we have together, and that we
20 not try and initiate a process to amend our
21 charter to have alternates is my thought and kind
22 of sense of the group.

23 How do people feel about that?

24 ERIKA BENNETT: Yeah, based on the
25 FACA rules, it would be years before we got

1 anything fixed, so --

2 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, yeah.

3 NANCY BALE: I think it weakens us
4 as a group.

5 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, to do that.

6 SALLY GIBERT: I agree. Okay. And
7 then we've also talked about replacement members.
8 Some of the ones on the Council have two-year
9 terms and some have four-year terms. We're
10 already into the second year. It's September '10
11 or '09.

12 TIM CUDNEY: September 4th for the
13 first two-year term.

14 ERIKA BENNETT: Who here are on
15 two-year terms?

16 SALLY GIBERT: I've got this
17 information here. Scott, you're two; Nancy Bale,
18 two; Erika, you're four; Tim is two; Nan is two;
19 Jim Edwards is four; Joan is two; Tom is two; I'm
20 four; Brian is four; Suzanne is four; Charlie is
21 four. Just in general, sort of like for the
22 reason that we decided for not having alternates,
23 I think it would be good if we as a group
24 recommend to the Park Service that we stick with
25 the people that we have now in our two-year terms

1 and those will move into four-year terms, and
2 then after that everybody would have four-year
3 terms so that not everybody would expire at the
4 same time. To do that next year, I think, would
5 be too soon. I understand there's some kind of
6 policy directive or general philosophy to replace
7 members periodically, and that may have merit in
8 the long run to provide continued diversity and
9 provide breathing space. But I think at this
10 stage for those first two-year terms, I don't
11 think that would be wise in my opinion.

12 Any other thoughts about that?

13 ERIKA BENNETT: I agree.

14 TOM GEORGE: We could impose term
15 limits of people staying on forever.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Don't we have a
17 set time we're supposed to work in?

18 SALLY GIBERT: Six years, but it
19 could be extended. The first term rollover, then
20 I guess it's unknown how long it would go.

21 NANCY BALE: That may just be a
22 feature of FACA to try to make it possible for
23 people to leave without tons of paperwork because
24 their career changes or whatever. Ideally, I
25 believe we should stay the same until we're done.

1 TOM GEORGE: In the case of FAA or
2 with any government agency when the term is
3 over -- you know, Scott actually tries to escape
4 the Air Force -- what then are the provisions for
5 replacement?

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So because of --
7 they go back and look at what the charter says.
8 In this case, they go back to how you appointed
9 the members originally and use that. And so that
10 is why we kind of got stuck in a bind that there
11 wasn't any provision in the charter language for
12 alternates. So like in Jim Edwards' case, when
13 he indicated that he may be retiring, I had
14 actually sent a note to Jim and to some other
15 members of the FAA and said, you know, your
16 representation is vital to the group, so if
17 you're considering this even in a six-month
18 year-out time frame, please send us your next --
19 like we would get ahead of the curve. Who do you
20 anticipate serving in this role for you? I
21 haven't received anything yet from Jim.

22 TOM GEORGE: My question is: What
23 does your process require? You essentially
24 replace any -- you don't have to go through the
25 Park Service?

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right. This is
2 how it would go.

3 TOM GEORGE: What's the rough lead
4 time of that?

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, change in
6 administration lengthens that. Let me just talk
7 about the mechanics of how we're going to go
8 about this. To replace a position we'll solicit
9 suggestions from the people who are in those
10 positions as well as other suggestions that come
11 forward. They're first screened at a park level.
12 They're then screened at the regional director
13 level, so for the National Park Service here in
14 Alaska. From the regional director, they're
15 forwarded to the director of the National Park
16 Service for consideration. And after review and
17 consideration, it gets forwarded to the Secretary
18 for the Department of the Interior. So it goes
19 up the chain like that.

20 So that process had been a fairly
21 lengthy one, and my last conversation with D.C.
22 as the administration continued, this past
23 administration, the first four years was kind of
24 lengthy. As they got more comfortable with the
25 process, the time for that was shortened to eight

1 months to a year and, you know, part of that is
2 just, you know, that's their prerogative. That's
3 policy. And that's when Sally mentioned there
4 was this desire. We had received a note that
5 said, be prepared that you can't just continue to
6 have the same people on your advisory boards.
7 We're going to ask you to look at changing those
8 folks out just for the reasons Sally mentioned.
9 So that's why we will want to come forward with
10 more than one name for consideration. Even
11 though it may be from Paul and a regional
12 director's perspective, but we would ask you to
13 consider continuity in this group.

14 TIM CUDNEY: So in the case of,
15 say, the FAA's position right now, they have
16 conceded what the charter request requires. So
17 now will you look at making a recommendation for
18 them to just have somebody by the next meeting?

19 PAUL ANDERSON: I think it's time
20 to have a meeting with the administration. The
21 regional director would be needing to discuss
22 their commitment.

23 TIM CUDNEY: Okay.

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought FAA
25 chose a replacement. Wasn't it Dan who was at

1 the last meeting?

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: When I say this
3 is a very formal process, this is a piece of it.
4 Dan Billman, who seemed very interested in
5 serving on this advisory group and had been what
6 appeared selected but sent from the FAA, he
7 cannot officially serve as an alternate. Once
8 again, we would go back to the charter and we
9 would say, so how were all of the members
10 selected? And we would have to go through that
11 same process.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought we were
13 going through that process for him.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No.

15 SALLY GIBERT: I think he was here
16 as a subject matter expert. Kind of a
17 placeholder.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Jim was not able
19 to attend the meeting. I think there was some
20 confusion about the term alternate and what it
21 implied. I shared information back with FAA
22 about it's a little bit more formal than that. I
23 don't know when Jim's retiring, but if it's a
24 year out, this would be a wonderful time for them
25 to be considering who we would put in that place.

1 Because that person can physically not sit at
2 this table and have voice, a vote, unless it runs
3 through that process.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Right, and I
5 thought that's why Dan sat in the audience. But
6 I thought the process was in place to get him
7 approved.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, there had
9 been e-mail some correspondence and Jim has
10 elected not to retire at this time.

11 SALLY GIBERT: At that time he was
12 planning on retiring and then he decided to keep
13 working, but he couldn't make the meeting.

14 TOM GEORGE: There was confusion
15 and miscommunication within the FAA regarding
16 that.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So Jim is still
18 the FAA person?

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Jim is still
20 officially the representative, right.

21 TOM GEORGE: Did he report in at
22 all regarding this meeting?

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: He reported that
24 he was not able to attend.

25 TOM GEORGE: Okay.

1 SALLY GIBERT: I added both he and
2 Dan on my master mailing list, so I'm mailing
3 both of them routinely. I was hoping Dan would
4 be here. So the Council believes that continuity
5 is a good idea. You guys can make that
6 recommendation, but you also need to have other
7 names.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think it would
9 be beneficial to the process if there was at
10 least one other name brought forward for
11 consideration. Certainly Paul can offer names
12 for consideration. It doesn't all come from this
13 body. It could also come from a member of the
14 public saying, I think this person would do well
15 in a representative role.

16 SALLY GIBERT: So maybe by next
17 meeting anybody that has recommendations for -- I
18 don't want to use alternate.

19 TOM GEORGE: The two-year seats.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. The group --
21 it sounds like we want to have everybody maintain
22 their seats, but if that is unacceptable for some
23 reason at the higher levels, then do we want to
24 provide some names to you, Paul, by the next
25 meeting? And I don't think we need to make that

1 a public process. Everybody can suggest names to
2 you. Just so we have that be a deadline for
3 letting you know who people are.

4 PAUL ANDERSON: In order to get the
5 appointments done timely -- I use that
6 cautiously -- we need to do it as soon as
7 possible. If you wanted to make recommendations
8 for other names, that should go forward in
9 addition to the names that are already serving on
10 the Council.

11 SALLY GIBERT: You don't need them
12 sooner than that?

13 TIM CUDNEY: Is the anniversary
14 date the date the charter was filed as far as the
15 term?

16 PAUL ANDERSON: Whatever date the
17 appointments were made.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Which was September
19 4th.

20 PAUL ANDERSON: And you'll note in
21 the charter that those members currently serving
22 will continue to serve until new members are
23 appointed.

24 SALLY GIBERT: At this point, Tim,
25 that's no big deal.

1 TIM CUDNEY: I agree, we're just
2 getting going.

3 SALLY GIBERT: So if we do nothing,
4 just ignore the --

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No, we're not
6 going to just ignore it. You can provide your
7 recommendations by the next meeting because it's
8 my job to at least do our part in keeping the
9 process on track.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Got it. So
11 if anybody has recommendations for other members,
12 get them to Paul before the next meeting. Okay.

13 Anything else before we leave
14 member reports and give the audience a chance to
15 weigh in?

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I didn't finish
17 reading them, but I clicked on some of the
18 minutes that came directly from the person that
19 transcribed. I noticed there was some
20 inaccuracies as far as names and spellings and
21 things like that that should probably be
22 corrected, so --

23 SALLY GIBERT: That's this document
24 here. I printed it out with the intent of
25 reading it on my vacation last week and I didn't

1 do it. I have read the last two. I sort of felt
2 like I should for that kind of thing. I haven't
3 done that. If you have specific changes and page
4 numbers, send them to you?

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So let's be
6 clear about what we're talking about. Joan, the
7 transcript is inaccurate or the summary?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: No, it was the
9 transcript, the straight transcript from the
10 transcriber.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Was not
12 accurate?

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Well, I didn't
14 read very far. I know it lists both you and Paul
15 as Council members and then Sally is Sally
16 Gilbert with an L.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Why don't
18 you send me a list of corrections, edits, and
19 I'll figure out how we can do it.

20 NANCY BALE: It might be really
21 helpful to just mark up the printed copy with red
22 pen.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I mean, I only
24 glanced at it.

25 NANCY BALE: I can help you, Joan.

1 I think you'll need some help. It also didn't
2 have the first day when John and I made our
3 presentation and there was public comments. That
4 wasn't transcribed, I guess. Is there a reason
5 that it wasn't?

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, one of the
7 problems in having a weekend meeting and a
8 Sunday/Monday in particular that we learned is
9 that on Sunday we have to pay double time for a
10 reporter, plus travel time, plus -- anyway, so
11 that document is \$2500 worth of transcription for
12 just Monday. So we thought that we would have
13 most of the deliberation or the discussion or
14 like the meat of the meeting on Monday, so we
15 made the, you know, call to only have the court
16 reporter on Monday, though we did capture things
17 in the minutes on Sunday. So it wasn't like
18 there was a total loss of the record.

19 NANCY BALE: I had forgotten that
20 was a Sunday. I see how you had a problem.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Different people
22 could sign up to read certain pages. Actually it
23 sounds like probably --

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It was just some
25 obvious corrections.

1 SALLY GIBERT: If anybody has
2 anything else, just let me know. I just need to
3 change my name to Gilbert and it would be a lot
4 easier. Okay.

5 So agency and public comments. Why
6 does it say agency and public comments?

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Because I have
8 some public comments to share from the public
9 that came through the agency.

10 SALLY GIBERT: So this is your
11 chance, guys, out there. Anything you want to --
12 one chance; this is not your only chance. Is
13 there anything that you would like to contribute
14 now?

15 NANCY BALE: Can I make a request?
16 When the public person makes a comment, if they
17 could make sure they give their names because
18 that was one issue with the transcript, that
19 sometimes you didn't know who made the comment.
20 It just said "member of the public." So if you
21 could --

22 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It said audience
23 member or something. I told her to change that
24 to backbencher.

25 SALLY GIBERT: So, Eric, do you

1 want to --

2 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I'm Eric
3 Denkewalter. If you want to talk about -- if you
4 want to bring up the issue of harassment of
5 animals, you need to find somebody that's done
6 some wildlife surveys because one of the keys in
7 an accurate wildlife survey is you don't alter
8 the animal's behavior. There's a lot to that
9 other than just saying if you're 500 feet or
10 5,000 feet. If that's going to become a topic,
11 you should bring somebody -- I mean, you've got
12 plenty of people there that harass the animals in
13 the park.

14 I've seen a lot of military
15 aircraft. This last time I saw an A-10 circling
16 Moose's Tooth. I've seen F-15s on the Gilpin,
17 and I've seen a C-130 in the gorge. There is a
18 Denali 1 arrival over the summit that Alaska
19 Airlines takes. They can drop down to 24,000 and
20 they fly just to the west of the peak and then
21 make a big arch around to the east from there
22 then down. So it isn't just at high altitudes.
23 Sometimes they do a scenic flight coming in. I'm
24 done.

25 PAUL RODERICK: I'm Paul with

1 Talkeetna Air Taxi. I can reiterate what Eric
2 said about the military. It's not like we're
3 picking on the military here. There's probably a
4 lot more traffic than maybe you realize. I'd
5 say, if I was going to put a number on it, we see
6 the military up there every week and sometimes
7 below the elevation. We see multiple type of
8 aircraft, mostly fighters like the Raptor, some
9 A-10s and a few C-130s. Additionally -- and this
10 has to do more with soundscape -- on the MOA,
11 like especially in the Susitna MOA area, they do
12 impinge the sound barrier a lot. So you do get
13 those. I mean, that intense echo. I don't know
14 what you want to call it. That bang, if you
15 will. Especially if you're hiking. I spend a
16 bunch of time skiing and climbing up there and
17 you can hear it at the lower end of the Kahiltna,
18 the Rampart area and even in the Kichatna. Since
19 it's so remote -- you know, one of the things
20 they ask you is: Did you see anybody? Did you
21 hear anything? That type of thing. Sometimes
22 you'll see a wolverine or a raven. Most of them
23 mention the fact that there's a lot of military
24 activity. There's dog fighting, which I've seen.
25 You have military exercises there. Also there's

1 a release of some type of material. Chaff?

2 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: You've seen
3 chaff released?

4 PAUL RODERICK: I haven't
5 personally, but climbers have seen chaff releases
6 in the park.

7 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: All right.

8 PAUL RODERICK: I'm just
9 reiterating the feedback you hear from the
10 climbing community. So I think it's a little
11 more involved than most of us think, especially
12 with the soundscape. I've heard -- almost every
13 time I'm in that area I hear military activity,
14 and they may be outside the park, but sometimes
15 they're not and they are maneuvering around in
16 the park. I'm just saying during the maneuvers
17 per se. You think they've got to be somewhat
18 close to you and you look and you just see a
19 faint outline of dog fighting going on probably
20 outside of the park, but the noise factor is, I'd
21 say, significant. So that's it so far.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What's a chaff
23 release?

24 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Chaff is
25 actually a metallic material that the airplane

1 puts out to confuse something that's trying to
2 lock onto them. It's something they do during
3 maneuvers. But I'm going to look into that
4 because we don't usually release chaff and flares
5 over the Susitna MOA.

6 PAUL RODERICK: What's that stuff
7 made out of?

8 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: It's a type
9 of like aluminum foil. I mean, it's not quite as
10 heavy as aluminum foil, but it's a metallic type
11 of thing that's released. There are
12 restrictions, and at the next meeting I'll brief
13 this and tell you what the restrictions are over
14 Denali and what altitude they can do it. There
15 should be no flare operations over that area.
16 Hopefully you haven't seen that. You actually
17 have flares shooting out of the aircraft. It
18 ignites and confuses a simulated heat-seeking
19 missile. I will follow up with that on the next
20 meeting and get a little more background on what
21 our rules are and what we're doing.

22 PAUL RODERICK: Like with the
23 fighters, do they have the ability to see other
24 aircraft?

25 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Oh, yeah.

1 PAUL RODERICK: We always get on
2 frequency really quick and we try to tell the
3 direction and how fast they're going. They're
4 going 3- or 400 miles an hour and you see them
5 here and then see them 10 miles away.

6 ERIC DENKEWALTER: They don't see
7 you. It doesn't work like that.

8 PAUL RODERICK: It seems like they
9 don't. Do they have any --

10 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: All the
11 fighters have an onboard radar, but it's probably
12 not pointed down below them. It's out looking
13 for the other fighters. Unless it's purposely --
14 you know, C-17s and C-130s do not have ways to
15 look for other aircraft. You shouldn't see C-17s
16 and C-130s at 300 feet inside Denali at all.
17 But, like I said, the fighters you see up above
18 you, they're probably not looking down to try to
19 see you guys at all.

20 PAUL RODERICK: We're always
21 wondering if at least their forward-looking
22 capabilities for radar purposes are on.

23 JAY HUDSON: And I'd like to point
24 out that the Susitna MOA starts about 12 miles
25 west of Talkeetna and goes up to the Ruth. Also,

1 from the soundscape deal, a lot of the military
2 helicopters elect to go through Windy Pass via
3 Cantwell, which is in the north side soundscape.
4 And that's kind of a common route and they take
5 that route a lot because it's VFR. That's how
6 they get to the north side. So several times a
7 week those guys do that. They go there. I think
8 there's a lot more traffic on the normal routes
9 that's being used than what was mentioned.
10 That's all I got to say about that.

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: And is that
12 actually out -- going through Cantwell, is that
13 actually outside the park border?

14 JAY HUDSON: It just borders the
15 park.

16 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Yeah, sound
17 travels over the border easily.

18 JAY HUDSON: Everybody goes through
19 that. It does happen.

20 TIM CUDNEY: They're generally at
21 4500 or so, but they're unfortunately not
22 talking. I've mentioned this now for 11 years,
23 so --

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Scott, when these
25 pilots see military aircraft, especially when

1 they're in places they shouldn't be, do you want
2 them to report that and, if so, what's the
3 method?

4 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Anytime
5 anybody sees a military aircraft where they don't
6 think it should be or it causes interruption of
7 your day or your activity, a noise complaint or
8 if you think it's flying in a hazardous manner,
9 we want you to actually report that to either
10 Elmendorf or Eilson. We actually do have an 800
11 number, noise complaint, where you pick up the
12 phone and call the number. Depending on the time
13 of day, normally it's a recording and it will ask
14 you to state your name, what the complaint is,
15 give them a phone number, and then by regulation
16 they're supposed to follow back up with that
17 person in 48 hours, call you back. They have a
18 checklist to find out what the complaint is, and
19 then it gives us another three days to try to
20 track down that aircraft and give an answer to
21 you. It may not be satisfactory to you, but that
22 is tracked and we have -- Elmendorf probably gets
23 over 200 noise complaints easily per year.
24 Eilson gets even more because of Red Flag Alaska.
25 So that is the process. We encourage any time

1 you see an aircraft, you know, if you can look at
2 it and it's bothering you, sometimes it may be
3 legitimate. It can be a half mile away from your
4 cabin, you may not like it, you call and
5 complain, we'll look at it and come back and say,
6 hey, sorry, he was legal. We'll try to avoid
7 your cabin, but we can't avoid every cabin in
8 Alaska. We'll give you an answer and at least try
9 to explain where we are. If we're wrong, we'll
10 say, yeah, that guy was too close. We'll try to
11 correct that action.

12 JAY HUDSON: There is a lot of
13 low-level work going on in September.

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: From a lead-back
15 perspective, that might be problematic because if
16 people are out there in the backcountry and if
17 they have a satellite phone, they can call you,
18 but there's going to be a week or two separation
19 between the event and the reporting ability.

20 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: I agree. A
21 lot of calls we get are very vague. You know, I
22 saw the whites of the pilot's eye he was so low.
23 What type of aircraft? I don't know. I just saw
24 his eye. Obviously the more information you can
25 give, the better chance we have of tracking down

1 that actual pilot and crew to find out they were
2 there and actually pull the flight plan and
3 follow it up. Probably at least 20 percent of
4 the stuff we get on the noise complaints there's
5 not enough information for us to track it down.
6 There is a lot of flights that do occur. If you
7 don't give us enough information, you know, if
8 you give us a four-hour window, it was in the
9 afternoon. Was that 1:00 or 4:00? If you don't
10 give us the information, we can't track it down.
11 If someone is out there and they come back four
12 days later and call in and say, last Thursday I
13 saw this. You know, that's TDY or it could be
14 out of state.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: It doesn't really
16 address the management of it. It's just an
17 observation.

18 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Okay.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Do you have the 800
20 number?

21 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: I do not.
22 I'll have it next time.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Do you guys have
24 that 800 number?

25 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: It used to

1 be 1-800 Jet Noise, but I will confirm it for
2 you. These are good points and the fact is
3 that -- and some of you guys may have called
4 that, but the military is -- like I said, we're
5 here to serve the citizens of the country and
6 from General Atkins on down, if there's an issue,
7 we're probably going to be the most responsive to
8 this group. If what we're doing is affecting
9 you, especially if it's illegal, that will
10 absolutely stop. But we are here to enforce the
11 rules and that's part of our profession is flight
12 discipline and we expect to have the best flight
13 discipline. We want you to report it. We have
14 the ability to go after pilots and stop that.
15 From General Atkins, that's what we are here to
16 do, so we want complaints to come in if they're
17 valid.

18 SALLY GIBERT: So they go off of
19 what --

20 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Cancel.
21 Going between Eilson and Elmendorf if it's a
22 beautiful VFR day, without telling anyone else in
23 the Air Force, they can just cancel with the FAA,
24 drop down -- it's all perfectly legal -- drop
25 down to 15,000 feet and make a pass through

1 Denali or try to see a climber. And it does
2 happen. That way the military, the management
3 would have no way of knowing. They come back,
4 climb back up, pick up their IFR clearance and go
5 on to Elmendorf and the military management would
6 have no way of knowing. And that's a breach of
7 flight discipline. He had a flight plan, but he
8 changed his mind for some reason and if that
9 happens and you guys see it, call us and we can
10 find out exactly what happened.

11 SALLY GIBERT: What would happen if
12 the pilot didn't call FAA and still went off --

13 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Then he's
14 got other problems. He's going to try to keep
15 the FAA happy more because they're the first ones
16 that will point him out.

17 SALLY GIBERT: How would FAA know?

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: They track them.

19 PAUL RODERICK: One more question.
20 Say the Susitna MOA is hot and they're using it,
21 are they on radar the whole time even if they're
22 doing their dog fights?

23 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: On radar by
24 who?

25 PAUL RODERICK: By -- they're not

1 going to be on an FAA flight plan then.

2 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Right. Once
3 they hear that the military is operating, the FAA
4 doesn't -- I won't say doesn't care, but it's not
5 the responsibility of FAA to watch. They're in
6 the MOA and that whole air space is technically
7 IFR traffic, so the FAA is not looking at them at
8 all.

9 PAUL RODERICK: Do you have a radar
10 facility yourselves?

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Well, Top
12 Rock, they have a radar facility, but again
13 that's not -- during normal training they're not
14 sitting there watching those guys in the MOA.

15 PAUL RODERICK: It's not them
16 transitioning back. I think it's when the MOA is
17 active and they're during the maneuvers. They
18 say, well, we're doing our thing, let's branch
19 out over here and see the park. You can't blame
20 them. I'm wondering whether that's off base or
21 not. You don't want to make these phone calls
22 saying they're getting in our way. I wouldn't
23 say they're ever in your way, but it gets your
24 attention because they're moving so fast and you
25 have a map in your head of where all the aircraft

1 are because we're all talking to each other, and
2 you're flying according to where everybody is.
3 When they're in there, it throws a whole other
4 element to it. The question probably should be
5 more: Is that something that's frowned upon by
6 the military or -- because I can understand them
7 wanting to go there. Should we make phone calls
8 every time we see anything?

9 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: If they're
10 in the MOA, you can make the phone call and we
11 can investigate it and say they're legally in the
12 MOA. But if you've got jets leaving the military
13 operating area and going into Denali Park, they
14 should not be doing that. There's no legitimate
15 reason for them to be out there. There is no
16 reason, especially for a fast mover, to enter
17 into -- outside the Susitna MOA into areas of the
18 park and that's a flight discipline issue.

19 PAUL RODERICK: So you don't really
20 like seeing that. We wouldn't care as much if
21 they had radios on board and they were talking,
22 but they don't have that capability.

23 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Like I said,
24 I think the military is the easiest to police
25 and, like I say, if you keep your own logs and

1 have your pilots do it, give me any information
2 you have, I will take it and it will be addressed
3 up the chain.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Maybe we need to
5 put this on the agenda at some other time. But
6 looking at the MOA, just like Jay was saying, it
7 encompasses the Great Gorge, includes the Ruth
8 Amphitheater and where people land there. It
9 comes right up next to the wilderness boundary.
10 In addition to reporting illegal behavior, which
11 everybody cares about, but some of it might be
12 perfectly legal but maybe not appropriate, but
13 appropriate for this committee. So how do we
14 rectify that?

15 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: You make a
16 phone call to us and the call may come back
17 saying, you are correct, there were jets flying
18 in that time frame, they were maneuvering, they
19 were exceeding the sound barrier, whatever, but
20 they were all within the legal constraints.
21 We're sorry that bothered you. That's something
22 this group, then -- we're talking about it at
23 some point, one of the voluntary measures may be
24 to ask the military to try to refrain from using
25 it. If they're going to use it, to make sure a

1 notification process is out there. There are
2 ways if we see this is a problem for Denali that
3 we can certainly ask the military, and they're
4 going to be more than open to adjusting what we
5 do for the benefit of this group.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'd be interested
7 in exploring that further when the time is
8 appropriate.

9 TOM GEORGE: Two things: Scott has
10 already offered and I agree, maybe at the next
11 meeting put together a presentation on what their
12 operating rules are to give a little more
13 definition to that. The other side of this gets
14 back to there can be entirely legal operations
15 which, again, begin to impinge on the soundscape
16 arena. For that reason, I think we're going to
17 need to later on get into whatever sound data the
18 Park Service has, because the Air Force of all
19 people can match up very well times and places to
20 see how those two impinge and I think that's a
21 task down the road. Once the Park Service is
22 done, if they haven't already, sound monitoring
23 in that area and then getting that data so the
24 Air Force and other aviation groups can look at
25 it. So I think that's a future task as well. We

1 just need to get far enough down the road to do
2 that and then we can come back to the question of
3 does anybody need to change what they're doing of
4 the existing approved operations of today.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Scott, you're in a
6 lead position, knowing how it works, how
7 important these things are, the dynamics of the
8 whole thing to be able to suggest recommendations
9 that you think would be effective for the group
10 to give back to the military.

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: I guarantee
12 you -- you guys said Moose's Tooth, Ruth
13 Amphitheater, I guarantee you one out of 100
14 pilots even knows where that is. They just know
15 Denali Park. They don't even know the area. So
16 I think that's something that Tom and I at the
17 next military meeting we'll get up there and
18 provide more outreach to the military pilots as
19 well to let them know that there are areas out
20 there.

21 SALLY GIBERT: More in the back?
22 Anything else?

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So over the
24 course of the week I had two people e-mail me and
25 ask that this be shared with the group. This is

1 from Beth Pike. She writes: I know this Council
2 is about overflights of Denali and the impact on
3 the tourists that come to Alaska for one to three
4 weeks and then go home. How about the locals
5 that live here year round and are negatively
6 impacted by the large increase in Denali
7 overflights that are leaving out of the Talkeetna
8 Airport every day all summer long? We are
9 unfortunately right in the path of where all the
10 planes leaving out of Talkeetna Airport go. I
11 have talked to the owners of the flying services
12 with very little and with temporary results. It
13 seems like the last few years since Rust took
14 over K2 that things have gone from bad to out of
15 hand last summer when we had -- you know what,
16 I'm only reading -- between 50 to 80 planes a day
17 going over our house, some too low to the ground,
18 below 500 feet. The constant drone of airplanes
19 can about drive anyone crazy. The chances of a
20 plane going down in our area and starting a
21 forest fire or hitting a building are getting
22 higher all the time. We don't live on the road
23 system, but are about three miles from the
24 airport. I notice you state that unrestricted
25 overflights have resulted in substantial changes

1 in the natural sound environment and generated
2 new conflicts with park users on the ground.
3 This can also be said for locals who happen to
4 live in the line of this massive influx of
5 aircraft going to the park. I would also like to
6 say that if having another airport closer to the
7 Princess Hotel could cut down traffic in the
8 Talkeetna area, I would be definitely in favor of
9 it. Most of these tourists come from that hotel
10 anyway. It's a shame that flying services and
11 all tourist companies care about only their
12 bottom line and to heck with the locals. In
13 summation, I hope you will take into account the
14 negative effects all these overflights have on
15 the lives of the locals, even if they don't live
16 inside the park boundaries. We live here for the
17 peace and quiet and the sunshine. Please read
18 this at your next Overflight Advisory Council
19 Meeting and take the right of the locals into
20 account in your plan. Thank you. Beth Pike.

21 You have to appreciate that people
22 take the time.

23 TOM GEORGE: True.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: This one is
25 actually from a National Park Service employee,

1 Liz Hamilton. Miriam: I would like to submit my
2 written comments about aircraft in Denali. As a
3 National Park Service employee, I understand and
4 appreciate the work that goes into our radio
5 repeaters and the research we do as a park, so I
6 don't mind the operations that go on with park
7 flights. But there are a lot of park flights,
8 and when those are combined with so many other
9 aircraft, it gets really crowded overhead. I
10 only notice and become annoyed by the aircraft
11 when I go into the backcountry. I'm in the
12 backcountry in order to get away from the sights
13 and sounds of civilization. I find that
14 impossible to do with the amount of planes that
15 fly overhead. Maybe I just always pick the wrong
16 backcountry units, but are there any that aren't
17 high traffic areas? I started to keep track and
18 I found out that during the day a plane or a
19 helicopter flew over me at least every half an
20 hour. Now, if I happened to get hurt in the
21 backcountry, it would be nice to know that I'd
22 only have to wait 30 minutes before I could
23 signal someone to help. But aside from that
24 convenience, I found the near constant noise of
25 aircraft highly irritating. It negatively

1 affected my wilderness experience. Are there no
2 wild places left? I would really like to see the
3 park come up with some kind of a management plan
4 so that the wilderness can be enjoyed by all
5 users. Sincerely, Liz Hamilton.

6 Just those two.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you. Again,
8 anything else? Eric.

9 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Did she say
10 where she was? In the beginning it says she went
11 to a couple different areas.

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You know, she
13 doesn't specify which backcountry units she's in,
14 but she's also -- if I have this correct, I think
15 she's a backcountry ranger -- no, she's not a
16 backcountry ranger.

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: That's the
18 important bit of data that we need to start
19 looking at. It really is. That's the crux of
20 the whole issue. She says, is there anyplace I
21 can go? We ought to say, yes. That should be
22 your answer: Yes, this area is noise free; this
23 area has got a little bit of noise; this area has
24 a lot of noise. It would be a start. It would
25 be something. Right there is somebody you ought

1 to talk to and say, let's talk to her, let's get
2 her opinion on that so we have someplace to go;
3 otherwise, we're just kind of wandering.

4 SALLY GIBERT: I think some of our
5 next staff reports are going to begin to bring --
6 some of that information about where people are
7 is going to be coming to light in our staff
8 reports coming up.

9 ERIC DENKEWALTER: On the first
10 letter that you read, we received a copy of that.
11 And, you know, we all have to deal with people
12 like that. And we have made great effort to
13 avoid those places, and it was at the end of the
14 season and we'll continue to do that. I'll go
15 back to the Murray Nash thing from a couple years
16 ago. We changed the whole flight pattern in
17 town; he was happy. Hopefully you'll get a
18 letter from her saying, hey, whatever I did, it
19 worked.

20 TIM CUDNEY: The every half-hour, I
21 think, is a little exaggerated because that
22 doesn't match any of our departure times.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It's the
24 perception.

25 PAUL RODERICK: The issue with that

1 too -- I know we all kind of worked on this
2 together. I don't know what the date of this
3 letter was. But Randy, I know, talked to her
4 with K2 and we all had a meeting on it and
5 discussed it, and she is very close to the
6 airport. I mean, really close. And
7 unfortunately --

8 ERIKA BENNETT: Is she up the
9 track?

10 PAUL RODERICK: She's up the river
11 just a little bit. We were using three-six
12 taking off to the north and our arrival area
13 comes right not too far from her place. The
14 complaint -- in fact, we tried to address with
15 her and prove to her what 500 feet was. She's in
16 the traffic pattern. I have yet to see a
17 commercial airplane come in under 500 feet,
18 especially it just doesn't make any sense. All
19 those come in at at least a thousand feet above
20 the terrain. It's hard when you're on the ground
21 and looking up to tell how high up an airplane
22 is. We like to openly discuss this, especially
23 with our neighbors in Talkeetna, because if
24 there's a way we can avoid people's houses, we
25 do, and we've made a good effort in the past. I

1 know you and Randy -- I know Randy met with her.

2 SUZANNE RUST: We did try to talk
3 with her. We were looking for ways to avoid
4 people's homes. The hard thing is that
5 perception is reality, and for her we're flying
6 over her house at 500 feet. We're not. None of
7 us are. But she happens to be in the traffic
8 pattern and that's where she's just getting that
9 stream of traffic, and it's a challenging
10 situation.

11 JAY HUDSON: It's the same thing as
12 moving to the end of International Airport. I
13 think that's happened there. She's just moved
14 there lately also, I believe. So that's why
15 there's kind of a little bit of friction here,
16 because I don't know that she has been there long
17 enough to realize that we've spent years trying
18 to figure out how to get to Talkeetna with an
19 airplane. Years. All of us have. We figured it
20 out, this will work for everybody, and then two
21 years later she shows up and says, hey, I've got
22 a problem. So, you know, it does have some -- we
23 tried to work with her, but we won't be able to
24 fix everybody's problems.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: I think this is

1 illustrative of the issue that we're talking
2 about, that you guys are making accommodations
3 and that there's a problem in particular places,
4 so --

5 TOM GEORGE: Sally, to zoom out
6 just a little bit. I appreciate that we're
7 talking about this. This is actually an example
8 of a local land use problem. The airports suffer
9 nationwide. And, in fact, the sponsors of those
10 airports, in this case the State of Alaska, have
11 an obligation when they receive federal money to
12 build an airport to do appropriate land use
13 protection around those public use airports to
14 head off exactly this problem. Because the State
15 of Alaska hasn't done their job in this case,
16 it's now being left to the local operators to try
17 and make these accommodations.

18 I think this is, unfortunately, off
19 topic for the National Park -- our interest in
20 the National Park, so I think we can't afford to
21 get too far sidetracked on this. But there is a
22 problem with the sponsor at the airport, the
23 State of Alaska. It's not just at Talkeetna.
24 Talkeetna now is where it's surfacing because of
25 the operations out of there, but the potential

1 for this same problem exists at all the other 258
2 state-operated airports. This is a State of
3 Alaska problem and failing to live up to the
4 grant assurances that were made to the FAA when
5 they accepted that airport money. This is just
6 one example of where that's coming out.
7 Unfortunately, I do think it's really beyond the
8 scope of what -- at the moment I can't make the
9 connection back to what this Council focused on
10 the park would do that would make a difference
11 with regard to this situation.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's an analogy.

13 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, absolutely.

14 SUZANNE RUST: What I want to say
15 is we do recognize and we have in the past,
16 present and in the future will continue to
17 mitigate when we can. It's hard, though. There
18 are people we have worked with and had success
19 and there are other folks we have not been as
20 successful with, and there are things that we're
21 limited by as well. So it's a challenging
22 situation. But I think the most important thing
23 is the perception. The perception for her is
24 reality, and we all can recognize it and
25 appreciate it.

1 JAY HUDSON: The State may be being
2 blamed for the situation. It really isn't the
3 State. What happened there is the Talkeetna
4 Airport was a war effort, and it was done by the
5 federal government initially and the state has
6 sort of taken over and is doing their duty by
7 maintaining the airport, but it actually was a
8 federal airport to start out with. It was a B-17
9 airport during the war. So that's how it got
10 there.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Also, to address
12 some of those issues gets into zoning and private
13 land rights and all that stuff.

14 JAY HUDSON: It's a big ball of
15 worms.

16 NANCY BALE: Oh, yes, and they're
17 wriggling.

18 SALLY GIBERT: I can tell you that
19 the Department of Natural Resources is hesitant,
20 if not legislatively constrained, from some of
21 those kind of activities.

22 JAY HUDSON: I'd like to say one
23 more thing too. Think about all the poor people
24 that live at the airport. They have to listen to
25 those noisy airplanes all day long taking off.

1 ERIKA BENNETT: I live one block
2 away. I don't need an alarm clock.

3 JAY HUDSON: There are people that
4 work at the airport or live within a block or
5 two. It's constant. But it's a lot more noisy
6 than it is out at the Ruth.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Charlie's suggesting
8 we take a break so we can hit it again at
9 11:00 o'clock and launch in. The only thing I
10 would suggest that we might want to consider
11 hearing, Jared, is it your discussion about where
12 sound is occurring, where there's most sound
13 impacts -- or is there a presentation related to
14 that?

15 JARED WITHERS: Not that I know of.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think it was
17 my understanding we were going to respond back to
18 the information requests that were sent to us.
19 So Jared is going to speak to those because
20 they're specifically sound, and I have
21 information to share from the backcountry folks
22 about where people are going -- the last
23 three-year trend. Since we passed the
24 Backcountry Plan, what's the trend in the
25 backcountry.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So at least keep
2 that in mind. I think we should start at 11:00
3 since we committed to doing that with Suzanne's
4 presentation.

5 (Break.)

6 SALLY GIBERT: So we have a --
7 Suzanne, your presentation, is it just yours?

8 SUZANNE RUST: No, actually I used
9 part of my old presentation because that's what I
10 was asked to do, to present and remind us of the
11 progressive measures we've taken, so I kind of
12 started there. Then I took the notes from our
13 October 22nd meeting, and I'll show you a list of
14 who attended. It was air service folks and folks
15 operating in the Denali area. And I think out of
16 the -- I have to think of how many operators
17 there are, but there was just one representative
18 missing, I think.

19 So what was really good about the
20 meeting is it gave way to some ideas, and whether
21 it will be what everybody wants or doesn't want,
22 at least we have something. We did do some work.
23 Tom and Erika and Tim and I met yesterday and
24 made certain that that is what we wanted to bring
25 forward. Tom and I worked for several hours.

1 He's very good at PowerPoint. He has a talent,
2 thank goodness. And I learned a lot. That's how
3 all this came to be.

4 SALLY GIBERT: What I'd like is to
5 hear your report and then if it seems
6 appropriate, maybe have the audience supplement
7 that, if that's an opportunity. I'll take cues
8 from you about whether you think that's
9 appropriate.

10 SUZANNE RUST: I think it would be
11 a great idea. I'm also counting on Tim and Tom
12 and Erika to help out and if I miss something or
13 go astray, get off on a tangent, please stop me.

14 We just distilled the purpose of
15 the Advisory Council. I think it's always a good
16 place to just begin. Will develop volunteer
17 measures, safety of passengers, pilots and
18 mountaineers, and desired future resource
19 conditions. The things we're really tasked with
20 here. Who operates over Denali National Park. I
21 wanted to remind us of who the operators are
22 because we're talking about developing voluntary
23 measures that can help these folks: Fly Denali,
24 Hudson Air, Talkeetna Air Taxi, K2, Era,
25 Kantishna Air and Denali Air. Did I miss

1 anybody? So we're talking about seven operators
2 that do primarily the flightseeing and glacier
3 tours and take mountaineers in, but there are
4 other ones. There are folks out of Cantwell.
5 There are folks out of Anchorage. There are the
6 commercial jets, and we'll get to who else
7 operates over the park. We know that the
8 military does, general aviation. Eric talked
9 about commercial airlines. There's passengers
10 and cargo, government administration, NPS and
11 state agencies. I was shocked the last time to
12 find that the Park Service through their efforts
13 flies about 1200 hours a year and that's a lot of
14 time. And miscellaneous commercial operators.

15 Here's some pictures of airplanes.
16 I wanted to keep it a little bit fun. Current
17 practices, things that we're doing currently.
18 Pilot meetings. And I'm going to go through
19 these. We've been here before. Position
20 reporting procedures, that's really important. I
21 think you've heard from Paul and Eric and Jay.
22 That's essential to keeping the safety of our
23 operations up at the mountain. People
24 communicating. That's really a great thing that
25 goes on, and people really are good about it.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Let me clarify:
2 This is the seven -- the original seven air taxi
3 or tour operators that do this?

4 SUZANNE RUST: Yes.

5 Pilot training opportunities. Some
6 of us have asked Park Service employees to come
7 in and talk with our pilots and managers to help
8 us do a better job. We do preventative
9 maintenance. We operate the climbers' base camp
10 through an LLC. And that's for the south side
11 and not the north side. We have to remember,
12 there's south side operators and there are north
13 side operators. This is for the climbers' base
14 camp operated by the south side operators. Some
15 operators have been working hard, especially on
16 the north side, to identify locations of
17 backcountry users.

18 Things that people are doing. The
19 introduction of quieter aircraft. I think that's
20 been a tremendous change that we've seen both on
21 the north and south side. I know that Denali Air
22 was talking about how they have bigger airplanes
23 than they used to. Yes? So they're doing fewer
24 overflights, but they can take more people.
25 Well, that's something that's happening in

1 Talkeetna too. We converted from 185s years ago
2 to Beavers and the turbine Otters. So, fewer
3 overflights. Pilot training. We try to
4 maintain -- through our pilot training we teach
5 pilots to maintain a higher altitude than
6 required by FAA.

7 October 22nd, this year, given our
8 meeting here and what we discussed, we got folks
9 together. And those who attended were Erika, Tim
10 Cudney, Eric Denkewalter, Fly Denali, Tom George,
11 Sandra Loomis, Talkeetna Air Taxi, Greg Lahay,
12 Kantishna Air, Suzanne Rust, K2, and I did talk
13 with Denali Air too, so they knew what was going
14 on; they just weren't able to attend. We
15 developed recommendations in four areas for
16 consideration. From that meeting, we took our
17 notes and together Erika, Tim, Tom and I came up
18 with some recommendations. No. 1, visitor
19 feedback. Timely visitor feedback process is
20 needed. Currently we don't have a timely visitor
21 feedback process. Provide operators with a
22 timely sound-related and visitor experience
23 feedback. This allows operators to respond in a
24 timely manner. Recommendation: Establish the
25 feedback process. Needs to be timely, needs to

1 be detailed and specific and needs to be
2 integrated into NPS feedback process, if you have
3 one. If not, we should get one. These are
4 suggestions to be discussed. Develop means to
5 distribute to operators and system to track
6 notices and concerns.

7 TOM GEORGE: This parallels
8 actually Scott's description of their noise
9 reporting process the Air Force has. Sounds like
10 to me parallels exactly the kind of thing that's
11 needed here. If we can't track and identify
12 where things are happening, it's very hard to
13 come up with mitigations or figure out what are
14 legitimate noise complaints and what aren't. So
15 that was the genesis of this.

16 SUZANNE RUST: So if anybody wanted
17 to comment, I would be -- or do we want to keep
18 going?

19 TOM GEORGE: I suggest you go
20 through all four things to get everything on the
21 table and then have a discussion, because
22 otherwise we run the risk of talking about things
23 that you're about to show.

24 SUZANNE RUST: Okay. No. 2,
25 establish visitor perceptions regarding sound and

1 impact. We need uniform, unbiased information
2 from surveys or other sources to establish
3 visitor sound perceptions. Recommendation:
4 Identify the influence of sound on the overall
5 visitor experience, consider sound level,
6 duration, time of day and season.

7 No. 3, aviation best practices.
8 Building on the existing and historic work of the
9 aviation community to: Develop operator best
10 practices to minimize sound disturbances,
11 training for pilots on sound-sensitive areas and
12 techniques, encourage operators to migrate to
13 quieter equipment through maybe an incentive
14 practice, educate general aviation community on
15 sound sensitivity in park.

16 TOM GEORGE: Based on our earlier
17 discussion, I'd add a bullet saying educate
18 military on similar things.

19 SUZANNE RUST: Recommendation:
20 Create an aviation group to define best
21 practices. Our idea is to create an aviation
22 working group. The reason for this is it
23 provides a forum for operators and other
24 stakeholders to participate and have a voice in
25 the process. Also, we can develop detailed

1 recommendations regarding best practices. We can
2 review and refine Council recommendations and
3 suggestions and also provides an opportunity to
4 develop group consensus for the recommendations.
5 Educate Denali visitors in the role that aviation
6 plays in Denali. Aviation is used for
7 flightseeing, search and rescue, game surveys,
8 patrols, administrative and volunteer research.
9 Air space is also part of the national aerospace
10 system, airlines, cargo, et cetera. The
11 influence of weather and other factors on
12 aviation safety. Our recommendation: Establish
13 a working group to review existing materials
14 regarding the role of aviation in Denali National
15 Park and recommend development of future
16 materials, including exhibits, displays, park
17 orientation and presentations. I think that's
18 the end.

19 SALLY GIBERT: At lunch maybe we
20 can get the text and put it in a Word document
21 and play with it and talk about it.

22 TOM GEORGE: Sure.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. I would like
24 to switch into a mini public comment mode here.
25 How does this look to you guys? For anybody that

1 was involved or wasn't involved, does this seem
2 like a good kind of starting point for our
3 discussion? Any giant things missing or anything
4 really horrendously off the mark or anything?
5 Because at some point we are, when we get into
6 actual deliberation, we're going to need to limit
7 our conversation to the group, but I wanted you
8 guys to be able to say right off the bat if
9 there's any sort of burning comments.

10 JIM MORGAN: I saw no particular
11 sticking point in that. It's as good a place to
12 start as I've seen.

13 SALLY GIBERT: It's fairly general.

14 JARED WITHERS: I have a
15 suggestion. With the comment about how there
16 were fewer overflights due to planes that carry a
17 larger number of passengers per flight. I think
18 it would be useful for the committee to know that
19 we're talking a 15- or 20-year time line. The
20 number of clients that the flightseeing companies
21 are taking up, are they on the increase? Are
22 they stable? What's the trend? Because that
23 would -- in the next several years that's going
24 to indicate whether there will be more or less
25 flights going above the park.

1 SALLY GIBERT: I think it's sort of
2 commonly accepted that it's growing. It's
3 difficult to get hard information about that
4 because the information is proprietary for each
5 business and it's hard for them to --

6 JIM MORGAN: It's been increasing.
7 I've been there 26 years.

8 SUZANNE RUST: I wanted to take the
9 opportunity to clarify. Fewer overflights, what
10 I meant by that is in comparison if we had just
11 grown using the same aircraft, we would have more
12 overflights, more airplanes out there trying to
13 do the same number of people. So what's happened
14 is people have converted to larger aircraft and
15 also quieter aircraft in order to achieve the
16 goals of growth. It's been a positive thing.

17 TIM CUDNEY: That being said, you
18 have to keep in mind that the last couple of
19 years -- and I'll speak in kind of a general
20 consensus -- the last couple years have not been
21 exactly a boom for the air tour operators, a
22 combination of weather, operating costs,
23 demographic of passengers and, to be honest with
24 you, I don't expect the next few years to be any
25 better. It is what it is. I would not see any

1 major growth in the next two or three years. A
2 lot of operators right now, I think we're taking
3 a really, really strong look at what's going to
4 happen next year with the economy. Am I going to
5 put four aircraft in Denali or am I going to put
6 one aircraft in Denali? That's a fact of life.
7 Things are going to change. I think we're in for
8 a pretty good downturn in the next couple of
9 years.

10 JIM MORGAN: We agree with you on
11 that, that's for sure. We're seeing it coming
12 too.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Suzanne, those
14 recommendations sound nice. As far as the -- I
15 appreciate all your efforts on that. On the
16 first one, visitor feedback, I feel like through
17 conversations here, input from the audience and
18 other conversations I've had, I feel like I'm
19 beginning to get a pretty good picture in my mind
20 of where the problems are on the ground. I don't
21 know that we need -- I think we can continue to
22 ask people and find that out. I don't know that
23 we need the visitor feedback. I mean, that
24 sounds like that would be years out. I mean, I
25 think we already have that information. We just

1 have to gather it and get it together a little
2 bit more cohesively.

3 SUZANNE RUST: I think that that's
4 been a concern from Tim, myself, Erika, Tom. In
5 our meeting I don't think we feel as certain
6 about that. We recognize that there's an issue
7 and we recognize that there are issues in
8 different areas. And I think that it's important
9 for us to gather that information and to have a
10 process for it, because that's how we then adapt
11 and to try to mitigate things over a long term --
12 over the long term. So I think it is important
13 to try to --

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm going to step
15 off the mark here a little bit and this is --
16 you've got some really good stuff here, but it's
17 not courageous enough. It's a postponement of
18 what we -- sort of gathering around here, there
19 is an issue. That's why we're here. And so what
20 we have is that we really need the operators to
21 step forward and say, you know, we could change
22 these specific routes, we could either fly
23 higher. Give us something other than study it
24 more, because when we left our last meeting, the
25 intention I understood was -- and I think it came

1 from Eric -- was that we would have something
2 that we could implement in February that would
3 be -- decide this is our little plan and we would
4 try these actions for the season. And I think
5 that in the long run that this is a -- what
6 you've illustrated is a program that would sort
7 of maintain it in the long run, but the guts of
8 this we have to sort of, okay, we're going to fly
9 this place or not, and what we need is for the
10 operators to tell us sort of how.

11 I'll go through some of the
12 specifics. We have an area that's on the north
13 side of the mountain and the entrance. Eric, you
14 talked about some changes in routes there. I
15 can't remember how you articulated that, but
16 there was something in that. We have a problem
17 with sound on the Ruth and there was discussion
18 about that. There was a problem with climbing --
19 the aircraft climbing up the Kahiltna under power
20 and going over the top, and there was a
21 suggestion that was floated about reversing and
22 going in the other direction so that you're not
23 in power when you're coming back down the
24 Kahiltna. There was a discussion about maybe
25 there's another place we could land. Let's get

1 to where we actually have some actionable
2 elements that we can move on, because if we
3 just -- we only go as far as that, what we'll be
4 doing is diluting our purpose and postponing any
5 kind of real action and not coming to grips with,
6 like the analogy that we heard today, was the
7 people who live at the end of the airport. What
8 a surprise that they have a problem. You know,
9 too bad that they bought a house at the end of
10 the airport. That's sort of their problem. You
11 know, that's the analogy of it. So that's what I
12 would hope that the group could come forward
13 with.

14 SALLY GIBERT: I think that's
15 probably the goal with some of these things. I
16 see that there's kind of a two-fold thing here.
17 One is the longer term, like the reporting thing
18 is, I think, good for sort of planning for the
19 long term. Eric was talking about this at the
20 break. I'd like him to speak about that because
21 I think he agrees with that and is looking at,
22 you know, let's just try some stuff. Pick some
23 obvious things. Make a few -- work between now
24 and February and come up with some ideas for
25 short-term measures that can be taken on an

1 experimental basis this coming summer and
2 monitor, see how it's going.

3 JIM MORGAN: What's the chance of
4 getting a specific thought from you? You're
5 talking about general noise and you want us to
6 come up with an answer. We need guidelines to
7 get a course of action.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: We can be very
9 specific.

10 JIM MORGAN: Good. Do so and then
11 we can come up with some kind of specific answer.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: Specifically,
13 there's a problem when the aircraft are flying
14 below the peaks on the Ruth. In general, how do
15 we keep you guys as a viable, growing business
16 because you have this investment, but not oppress
17 the people that are on the ground?

18 JIM MORGAN: If the landing site is
19 below the peaks, you've got to get down there.

20 CHARLIE SASSARA: Very much so.
21 Everyone recognizes that. But it's the
22 separation in operations. How can we get greater
23 separation between people on the ground and
24 people flying? Can we do that?

25 JIM MORGAN: You have to go there

1 to land. I don't see how you're going to
2 separate it. If people are on the ground and
3 you've got to get them down there, how do you do
4 that?

5 PAUL RODERICK: There could be some
6 techniques to mitigate some. Us as operators,
7 we're sitting back here and there's really no
8 data. There's no -- you have to give us some
9 more input on some of the complaints, where they
10 are and who's giving them. Does the park have
11 data on basically some of the complaints in the
12 areas and when they were and how many they were?
13 I mean, it's like you're just taking these areas
14 and going, well, try to do something about the
15 noise on the Ruth. We're saying, give us some
16 feedback on actuality.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's really loud
18 in the Ruth. We know this. This is
19 acknowledgment. Let's take the Ruth for example.
20 How might we address the Ruth?

21 JAY HUDSON: We could quit landing
22 people there and then there wouldn't be any
23 noise.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Obviously if you're
25 landing, you've got to go below the peaks.

1 PAUL RODERICK: I'm just saying,
2 give us some data on the areas and more
3 specifics. We know the Ruth, but how long is the
4 Ruth Glacier? It's 35 miles. Are we talking the
5 gorge?

6 TOM GEORGE: I share Charlie's
7 frustration. As Paul pointed out, it took six
8 years to get a backcountry plan. This group's
9 been in business for less than a year. We're
10 saddled with some of the constraints of the FACA
11 which even make a discussion like we're having
12 right now challenging, which is exactly why we
13 recommended a couple of working groups to where
14 we can actually get the operators legitimately
15 sitting down with some other folks and do that.
16 Right now the process we're in makes it
17 difficult. We also have to get some objective
18 data from either you guys directly, from climbers
19 and/or the Park Service, which we've requested,
20 and the other thing we've got to put in place is
21 somebody to measure. Okay, let's say these guys
22 make a bunch of changes this year. We need some
23 way to measure that so next year we can tell if
24 it made a difference or not so we're not just
25 jerking people around. This may take a little

1 longer to get to where you want to go. But, I
2 agree, that's where we want to go. The question
3 is: Let's get the structure in place so we can
4 actually do that and start moving forward.
5 That's where the thought of working groups in a
6 couple of these areas to do this where we could
7 now engage people beyond the immediate Council
8 which we have to do to involve these operators in
9 that kind of specific activity.

10 CHARLIE SASSARA: If we have a
11 schedule to get it done, then that focuses the
12 attention. So could we agree that there's going
13 to be some sort of action taken for this season?
14 That would be one.

15 TIM CUDNEY: In respect to what
16 you're saying, you've identified one area. We
17 heard earlier that there was a complaint from
18 another area that was on the opposite side.
19 We're all faced with a safety platform that we
20 will not compromise -- I will not compromise.
21 We're also faced with very, very challenging
22 economic factors. When you say things like,
23 change your routes, change this, change that.
24 When you start to cut into an economic factor of
25 an already overregulated industry, regulated to

1 death, we're almost to the point of an
2 extinction. And I hate to throw that out there,
3 but how much more can we really, really do? I
4 went through this in Juneau with Corroboration
5 Juneau for three years, 35 people from the
6 Borough of Juneau. They wanted to talk about
7 airplane noise, helicopter noise, et cetera, et
8 cetera. At the end of that working group, they
9 came up with a recommendation, okay, let's just
10 move all the operators out to Taku Point. Cost
11 \$135 million. That went away so fast. It fell
12 off the edge because it was unreasonable. I'm
13 not saying we're in the same boat. We have to be
14 very, very, very careful on how we approach this
15 because you're talking about livelihood on both
16 sides. You're talking about a really, really big
17 asset to the park of being able to go in there
18 and fly over the park, being able to fly over one
19 of the unregulated national parks, thank
20 goodness, especially for helicopters. You're
21 talking the climbers on the ground that need that
22 access in there. You're talking to the air tour
23 operators that want to be able to fly people
24 there. So we have to be very, very careful about
25 how we approach this.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: It is going to
2 take some courage. That's what I am hoping that
3 we would have, the courage to step up to it and
4 resist postponing and pushing it off. I'm a
5 commercially oriented person and I run a company,
6 a construction company. I have a background in
7 aviation. I could easily have taken -- be
8 representing one side or the other. I really do
9 appreciate what you're going -- I know how big
10 the investment is in this stuff, and I'm saying
11 that we have -- we sort of stepped across the
12 Ruth the last time and sort of had a general
13 acknowledgment that, yes, there is an issue of
14 sound. We sort of generally agreed to that.
15 What I hope to encourage is the way this gets
16 solved ultimately is the operators are going to
17 tell us how.

18 TIM CUDNEY: And, again, I respect
19 that a hundred percent. Probably more than you
20 believe. I think, just knowing what we've done
21 in the last 11 years that I've run the Denali
22 show, we have already done a tremendous amount of
23 mitigating what we do, our flights, our
24 altitudes, our reporting points, hours of
25 operation. I mean, it's like --

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: Are you saying
2 you're done?

3 TIM CUDNEY: No, I'm not.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: Okay. Don't make
5 an argument that that's the end of it, you know,
6 that there's more. One little side piece I want
7 to throw out there. When we do have an idea, I
8 think that we have a tool to model it. What was
9 that woman's name?

10 NANCY BALE: Amanda Peacock. The
11 Park Service now owns that and they would do the
12 modeling, not Amanda.

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: This was a model
14 of the flight paths and sound signatures. What
15 you would do is say: This is the proposed change
16 and you could model it and say, how's that look
17 to you guys? And then measure against the model.
18 You'd at least have a way of graphically
19 representing the changes that you guys propose or
20 not propose. Right. That's just a model.

21 JIM MORGAN: It just shows a
22 concentrated area and proposes to spread the
23 noise out to cover a larger area?

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: Whatever it is.
25 These are some flights that were modeled so you

1 can see.

2 JIM MORGAN: To bring up a point
3 that Tim was talking about. The things that we
4 have done is we've probably reduced the noise
5 level by at least two-thirds just by changing
6 aircraft. And you in aviation should know what a
7 185 sounds like when it takes off or when it's
8 flying as opposed to a Navajo or one of the
9 turbines the other guys use there. They're much
10 quieter. I think we've gone a long ways to help
11 solve this problem. As far as, is there an end?
12 Yeah, there is. The end is we don't fly, you
13 don't have noise, but you also don't have anybody
14 going up there. That's the end of it.

15 R.D. ROSSO: The public loses a
16 viable access to the park.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Suzanne is burning
18 to talk here.

19 SUZANNE RUST: I think one of the
20 things that I realize and why I think it's so
21 important that we establish the work groups, it's
22 not a put off thing. I'm not going to sit in
23 this meeting at all and make a quick decision on
24 anything. I cannot do that and feel good about
25 the constituents that I represent. It's not

1 going to happen. I need to be able to sit down
2 and go through whatever issues we've talked about
3 and suggestions or whatever. We need to have a
4 forum for throwing out, gathering information and
5 saying, okay, one of our goals is to do this and
6 you come back with some ideas. Yes, we can or
7 no, we can't, but we need to have time to work it
8 out and to be able to think through the actual
9 consequences. Because there are consequences for
10 us moving forward. I will have to say that last
11 meeting when someone said that we would do things
12 for this year, I thought that that was premature.
13 It did not come from this group. I think we have
14 to be careful about how we proceed. I'm not
15 going to jump in and then think, oh, gosh, wow,
16 this was the wrong thing to do. I think that we
17 are perfectly willing to work hard to come up
18 with things, but to ask us to do it quickly and
19 to -- and to not get the feedback from the people
20 who are going to be affected is going -- is not
21 responsible.

22 SALLY GIBERT: So do you think it's
23 possible through the subcommittee process to come
24 up with not the end all recommendations, but some
25 things you might be able to do by -- or at least

1 by the end of the February meeting, assuming that
2 you're going to be working with a work group?

3 SUZANNE RUST: I'm not going to be
4 here the rest of January, so I don't know that
5 that's going to happen. But what I would say is
6 that we have to identify issues, specific issues
7 that we want to work on. We can't just, you
8 know -- and that's part of where we're gathering
9 information and drawing a picture. And I don't
10 know if that map is the right place to start
11 because --

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: Would it be
13 useful to have specifics, that is a handful of
14 specifics that were identified today that you go
15 to the working group and come back and say, this
16 is how we would address X?

17 SUZANNE RUST: I think that that's
18 where this process is hard. That's why I kept
19 thinking about how to make this process. Am I in
20 this meeting or is Tim going to commit or Erika
21 going to commit, or any of us going to commit
22 without giving serious thought to changing our
23 operations? Are we going to do that?

24 TIM CUDNEY: We have and I -- we
25 have looked at other technologies to change and

1 it's there. It is there. It's decibel levels
2 required and there's a higher capacity.
3 Operating costs are a little bit more and the end
4 results are a little better. When you're only
5 operating in Alaska in a four-and-a-half month
6 season, it's very hard to justify. The
7 technology is there. If we were in the Grand
8 Canyon or Hawaii where we could operate
9 year-round, it would be a no-brainer because the
10 end investment would pay off. If there were the
11 incentives, it would be a lot easier. It's the
12 same thing with everybody in aviation. There's
13 very little incentive because we're constantly
14 having something thrown at us that would deter us
15 from making a change. And we can't lose sight of
16 the safety.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What I'm
18 gathering is that the air tour operators feel
19 like they don't have enough information about
20 what the problem is on the ground; is that
21 correct?

22 SUZANNE RUST: I think that we need
23 to have a working list. I think that's what our
24 recommendations were focused on. Let's get some
25 information. Let's go and meet. And it's going

1 to be a process for us to think, okay, can we do
2 this? What can we do about this problem? Is
3 that a solvable problem? There are problems that
4 are solvable; there are problems that aren't
5 solvable. Sometimes when somebody lives in your
6 traffic pattern, is that a solvable pattern?
7 Maybe not. I think we have to start determining
8 what are they, because we don't have a clear
9 list. And some of it is -- even more valuable is
10 the specific information that comes from
11 individuals that say, this is a bother in these
12 areas. This is a bother in these areas. Getting
13 that specific information helps us gain
14 perspective.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: A limited
16 perspective. I can give you a list.

17 SUZANNE RUST: I think we need to
18 start with a list, but I think it also needs to
19 be broader.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So where I was
21 going is I think it's helpful to gather
22 information. I think we have that information.
23 That's why we're here. There's a problem,
24 there's a big problem, and perhaps it is our
25 fault we have not communicated that problem well

1 enough. We have purposely held back to some
2 degree. I mean, I felt we did that last meeting
3 in at least a general, but some very specific,
4 some anecdotal. And there has been -- you know,
5 Sally has cautioned us not to overwhelm everybody
6 with every complaint and everything on the
7 ground, so we haven't done that because we don't
8 want to overwhelm and put people on the defensive
9 when it's not necessary. But I feel like we've
10 held back too far. It feels like you do not
11 truly have enough information. We can bring you
12 that information. There's plenty available. I
13 think we can probably put it in a fairly concise
14 way. We can get together and brainstorm, talk to
15 our constituents. Which are the top three
16 problem areas? Which are the next of concern, et
17 cetera? Is that the information? I mean, we
18 have not gone forward and been that specific
19 because we didn't feel like it's necessary, but
20 I'm hearing it is. I think that information is
21 out there and I'd be happy to put it together and
22 clarify that for you. The problem is, you know,
23 many of those things were said at the last
24 meeting.

25 SALLY GIBERT: It could be that

1 maybe two out of three of the top issues may be
2 too difficult to solve.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Right. I can
4 understand that.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Just the fact that
6 they're there doesn't mean you have to solve
7 that. At least it's a starting point. I agree
8 that there's been kind of conservatism in not
9 being in attack mode or --

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I could list off
11 the top of my head some of the problem areas. We
12 could do it more thoroughly and get more input
13 from our constituency. Is that what you need?

14 SUZANNE RUST: It's helpful. It's
15 concrete. We have this thing out there and what
16 we need is to say, okay, these specific things,
17 what can you guys do? Then we say, well, this
18 one we could probably do this. On this one I
19 don't know that we can do anything. That's why
20 the importance of the working group allows us to
21 have that conversation not in here where it's
22 awkward.

23 CHARLIE SASSARA: In terms of the
24 solution, I understand that. There's issues
25 about finance and everything that relates to

1 that. But we can give you enough specifics today
2 in order to act on it or not, you know. Because
3 we're going to -- the issue here is we sort of --
4 it's an element of trust here and we're going to
5 make some recommendations based on incomplete
6 information. And that's going to be the nature
7 of this because the information is going to
8 continue, the data is going to continue to move
9 and we're going to make a judgment and if we're
10 looking for certitude, it's not going to happen.
11 Just like you didn't need a meter -- the woman
12 didn't need a meter that was living at the end of
13 the airport and you guys changed your behavior.
14 You made accommodations for your neighbors. You
15 didn't need a meter to do that; you just did it.
16 You figured out how to work it out. That's sort
17 of what we've got here. If there's an economic
18 impact, what do you do about it? It's a balance,
19 a very, very delicate balance. But just to get
20 started I think we need some -- okay, here's the
21 three or four areas. You tell us how to do that
22 and maybe there's a pushback, but the operator is
23 going to tell you if it's workable or not as a
24 voluntary effort. Right?

25 SUZANNE RUST: Uh-huh.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And as far as the
2 timing. I mean, I think it was Eric last
3 meeting -- and I appreciate it -- let's throw
4 some things out there and let's try them for next
5 summer. But I also realize that may not be
6 realistic. Some of these are huge decisions and
7 I'm not saying we put something on the table and
8 we vote on it. Absolutely not. But I was hoping
9 at this meeting to get some things on the table.
10 Do we fly higher here? Do we avoid this area?
11 Do we not go in this place? Those kind of real
12 specific things. At least start thinking about
13 them. What implications are there? I might
14 think something is a great idea and you say, oh,
15 but it might cause a problem here and so on. I
16 think we're at that point to kind of be specific.

17 SALLY GIBERT: I think we are too.
18 I think we're all comfortable with the idea, and
19 I have been reluctant to encourage people putting
20 specific recommendations on the table before now
21 because I think we all understand that not every
22 suggestion is workable. I can think I have a
23 really good idea and put it out there and it's
24 not. That's okay with me. I think we're all at
25 that stage where we can put ideas on the table

1 and talk about it and say that didn't work.
2 Let's try another one. I don't see people
3 entrenching and saying, if you don't do this, I'm
4 out of here. I think we're at the time where we
5 can start to do that.

6 TOM GEORGE: With that in mind, I
7 think it might be achievable for a goal by the
8 end of this meeting to see if we couldn't
9 establish a working group, maybe even over lunch
10 so you guys can chat and identify high priority
11 areas, and see if we could establish a working
12 group and a task to address that. At the same
13 time it's not just about next summer. It's about
14 25 years from now. That's why we try to look
15 both long and short term. Some of these other
16 issues do need to be addressed at well. I don't
17 think they should be thrown under the bus as we
18 blaze through. It should be achievable to come
19 out of here with a working group so that we can
20 actively, without violating FACA guidelines,
21 engage the operators and get input from folks on
22 where are high priority areas. Already, just
23 based on your input from your stakeholders or
24 your own personal experience, there are
25 challenges. Again, though, we may need to do

1 monitoring in those areas too, because to start
2 making changes without -- ultimately there is a
3 sound standard that was established in this plan.
4 That will have to be dealt with as well. We're
5 going to have to do some monitoring, and I think
6 it has to do with visitor perception because I'll
7 go on record as saying I don't believe that the
8 information that went into the Backcountry Plan
9 as far as sound perception was accurate and
10 unbiased. That's one of the reasons we think we
11 need to establish something that we can all agree
12 is an unbiased way to move forward because we are
13 going to be dealing with this issue for years to
14 come. And so we need a frame of reference to
15 address that and to drive education efforts after
16 we've done everything we can do to make things
17 better. We really need to work on all those
18 fronts and not just the low-hanging fruit. I'm
19 all for putting at the top of the priority list
20 in this meeting trying to come up with a working
21 group to start to address those issues. It is
22 going to take time and we may not be ready to
23 have a meeting in February if, in fact, you want
24 results from that working group before you meet
25 again. So I think that near the end of the

1 meeting that's something we need to decide in
2 looking ahead to when the next meeting is. I
3 feel like we actually perhaps rushed this meeting
4 since we still don't have the data that was
5 shared from the last meeting for us to have
6 really done our homework and come here more
7 prepared, which might have allowed us to get a
8 little further ahead than we did on some of these
9 recommendations.

10 NANCY BALE: I like the way Suzanne
11 organized the information because I do think it
12 takes into account all the things that do have to
13 be considered. The timely visitor feedback, we
14 could maybe make that bigger and just call it
15 effective monitoring. The second one, establish
16 perceptions. That's a survey kind of approach.
17 The third one, aviation best practices. That
18 incorporates everything that Charlie was talking
19 about. In addition to the education piece, you
20 mentioned equipment and location of flight paths.
21 So, really, in the best practices that
22 incorporates a lot of the types of suggestions we
23 might make, and under each of these headings we
24 could have short-term goals and longer-term goals
25 that would depend upon more monitoring and

1 gathering of information, but the short-term ones
2 could depend upon real knowledge that people
3 bring and that people from the public bring and
4 then education of Denali visitors on the role of
5 aviation. I want to commend the Park Service
6 that already does do a great deal of good
7 education with visitors on the role of aviation
8 at the visitor center at the entrance to the park
9 and also at the Talkeetna ranger station. That
10 to me is a really long term kind of thing that
11 they're working on. It's not as germane to our
12 purposes other than as a goal for the Park
13 Service, but I would be willing to include it. I
14 think that we should build maybe our structure of
15 recommendations using this as a basis and discuss
16 how we want to word the different topics, because
17 I think most of the things we're concerned with
18 are listed in Suzanne's presentation. And I
19 would like to thank her for putting my mind a
20 little bit more straight about how much
21 monitoring do we have to do? How much visitor
22 feedback do we have to do before we can make some
23 short-term suggestions? If we're going to be
24 active for six years, we could put some stuff off
25 a little bit.

1 SALLY GIBERT: We don't have to
2 plan to be active for six years.

3 NANCY BALE: I think the six years
4 is probably minimal. I kind of think we are the
5 working group in a way, although I appreciate
6 that it's hard to get us called together and I
7 realize it seems like a short period of time
8 before February, but remember that in April
9 everybody is going to be gearing up. We need to
10 seize the winter because that's when our busy
11 pilots are less busy and they have more time to
12 meet in working groups or come to these meetings.
13 To me, we've been a pretty good working group so
14 far, really, but if there were to be a separate
15 working group that didn't require all the FACA
16 notification and everything, I would just want to
17 be sure that I knew as a member of the Council
18 when it was and I could attend and plan to
19 listen.

20 SALLY GIBERT: It's about noon.
21 How about if we see about getting a narrative of
22 the central part we're talking about printed up.

23 TOM GEORGE: You want the words off
24 the --

25 SALLY GIBERT: Just the words.

1 TOM GEORGE: We can do that. Not a
2 problem. We'll have that in ten minutes after we
3 adjourn. I didn't bring a printer.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: This isn't our
6 facility, so I'm not going to make any promises
7 about that. I would ask.

8 SALLY GIBERT: I would hope they
9 have a printer here.

10 SUZANNE RUST: We can cut and paste
11 the words.

12 SALLY GIBERT: After lunch, at
13 1:00 o'clock, we can take that Word document and
14 at 1:00 start to work on that and see what we can
15 do with that in terms of identifying short-term,
16 long-term goals, issue identification, with an
17 eye towards how we can best use our time until
18 the February meeting. Has that already been
19 noticed?

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We can change
21 the date at this point if people feel strongly
22 that they won't be prepared and there isn't value
23 in the meeting.

24 SALLY GIBERT: I'd rather not
25 change the February meeting. Maybe we can make

1 use of it, but recognizing it's an option. So I
2 think we have a game plan. At 1:00 do we want to
3 come back to our discussion, or do we want to go
4 back to our agenda and pick up our staff reports?

5 TOM GEORGE: I go for staff
6 reports, then come back to this.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So we've got
8 a plan. So we're adjourned until 1:00 and
9 hopefully we'll have documents we can work with.

10 (Lunch break taken from 12:00 p.m. to
11 1:10 p.m.)

12 SALLY GIBERT: Charlie had a
13 teleconference that he had to go to at
14 1:00 o'clock, but he hopes that he'll get back.
15 We agreed to go back to No. 8, the staff reports.

16 Miriam and Paul.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And so Sally
18 presented to the committee -- or consolidated the
19 information requests from the committee, and I
20 think everybody received a copy of that. So I'm
21 just going to go -- there's a list of nine items
22 and we'll kind of go down through them if that
23 works for people.

24 The first one was -- the question
25 to Park Services: Tom George desired a better

1 understanding of the sound generated by different
2 aircraft at different elevations to inform
3 recommendations. So, Jared, you had an
4 opportunity to speak with him, and then I also
5 have a response.

6 JARED WITHERS: So Tom and I talked
7 directly about this. And as I understand it,
8 what he's after and what you guys are after is
9 related to what you guys talked about during the
10 lunch break at the last meeting. There was a
11 controlled conditions experiment that we did last
12 summer where we measured the park plane and
13 helicopter overflying at known altitudes over a
14 sound station, and the experiment was designed to
15 measure the maximum sound level of the
16 overflight. So it really just measured when the
17 plane was closest or directly overhead. What my
18 understanding is you guys are interested in is
19 something that's more illuminating to what the
20 aircraft sounds like when it's at different
21 distances, not necessarily its maximum level and
22 its closest or how loud it is when it's not
23 flying directly overhead, but flying past you at
24 an offset distance. And the answer to that
25 question is it's going to take another controlled

1 conditions experiment to measure that. The
2 experiment that we already did wasn't designed to
3 shed light on that question. And it will be --
4 you know, it's a fairly -- it's not a simple
5 experiment to do. We certainly have the means to
6 do it, but I would maybe ask that you guys
7 deliberate and really nail down what you want the
8 experiment to address and have some specific
9 things, and then I can design it so that it will
10 address those things before I do it. And I would
11 say that it would probably be, you know, spring
12 or early summer before something like that would
13 happen. We can maybe do it in the winter, but I
14 don't know that it would be as representative if
15 we did it in the winter since we're mostly
16 talking about fair weather flying here, not
17 wintertime flying. So if you guys wanted to talk
18 about that and put together a more detailed
19 request for some specific things, I'd be happy to
20 accommodate that.

21 Another thing that was requested is
22 just more information about both the Kahiltna
23 site that I presented before and everything that
24 I presented before is -- sorry for the delay --
25 but it's going to be on the CD that's being

1 burned right now and you guys are going to take
2 home with you today. So if you've forgotten some
3 of the audiograms, the graphical representations
4 of a day's worth of sound data, they're good for
5 seeing how loud overflights are; they're good for
6 counting how many there are; they're good for
7 classifying aircraft types like helicopter, prop
8 jet; not so good for classifying make and model
9 of an aircraft. You're probably not going to be
10 able to identify whether a certain flight was K2
11 or Fly Denali's plane based on the picture -- not
12 with any level of confidence are you going to be
13 able to identify that. You also can't know much
14 about where the plane is. You can tell how loud
15 it is, but that could mean it's at low altitude
16 and a half-mile offset or that could mean it's at
17 high altitude and directly above. So it's going
18 to be difficult or impossible to try and tease
19 out spatial locations based on that data. But
20 certainly statistically it offers a lot as far as
21 the general level of traffic in that area. You
22 can see how weather affects the level of traffic
23 in the area and maybe how seasonal -- as the
24 season progresses, some sites we have a whole
25 four months of data for and you can come to

1 conclusions about what the traffic is doing in
2 that area seasonally.

3 So one of the things I'm working on
4 right now for the sound program, not just for the
5 Overflights Committee, is putting basically
6 everything we've got, all the data that we've
7 collected and all the data that we will collect
8 is going onto a sound monitoring web site, and it
9 will probably be through the Central Alaska
10 Network at this point, so it will be hosted on
11 their site. But there will be a link to it on
12 the overflights web site that Jenni is putting
13 together. The format that I'm thinking it's
14 going to come together in is it will be a picture
15 of the park with clickable dots with everyplace
16 we've had a site. You'll click on a dot and
17 it'll take you to a profile page for that site
18 that'll have a couple of photos of the site,
19 where it was situated. It will have all the
20 audiograms from that site that have been
21 generated from the sound pressure level data. It
22 will have the annual reports that I do every year
23 that has the results of the actual listening that
24 we do, which in many ways I think is more
25 insightful than perusing the many, many audiogram

1 sheets, although there are certain things looking
2 at the audiogram sheets can tell you that the
3 listening data, at least in our current format,
4 doesn't tell you as easily. Like what the
5 distribution of flights are in a day, like what
6 hours of the day are the busiest. We're not at
7 this point compiling statistical numbers that
8 tell you which hours of the day have the most
9 activity. It's more like on a day-by-day basis.
10 So it will be just a lot of information. And
11 then hopefully at that point, if you guys so
12 desire, you'll be able to bury yourself in that
13 and then ask me for clarification and
14 explanation, and I can interpret the data for you
15 if you would like. So I'm thinking that setup
16 might be a good fit.

17 Any thoughts on that?

18 NANCY BALE: You were saying that
19 the sound signatures now you can't really tell
20 except basic information like whether it's maybe
21 a -- if it were a single engine prop versus a
22 dual; would you not really be able to tell
23 differences there?

24 JARED WITHERS: Not from the visual
25 sound, the audiograms. The spectral color

1 pictures, probably not. The audibility analysis,
2 if the plane is close enough, I can certainly
3 differentiate between a twin engine and a single.
4 When they're far away, they're much more
5 difficult.

6 NANCY BALE: Is there a future for
7 -- is the sophistication of the equipment and the
8 monitoring, does it have a future of becoming
9 more specific to individual types of aircraft or
10 other types of motorized noise, or does it have
11 some limits even with improved technology and
12 everything?

13 JARED WITHERS: It certainly has
14 limits. The stations, the angle at which they're
15 designed is to mimic human hearing. So the goal
16 they strive for when they're designing this
17 equipment is what it records is what you would
18 hear if you were standing there, and I think they
19 do a pretty good job of that. But as far as
20 spatial information and -- you know, someone that
21 has a lot of experience in distinguishing
22 different makes and models of aircraft might be
23 able to do a little bit more with it than they
24 could, but I think in the near future it's going
25 to be probably more limited.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Why would that be
2 important? If we know how much sound something
3 makes, whether they've got dual --

4 NANCY BALE: Well, there was a
5 discussion about how you attribute the sound,
6 whether you attribute it to general aviation
7 versus specific planes used for overflights or
8 flightseeing, and if the equipment could discern
9 that, then that would solve that question. But
10 it sounds like from what you say, Jared, the
11 noise monitoring equipment isn't specific enough
12 to differentiate that type of thing.

13 JARED WITHERS: No.

14 NANCY BALE: In general aviation
15 also there are many smaller planes used for
16 general aviation too in addition to larger, so
17 what basis would you have for trying to determine
18 that?

19 JARED WITHERS: If you're
20 interested in what the sound characteristics of a
21 specific type of aircraft are, it's always better
22 to make those under a controlled conditions
23 experiment. If you're interested in how much
24 quieter a turbine Otter is over a 185, we can
25 measure that on the runway at Talkeetna. That's

1 something that's very possible. It would take an
2 afternoon.

3 NANCY BALE: Okay. Thank you.

4 JARED WITHERS: You guys were easy
5 on me this time.

6 I'm shooting for -- I'll make you a
7 promise and say before the next meeting, at least
8 maybe.

9 TOM GEORGE: You don't know when
10 the next meeting is yet.

11 JARED WITHERS: There will be a
12 site by the beginning of the next meeting. It
13 may be still under construction. How about that?

14 TOM GEORGE: And as you point out,
15 we talked about this, but the concern I have is
16 to do some of the analysis I think we need to do
17 the issue of when the aircraft are there is very
18 important. Is it 8:00 in the morning? 8:00 at
19 night? Are they all bunched together in the
20 middle of the day? That's one of the kinds of
21 data that I think we need to evaluate the nature
22 of problems and think about mitigation. So if
23 there's a better way than audiograms or whatever
24 to get that data, I'm all for it. But I think
25 that's really important information that we need

1 to be able to look at. Whether it's Kahiltna
2 Pass or the sound monitoring site next to
3 Kantishna, that detail is very important to being
4 able to understand not exactly what kind of
5 airplane it is, but what the nature of the
6 operation is. Are they all concentrated in a
7 three-hour window? Is it one flight late at
8 night and another flight in the middle of the
9 day? What is the nature of that?

10 JARED WITHERS: That's something
11 that can certainly be computed with the data that
12 we gathered. If that's something that the
13 committee wants, I can put that together. I can
14 tell you anecdotally just from all the listening
15 that I've done that most places are fairly well
16 distributed. You know, you start to hear the
17 first flights around 6:00, 7:00 in the morning in
18 the lighter months of the year when there's ample
19 daylight, and then generally you don't hear
20 anything later than 11:00 at night. But if the
21 committee would like very specific daily time
22 type of statistics, I can put that together.

23 SUZANNE RUST: From the sound data,
24 can you also determine the duration of each
25 flight? You should be able to, I imagine.

1 JARED WITHERS: Yeah.

2 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's a
3 good piece of information. What are these
4 experiences like? Are they prolonged? Three or
5 four minutes? Are they 30 seconds? I would like
6 to know.

7 JARED WITHERS: Three minutes is
8 the approximate average, I can tell you that.
9 And of course it depends on the altitude. The
10 higher you fly, the longer generally you're
11 audible, but you're quieter. So that's something
12 interesting to think about. That's something I
13 could, if you would like, add a little bit more
14 detail in that department. Were you planning to
15 talk, Miriam or Paul, about the schedule of
16 information requests?

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No, but this
18 might be a good time.

19 JARED WITHERS: All these things I
20 say I can do for you, when I say that I just mean
21 put it in one of those information requests and
22 I'll do it. But some of these things will take
23 longer than others obviously, so the earlier the
24 better.

25 SALLY GIBERT: I think we

1 understand that we need to be judicious at this
2 point about what additional information we ask
3 for.

4 JARED WITHERS: As long as you
5 guys reasonably think that it's useful, I'm going
6 to do it.

7 SUZANNE RUST: It's an important
8 point that I think that as we look at this, the
9 more we learn, the better equipped we are to make
10 decisions. Because my idea of, well, let's fly
11 higher. In some areas that may actually not be
12 the thing to do. It's the question of how
13 long -- how important -- looking at the big
14 picture and saying, okay, we're going to hear the
15 noise, it's going to be lower, but we're going to
16 hear it longer, or this airplane is flying lower
17 and we're going to hear it for a shorter time.
18 It does make a difference in helping us guide
19 some decisions.

20 JARED WITHERS: At that point you
21 get in the -- it becomes more of a psychological
22 thing. Most of what I've read is that short
23 duration high intensity noises are regarded as
24 more disruptive than low level continuous noise.

25 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's

1 important to put out there. It's information
2 gathering that's important. Is that anecdotally
3 or is that from studies you've read?

4 JARED WITHERS: That's from studies
5 I've read. I couldn't quote the author or
6 anything.

7 SUZANNE RUST: Right. I think
8 that's important information to have. Again, it
9 helps us define how people perceive things.
10 There's a psychology to perception. There's
11 definitely a psychology.

12 JARED WITHERS: Studying noise
13 quickly moves into psychology in every field. In
14 transportation noise some departments of
15 transportation use pavements that are physically
16 louder, but they're less annoying because they're
17 spectral. The frequencies they omit the noise in
18 are less annoying to people even though
19 decibelwise they're louder. So there's a whole
20 world there. Summarizing it is difficult, but
21 you can certainly get into it.

22 TOM GEORGE: We'd ask that if you
23 have specific documents and stuff, you would
24 reference those on the web site as well just to
25 make it easy for any of us to go, to the extent

1 we can and have time, to delve into some of that
2 stuff, rather than asking you to summarize it all
3 for us and just give us the answer.

4 SALLY GIBERT: I kind of like just
5 getting the answer. Just the fact that he says
6 that based on what he knows that longer lighter
7 sound seems to be less intrusive than more
8 intense shorter sound. That seems to be true for
9 me, so it's interesting to hear that may be
10 commonly held.

11 TOM GEORGE: And what's the
12 threshold that constitutes annoyance? Which is
13 the whole visitor perception realm that I think
14 is very important that we continue to advance in
15 parallel to some of the other things we're
16 talking about doing.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Right. Just these
18 collections of anecdotal things, to me, are
19 really interesting. I probably wouldn't want to
20 go read the reports that verify that, although I
21 know that other people may.

22 TOM GEORGE: So she's asking for a
23 summary and the lengthy report.

24 (Laughter.)

25 JARED WITHERS: One thing that I

1 put together is a bibliography and a little
2 review on noise effects on wildlife for the last
3 meeting and then didn't have time to do it. So
4 that PowerPoint is on the CD that you're going to
5 get, and there's a half-dozen or maybe ten
6 articles in that bibliography that speak to
7 effects of noise on wildlife that you guys might
8 like to look at. And I summarize some of the key
9 points of those in the PowerPoints. Take a look
10 at that one because you haven't seen it before.

11 NANCY BALE: Do you know where your
12 two nonrandomly placed stations are going to be
13 next summer, or are you still in the process of
14 deciding that?

15 JARED WITHERS: We're still in the
16 process of deciding. In fact, we haven't begun
17 the process of deciding.

18 NANCY BALE: If the Council were
19 concerned or interested in having a certain area
20 or two monitored, would that be influential?
21 Could it be influential?

22 JARED WITHERS: I would think it
23 would be. I don't solely make the decisions, but
24 I think that that sounds totally appropriate.

25 NANCY BALE: Then the others are --

1 the randomly selected ones, are those pinpointed
2 on a map yet?

3 JARED WITHERS: Yes.

4 NANCY BALE: Because maybe it would
5 be good for us to see that map because if there
6 are some areas that we've identified as
7 potentially problem areas, if one of the random
8 stations is located in one of those, then we're
9 home free. That would be great to see that map.

10 JARED WITHERS: Exactly. If you
11 guys decide that you want to make a change or be
12 courageous and -- make a quick change and you're
13 looking for a spot sample, I'm sure we could
14 accommodate you there as long as you guys promise
15 not to avoid it.

16 TOM GEORGE: Which do you want,
17 less sound or --

18 (Laughter.)

19 NANCY BALE: The good thing to do
20 maybe would be to have a site that was in a
21 potentially problem area, not do any changes one
22 year and then the next year do an avoidance
23 strategy and then compare the numbers. You know,
24 if we're really looking for some fairly short
25 term --

1 JARED WITHERS: Everything we've
2 done is kind of the first step in that. If you
3 want to look at all the places we've sampled and
4 decide you want to make a change around one of
5 those places, we could resample and we would
6 already have the before.

7 TOM GEORGE: That's on the
8 PowerPoint we'll be getting, right? Didn't you
9 show those last time?

10 JARED WITHERS: Yeah.

11 TOM GEORGE: That's why we need
12 that. That's one of the things we might be able
13 to take advantage of, because that would give us
14 the before and then to look at the after.

15 JARED WITHERS: Doing the before
16 and the after for a specific point that you guys
17 decide on is totally doable, but I don't see
18 it -- well, maybe. It would be a two-year time
19 line type of thing, which I feel like you guys
20 might be trying to get away from.

21 NANCY BALE: There's short term and
22 there's long term. There's both. It seems like
23 a good idea.

24 JARED WITHERS: It's totally
25 doable.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I wanted to
2 clarify something that I learned the last time we
3 were with you when you were outside that I wanted
4 to make sure I had correct. We had heard a
5 plane, but it was pretty far away and then later
6 you said that wasn't loud enough to qualify as an
7 intrusion on the Backcountry Plan. If it's a
8 far-away plane, it's high up, it's way over, I
9 can hear it, but it's light, it's background,
10 that doesn't necessarily -- it has to be at a
11 certain loudness to qualify as an intrusion?

12 JARED WITHERS: It has to be at a
13 certain loudness to qualify as an intrusion or an
14 event. What that loudness is is it has to be
15 louder than the natural.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So if we can hear
17 a plane, that doesn't necessarily violate the
18 soundscape standards?

19 JARED WITHERS: Well, it does and
20 it doesn't.

21 TOM GEORGE: Listen carefully to
22 this. This is important.

23 JARED WITHERS: So the standard
24 that calls for the number of intrusions today
25 above natural ambient, it wouldn't. But during

1 the percent time audible, the audibility maximum,
2 if it is audible, it would add to the percent
3 time audible. But it wouldn't count as an
4 overflight proper.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

6 JARED WITHERS: I assume that's why
7 we have -- one of the reasons why we have
8 multiple standards.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I was kind of
10 confused about that. That helps clarify that
11 aspect as well.

12 JARED WITHERS: Anything else?

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I would like to
14 say that as people said, oh, that would be good
15 information to have, there seemed to be a lot
16 of -- it took a while to gather the information
17 request lists for the National Park Service for
18 this meeting. So we thought we would kind of
19 streamline the process a little bit. That's why
20 this information request list sits here. I would
21 like to leave at the end of the day with all of
22 the information requests that have been generated
23 today, because we're going to go into holiday
24 mode and people go on vacation and pretty soon it
25 will be February.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So she doesn't have
2 to ask me in two weeks, what were the information
3 requests?

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: This just kind
5 of lightens the load for everybody. While it's
6 still fresh in your mind what you would like to
7 know more of, that allows us to compile the
8 information and get it out before the meeting so
9 people can come better prepared. Does that sound
10 like a process we could try? And if it doesn't
11 work, we'll try something else. So that means
12 that I have -- I brought markers. Each person is
13 going to be responsible for putting their request
14 and then put your name by it so that we can
15 follow up if we don't fully understand. Does
16 that make sense?

17 TOM GEORGE: Well, I think that's
18 courageous in the world to do that, but to be
19 fair to you guys, I think -- I mean, I could ask
20 59 things. It ought to be what the group agrees
21 to, so we aren't either asking for a ton more
22 things or just a thing to satisfy individuals.
23 In other words, maybe we need to spread that list
24 a little bit just to make sure that we're not
25 sending you on a fishing expedition.

1 SALLY GIBERT: We can make sure
2 that the requests were pretty much collective,
3 but assign a person for clarification if there's
4 need for one.

5 TOM GEORGE: Absolutely. The
6 thought, again, is let's combine it to get it
7 right and hopefully in one pass get information
8 that will satisfy at least the different things
9 we know we need to know now. Doesn't mean we're
10 not going to need to learn something down the
11 road that might generate a request for further
12 information. Right now the two things I saw is,
13 again, for any of the sound monitoring that's
14 done, I think we need to know the time of the
15 event, time of day, and as Suzanne said,
16 duration. At least for considering any of the
17 mitigations we want to consider, that's really
18 important information for us to have. Those
19 would be my nominations.

20 SALLY GIBERT: So that's for all
21 data that's been gathered to date?

22 TOM GEORGE: Well, he's talking
23 about putting the data on the web site, right?

24 JARED WITHERS: Yeah. One of those
25 things that you asked for would be -- would take

1 some analysis to come up with.

2 TOM GEORGE: Which one? We can
3 deal.

4 JARED WITHERS: The time of day.

5 TOM GEORGE: I guess at the moment
6 that's almost the most important one. Again,
7 others can weigh in here. The thing is we're
8 trying to sit around a table and look at the Ruth
9 Amphitheater or any other thing. It seems to me
10 you're going to -- we're looking at an area they
11 have monitored that we're thinking maybe we can
12 make some mitigations. It seems to me if you
13 don't know the time of day the events occurred as
14 well as their relative loudness and duration, we
15 really don't know what problem we're trying to
16 fix.

17 NANCY BALE: Perhaps we need to
18 narrow it down to certain areas of the park that
19 we see as particularly -- you were going to say
20 that, weren't you?

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. Don't
22 necessarily ask for that information for all the
23 stations for the last five years or ten years.
24 If that's information is important to the Ruth,
25 then ask for that information for the Ruth.

1 JARED WITHERS: Some of that sounds
2 like it's a step beyond like general knowledge of
3 the problem. Like if you make the decision that
4 you want to consider making a suggestion
5 pertaining to the time that flights happen, then,
6 yeah, it's totally appropriate to want to know
7 good specifics about when flights are happening.
8 But me giving you statistics on when flights are
9 happening at all the places we've measured, it's
10 kind of --

11 TOM GEORGE: How about the places
12 where we're breaking sound standards?

13 SALLY GIBERT: I think earlier I
14 heard some discussion that potentially using that
15 tool of trying to -- if people fly there at
16 certain times and not other times maybe would be
17 inherently problematic for whatever reason, so
18 maybe we should find out whether that's a tool
19 that should be on the table. Without prejudging
20 absolutely yes or no, but if it's useable to
21 consider.

22 JARED WITHERS: Yeah, if you want
23 to really consider data to inform a possible
24 decision, rather than just being general
25 information.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Right. I definitely
2 think we need to be judicious in what we ask for.
3 We want to have a good basis for asking.

4 TOM GEORGE: How about for areas
5 where the data you have so far -- I mean, you
6 only have like one season for any of these sites,
7 don't you?

8 JARED WITHERS: Yeah.

9 TOM GEORGE: So, again, it's not
10 like the last six year's worth of data. It would
11 be a few sites. How about any of those sites
12 that we are currently above the standards defined
13 in the Backcountry Plan? Because obviously those
14 are variants we need to be looking at whether we
15 want to or not.

16 JARED WITHERS: It will be several
17 years of data. It will just be all at different
18 sites.

19 TOM GEORGE: But that's like a
20 handful of sites, right? I mean, how many -- I'm
21 trying to remember your PowerPoint presentation.
22 I remember a few up in the Kantishna area and
23 then I think some down in the southern end of the
24 park. Was it more than that?

25 JARED WITHERS: It's more than 20,

1 less than 30. Something like that.

2 TOM GEORGE: We'd be happy to look
3 at a map and narrow that down because I'm not
4 trying to swamp you. But these are the areas we
5 need to be looking at to understand why.

6 JARED WITHERS: Another thing would
7 be, if the committee and the park are interested,
8 I heard you guys talk earlier about defining
9 areas of interest whether it be based on
10 standards or where the most popular backcountry
11 area is or where complaints are coming from. Any
12 kind of spatial narrowing it down would make the
13 task a lot easier. If you're not interested in
14 what's going on in the northwest, then that
15 lessens the task, but certainly there's value in
16 statistics that cover the entire park as well.

17 TOM GEORGE: Sounds like we need to
18 sit down and look at your map a little bit to
19 narrow that down. We can do it at a break.

20 NANCY BALE: Is it on paper?

21 TOM GEORGE: It should be on this
22 CD.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We can project
24 it up on the screen.

25 TOM GEORGE: Let's take a look at

1 it on a break and see. If we need to, then we'll
2 put it up.

3 SALLY GIBERT: So we're going to
4 end this part of the discussion knowing that we
5 only have one part up there that's not completely
6 defined yet?

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I just didn't
8 want to lose at least that.

9 NANCY BALE: Another information
10 piece that everybody thought was good to have was
11 the projected placement for the soundscape
12 stations for the summer of '09 so if we wanted to
13 make any suggestions.

14 TOM GEORGE: Is that on your
15 PowerPoint?

16 JARED WITHERS: No. Only up to '08
17 on this.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: When are you
19 going to make that decision? Because if we want
20 to make a recommendation, we probably need to do
21 that today.

22 JARED WITHERS: The stations won't
23 go out until the beginning of June, end of May.
24 So you'll have at least the next meeting.

25 NANCY BALE: But you've decided

1 where to place the random ones already, haven't
2 you?

3 JARED WITHERS: Yes.

4 TOM GEORGE: That was the question
5 so to the extent they did overlap an area we
6 might be interested in, we're not requesting
7 something that they're already -- we can save our
8 requests for other areas.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Let's take a quick
10 public comment session.

11 WAYNE FULLER: I sort of have a
12 question of comparing volume, number of flights
13 versus impact and noise. It seems like it would
14 be pretty easy to do a controlled study of having
15 a sound station in different locations, fly
16 different aircraft over it at different levels
17 and we could record that, and you know any given
18 day it's going to be so loud at a certain height.
19 That would give us like a hard baseline of data.
20 If there's four flights a day or 100 flights a
21 day, all that stuff is variable depending on
22 economics and weather and a bunch of factors.
23 But we could have concrete, fixed data saying
24 that this 182 at this high makes this much noise,
25 this Otter makes this much noise, maybe this guy

1 can fly a little lower. You know, different
2 things. I'm not an expert on doing studies, but
3 I think we should come up with some concrete
4 baselines of this is how much noise it takes
5 taking off; this is how much noise it makes
6 flying in to descend. So maybe you fly a bunch
7 of planes over it at a couple different
8 elevations and you have a constant quantitative
9 data that you can compare. Not that numbers of
10 flights are important, but constants are things
11 we could work with more readily.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Sounds like you're
13 interested in teasing out how different kinds of
14 planes and whether taking off or landing, what
15 that looks like as sort of baseline information.

16 WAYNE FULLER: I think those are
17 constant measurements we could make. You would
18 be much more adept at designing a study of that
19 sort. But for designing future operations, maybe
20 consider, well, this plane is kind of loud, maybe
21 I'll take this plane and I'll fly at this height
22 because I know it won't bother anyone where if I
23 take that plane and fly at a different altitude,
24 it does bother people. So, to me, it seems like
25 knowing constants would allow people to make

1 better choices about how they want to mitigate
2 their impact as opposed to, you know, we're going
3 to have lots of numbers and that sort of thing.
4 Does that make sense?

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. I'm
6 interested from Jared to know if doing it at
7 different locations would greatly increase the
8 complexity and cost of the study.

9 JARED WITHERS: That sounds like a
10 pretty big project. I mean, there's certain
11 information you can glean from like the aircraft
12 manufacturers, and there are -- I'm pretty sure
13 the FAA does -- has noise measurements on a lot
14 of aircraft. I don't know if they have all of
15 them. Getting into the specifics, like how much
16 noise does it make climbing or descending.
17 Different altitudes is pretty easy to calculate
18 and you can do that using principles of sound
19 propagation. For aircraft it's easier than
20 ground-based transportation because sound travels
21 fairly constantly through air. When you start
22 traveling over ground you get a lot of
23 environmental effects. It's not nearly as
24 accurate. So there could be some -- a little bit
25 of light shed on that, I think. Also maybe I

1 might go as far to say that every plane -- a
2 plane that has an engine and a certain prop and
3 it's a certain size and weight, you know, if it
4 makes X number of decibels cruising, it's
5 probably -- it would probably be a proportion of
6 difference climbing, cruising and descending to
7 most other planes. That might be a strong
8 assumption.

9 WAYNE FULLER: I guess what I'm
10 looking at is if I were an aircraft owner and I
11 knew I could fly at a certain elevation, I would
12 want to know where that was just to make sure I
13 was doing the right thing. That's what I think
14 we need to determine.

15 JARED WITHERS: I think that's a
16 great thing to know, but I'm pretty sure it's
17 outside the realm of what our -- what we can do,
18 at least with our current study. It may be a
19 good project for a master's thesis or something.
20 It would be a new project, I guess. That would
21 be too complex to incorporate without really
22 growing the program, but it's a good idea.

23 TOM GEORGE: The work you did so
24 far is kind of a first step. You took a single
25 aircraft and flew it at multiple altitudes over a

1 fixed location. So we've got that. Is that on
2 the CD?

3 JARED WITHERS: Yes.

4 TOM GEORGE: So there's the first
5 step. But that's only one type of aircraft. And
6 the other thing that's become clear is the
7 acoustics, whether you're in a V-shaped valley
8 where things radiate back and forth is way
9 different, so then the geometry of the landscape
10 comes into play. It may be that playing around
11 with some of these modeling programs is an
12 alternate way to at least consider the impacts of
13 changing those things. Bear in mind, this
14 modeling study doesn't take in the ambient, if
15 the wind was blowing that day or not, humidity in
16 the atmosphere, all those things.

17 JARED WITHERS: Yeah. The model
18 allows you to specify aircraft type and I know
19 there's not a long list of them, a general single
20 engine prop or a general twin engine turboprop or
21 whatever. It also doesn't account for climbing
22 or ascending and things like that.

23 WAYNE FULLER: Not to bog down the
24 discussion, but I was thinking that's what I
25 would want to know is where and how do I reduce

1 my impact and how we determine that. You're
2 obviously more qualified than I am to figure it
3 out.

4 SALLY GIBERT: I'm wondering if
5 Jared has any anecdotal observations based on his
6 experience about what types of airplanes are
7 noisiest, which types are quieter. I bet he
8 could write up ten things like that.

9 JARED WITHERS: Actually I'll bet
10 all these guys are much more knowledgeable than I
11 am. I haven't been around that much aviation.
12 Just what the park does. I stood next to the
13 runway while a turbo Otter took off. I haven't
14 measured one, but it sure seemed quiet and
15 carries a lot of people. It seems like the more
16 blades your prop has, the happier I am.

17 (Laughter.)

18 SALLY GIBERT: Any other thoughts
19 about soundscape monitoring in particular from
20 the audience? Okay. Thanks.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Moving on to the
22 next. So Tom George asked whether air taxis and
23 flight services could provide information on the
24 days in 2007 that could better inform the sounds
25 reported by the sound station.

1 TOM GEORGE: That got kind of
2 twisted around. That was starting with, again,
3 the data collected in the Pass and I thought if
4 we could get that data in some form, then
5 perhaps -- emphasis on the word perhaps -- the
6 operators or flight services could let people
7 look at that data and consider their operations
8 in that area at that time if they have those
9 abilities.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: While the
11 question was asked of the National Park
12 Service, we don't have that information.

13 TOM GEORGE: But the real question
14 was, again, the -- is that data on the CD, the
15 Kahiltna Pass monitoring?

16 JARED WITHERS: Yeah, all that's in
17 the PowerPoint I gave the last time which is on
18 the CD.

19 TOM GEORGE: But there isn't data
20 for every day you monitored, is there?

21 JARED WITHERS: Yeah, because that
22 one was shorter than the others. We just put it
23 up on there and let it run for a month and it
24 happened to run for 13 days. All that's on
25 there.

1 TOM GEORGE: So check that off the
2 list. That was answered.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Then, from Karen
4 Fortier's presentation on backcountry use,
5 Question 3 was: Karen reported that the No. 1
6 complaint from backcountry users is about
7 aircraft, although Paul Anderson clarified that
8 most backcountry users had no complaints. What
9 questions will be asked the backcountry users
10 next summer?

11 We had mentioned that we had hoped
12 to do a backcountry resource survey in 2008.
13 When we do social science in the park, it goes
14 through a fairly extensive process back in D.C.
15 before we actually get the survey to administer.
16 We got caught in a reorganization of the social
17 survey program and we were not able to do the one
18 in 2008 as intended and so we're hoping to do the
19 one in 2009, but those questions have been
20 like -- they were decided probably two years ago.
21 So there isn't an opportunity right now for the
22 committee to influence that survey or to ask
23 questions.

24 The next one down says: Guy Atima
25 (ph) shared that the park is hoping to do a

1 social science survey on soundscape to establish
2 norms of acceptability for the soundscape. Is a
3 draft survey available? Could the Council offer
4 comments?

5 Guy's response to that was: This
6 won't begin development until fiscal year 2010,
7 fiscal year 2011. Our best information is from
8 the public interaction used to develop the
9 Backcountry Management Plan. So in the middle of
10 those two questions there was a question I do
11 have some information to share with you today.

12 The question was: Are maps
13 available that show density or concentrations of
14 backcountry use by season, perhaps compiled by
15 the backcountry unit? It would be helpful to
16 correlate this information with where overflights
17 tend to be concentrated. I spoke to Karen,
18 again, about this and then I had an opportunity
19 to just briefly speak with Joe Van Dorn (ph) who
20 supervises the backcountry operation in the park.
21 Once again, they would like, just like you've
22 heard Jared ask you, that your information
23 requests are somewhat strategic in informing your
24 recommendation. The same request kind of came
25 from Joe and Karen. They would love to come back

1 to the February meeting and have more data
2 compiled, but to just ask can you give us a
3 sample of this -- I mean, they're welcome to do
4 that, but they think that if you can have a
5 better idea of what you want to know, they can
6 better provide the information in a format that
7 will help inform the recommendation. It's a
8 chicken and an egg thing a little bit.

9 So this is what I brought today to
10 share. Here are some -- I'll put the map up.
11 I'm going to see if I can get the computer to
12 recognize it. So we have a map here to the right
13 of the backcountry units. What I want to do is
14 project this backcountry map so folks in the
15 audience can also see. So the data that I passed
16 out that you all have -- the plan was passed in
17 2006. So this is not -- you'll notice the date
18 range is from May 1st through September 30th for
19 the years 2006, '07 and '08. And I think the
20 most -- if you can't see it, you're welcome to go
21 look at the map or come closer to the screen. If
22 you look at the information, what's most
23 interesting is if you flip over the page and see
24 the totals in 2006, these are user nights --
25 that's how we calculate backcountry use on the

1 north side -- 7,793. Then the next year in '07
2 we were 7,792, so relatively flat. Then we had
3 what we consider a fairly big jump last year to
4 8,808. So one of the first questions is: Wow,
5 why do we have so many people out in the
6 backcountry? From the backcountry desk, their
7 best professional guess at why this increased --
8 and what they do is they query the database by
9 the ZIP code because people when they sign up to
10 go in the backcountry give an address for
11 contact. They saw a lot more Alaskans and they
12 didn't know if it was due to the economics or
13 what, but a lot more Alaska ZIP code holders went
14 into the backcountry last year. As well as our
15 concessionaires and maybe Princess -- Paul, I
16 wasn't sure -- offered what was called a
17 six-pack. So they offered their employees free
18 transport into the park basically, so there was
19 an opportunity to get out -- do you know more
20 about that program?

21 PAUL ANDERSON: It's available to
22 anybody. Apparently Princess, and I don't know
23 if anybody else, took -- essentially bought them
24 for their employees so the employees didn't have
25 to pay for them.

1 TOM GEORGE: This is very helpful.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm sorry, I'm
3 not the expert, but I'm going to do my best.

4 TOM GEORGE: Does the fact that you
5 don't have any numbers between 56 and 87 mean
6 that there were zero? Like in the northwest
7 parts, 64, 66, 67, 68, there aren't any numbers
8 showing at all, so does that mean they were
9 zeros?

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Some on the
11 south side you don't need to register for. It's
12 not mandatory registration.

13 SALLY GIBERT: That's the main
14 reason.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Like we're in
16 the 70s on the south side.

17 SALLY GIBERT: This is the outside,
18 outside the old park.

19 TOM GEORGE: So was this only
20 inside the old park?

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So this is the
22 mandatory registration.

23 TOM GEORGE: Okay. So this is only
24 inside the old park.

25 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Where are the 50s

1 and --

2 ERIKA BENNETT: Where the Yukon
3 concentrated.

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I don't know
5 where 50 is. They just ran the numbers for me
6 and I came with the map they printed off. Does
7 anybody have wireless?

8 DAVE WORRELL: It's not working
9 right now. Not strong enough.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You can go to
11 the park web site and click on the trip planning
12 and go in the backcountry by unit. It comes up
13 with a description of the area.

14 NANCY BALE: I have this list.
15 Fifty-six doesn't seem to be on there, though.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: This is not
17 including climbers onto the mountain.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: That's a
19 different list.

20 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Backcountry
21 use is different than mountaineering.

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Yes, they're
23 permitted. This could be a good information
24 request for February and maybe -- where is 56?

25 TOM GEORGE: If these numbers were

1 taken and put in or color-coded with red being
2 the highest number and green being the lowest
3 number, that in itself would visually allow us --
4 those are the high concentrations of backcountry
5 users.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Did you have a
7 laser pointer? I mean, it's been years, but I
8 used to work at the backcountry desk, so I can
9 tell you about my personal experience. Here's
10 Wonder Lake. These units here south of the road
11 up to the range, pretty much from the Muldrow
12 Glacier to the sanctuary, that is in the most
13 desirable area. Those are almost always full.
14 It's hard to get into them. Next after that
15 would be north of the road in the same area and a
16 lot of these in the Kantishna area. If we were
17 to place these on a map, I would almost guarantee
18 that these here are going to be the top used
19 ones.

20 NANCY BALE: The data supports
21 that.

22 DAVE WORRELL: Another little piece
23 of data that might be useful is knowing how many
24 are permitted per given period of time in each
25 area. Some areas, I'm sure, have more people

1 allowed in them.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah. They're
3 all pretty sparse, though.

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So like
5 percentage of total capacity?

6 DAVE WORRELL: Like Unit 10 had 511
7 and Unit 2 had 38. Well, of the number of people
8 allowed in them, is 511 a hundred percent of the
9 people allowed, and is 38 a hundred percent of
10 the people allowed?

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: My experience are
12 those units on the south side of the road is
13 filled almost all the time.

14 TOM GEORGE: The seasonal aspect
15 was the other dimension of the question. Is
16 there a time when one area lights up? That
17 definitely gets to how flightseeing operators
18 might respond.

19 So another question, then, is
20 thinking back to Charlie's request and concern
21 about the Ruth Amphitheater. That's not included
22 here, is it?

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No.

24 TOM GEORGE: So where would you
25 need to go to get the magnitude of visitation or

1 use of that area to add that dimension in so we
2 aren't leaving him out?

3 ERIKA BENNETT: Probably from --
4 you'd have to extract it from the people. You
5 don't have to have a permit to go in. I've gone
6 in there and spent the night without talking to
7 anybody.

8 TOM GEORGE: You're doing this as a
9 partner and operator or --

10 ERIKA BENNETT: General aviation.

11 TOM GEORGE: He's talking about
12 commercial business.

13 ERIKA BENNETT: There are climbers
14 that have their buddies drop them off.

15 NANCY BALE: The Park Service
16 tracks landings, doesn't it?

17 TOM GEORGE: Right. If you have a
18 business and land in the park --

19 ERIKA BENNETT: That doesn't
20 discriminate between climbers or flightseers.

21 JAY HUDSON: It does, but maybe the
22 climbers go into the Kahiltna from the Ruth
23 because those are actually sought out too. We
24 give the information every two weeks.

25 SUZANNE RUST: We would have the

1 number of people we take, yeah.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Would you have
3 the number broken out? Of your glacier landing
4 reporting, would you be able to distinguish
5 scenics, glacier landing versus backcountry
6 mountaineering overnight?

7 JAY HUDSON: It's mostly scenics
8 and climbers is the two categories.

9 PAUL RODERICK: So you're reporting
10 the number of climbers you drop off every time
11 you land?

12 SUZANNE RUST: Right. We wouldn't
13 know how long they stay. We would know how long
14 they were at the Kahiltna. We would know this
15 many went in, this many came out on these days.

16 SALLY GIBERT: If you're dropping
17 somebody off, they're not going to get picked up
18 that same day.

19 SUZANNE RUST: No. I think this is
20 calculated with user days.

21 TOM GEORGE: But there's some
22 relative measure of more people in one area than
23 another, which I think is what we want to know.
24 It begins in terms of picking areas to consider
25 mitigation. So is this something the Park

1 Service, then, has from these different reports
2 the operators feed you or --

3 PAUL ANDERSON: We would have -- we
4 wouldn't have numbers to compare to these
5 numbers. We would have visitors --

6 TOM GEORGE: It's a different kind
7 of number. Is it the numbers of people dropped
8 off or --

9 PAUL ANDERSON: We would have the
10 number of people that landed on the glacier from
11 the commercial operators, but not from general
12 aviation.

13 TOM GEORGE: Yeah. But my guess is
14 the lion's share of the people in here are going
15 in as part of commercial operations. So it's not
16 going to be complete, but a relatively sense of
17 this area is more heavily used than that area I
18 think is what we're looking for now so that we're
19 focusing our efforts in the places that will do
20 the most good or there's the biggest problem.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yes. It's the
22 relative number.

23 TOM GEORGE: So the caveat that
24 these and these are apples and oranges, but it
25 would still give a relative measure so we know

1 we're focusing on an area where we could make a
2 difference.

3 SUZANNE RUST: We could color-code
4 it too for high use, medium use, low use. We're
5 looking at intensity of use.

6 NANCY BALE: How long have you been
7 collecting that data on number of folks landing
8 on the Ruth?

9 SUZANNE RUST: Isn't it '98 that we
10 became concessionnaires? '98.

11 NANCY BALE: So you have several
12 years of data. I'd like to see that data.

13 TOM GEORGE: For this purpose, the
14 last year or so would be --

15 PAUL ANDERSON: It's in the
16 Backcountry Plan.

17 NANCY BALE: Oh, is it?

18 PAUL ANDERSON: I'm sure it is.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So the other
20 question regarding our backcountry use had to do
21 with having the comments. So we went through and
22 for the last year -- and we're not confident that
23 these are all of the comments from backcountry
24 users in regards to aviation. This is like
25 somebody filling out a response card and sending

1 it to the superintendent. So it's just one
2 method. Unsolicited. So this is somebody who
3 wrote. This is from Casey Merritt, who is a
4 Denali interpreter. She writes: From 6:00 to
5 7:30 on May 26th while I was roving Riley Creek
6 campground prior to my interpretive program
7 there, I was surprised by the excessive and
8 disturbing noise from a small plane that seemed
9 to be doing maneuvers of some sort, circling,
10 landing and taking off. I received complaints
11 from visitors at my campground program that night
12 about the disturbance and was told that the same
13 thing occurred the previous evening.

14 TOM GEORGE: What time was that
15 again?

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Between 6:00 and
17 7:30. Circling, landing. Above Riley Creek
18 Campground.

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Collins Air
20 Strip.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: From 6:00 to
22 7:30 p.m. on May 26th.

23 SUZANNE RUST: That's the McKinley
24 Park Strip.

25 TOM GEORGE: That's Park Service or

1 GA.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So here's
3 somebody who was -- activities at 17,200 feet on
4 the mountain, date and time of occurrence says
5 every day. Planes flying very close to
6 17,200 feet. Very loud and unpleasant. Tourist
7 planes.

8 ERIKA BENNETT: It's hard to get
9 close to 17,200 feet from personal experience.

10 JAY HUDSON: Could that have been a
11 search and rescue or any of that? Because that's
12 a park service function.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It says every
14 day.

15 JAY HUDSON: Every day of the
16 summer?

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, I would
18 assume while he was on --

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That's one of the
20 camps.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm just going
22 to read what's written and you can make whatever
23 inferences you want. 17,200 feet was the
24 location. Date and time of occurrence, he wrote,
25 every day. It says: Please give details. He

1 wrote: Planes flying very close to 17,200 feet.
2 Very loud and unpleasant with an exclamation
3 point. Tourist flights, with an exclamation
4 point. He doesn't say I saw tail numbers or I
5 could identify -- that's the end of that comment.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Isn't that where
7 the medical tent is?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No, 14.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Isn't there a
10 camp at 17,000?

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The next one.
12 He doesn't say where he was at, but this was a
13 September comment to us. September 1st through
14 5th was his visit. Thanks for bus service.
15 Thanks for natural quietness. I'm not aware of
16 any airplane/helicopter noise. Nice.

17 This is Dr. Peter Bertocinni (ph).
18 This was May 28th of '08. Date and time of
19 occurrence: Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday
20 afternoon. Our experience was adversely effected
21 by the continuous buzzing of the park, Riley
22 Creek Campground Visitors Center and park
23 headquarters area by a low-flying airplane.
24 Please contact the appropriate parties to prevent
25 this happening in the future.

1 TOM GEORGE: The date was May what?

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: 28th.

3 TOM GEORGE: Was this the same year
4 as the first comments you read?

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Casey's was May
6 26th and this gentleman was there May 28th.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Probably the same.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: This person
9 wrote on the 22nd of June. The noise from the
10 sightseeing helicopters is annoying. Seeing as
11 this is a wilderness area, they should be
12 restricted from flying over -- below -- wow --
13 flying something. I can't figure out the word.
14 Below a certain altitude or altogether. Flying
15 over below a certain altitude. I needed to put a
16 comma in there. I don't have the comment. All I
17 have is our --

18 TOM GEORGE: Your response. That
19 will be interesting.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We actually talk
21 about you guys. So we responded to Mr. Thomas
22 and, I'm sorry, I don't have his original. It
23 says: Thank you for taking the time to comment
24 about your recent climb on Mount McKinley and
25 your concerns about the air taxi flights which

1 circle the summit area around Mount McKinley.
2 Other climbers share your view that such flights
3 detract from the experience of climbing the
4 mountain. While the National Park Service has no
5 legal authority to regulate landings by
6 commercial air services within the park -- while
7 the National Park Service has the legal authority
8 to regulate landings by commercial services, we
9 have no legal authority to regulate commercial
10 aircraft. Only the FAA has the legal authority
11 to restrict aircraft in flight. Currently the
12 FAA has no regulations prohibiting the air taxi
13 flights to which you object. The FAA has a
14 longstanding advisory which requests but does not
15 require the pilots maintain an altitude of 2,000
16 feet above ground level. The recently completed
17 Backcountry Management Plan for Denali National
18 Park identifies aircraft noise as a significant
19 issue to climbers, backpackers and other users of
20 the park. The plan called for the establishment
21 of a federal advisory committee to address the
22 issues of aircraft inside the park. The Denali
23 National Park & Preserve Aircraft Overflights
24 Advisory Council was established and convened for
25 the first time in the fall of 2007. The Council

1 consists of 12 members appointed by the
2 secretary. So a diverse range of interests and
3 stakeholders are represented. We go on to talk
4 about that. I think that's all we shared with
5 him. The role of Mr. Sassara. Charlie Sassara
6 represents the Alpine Club on the Advisory
7 Council. The role of Mr. Sassara is to represent
8 the needs and interests of the climbing community
9 on the Council. It would be useful to share your
10 concerns about the summit flights with him so he
11 can represent those concerns before the Council.
12 So somebody must have called us.

13 Okay. That's all that we had
14 readily available in the files.

15 TIM CUDNEY: Who answers those?

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Paul. Paul sees
17 every comment card.

18 PAUL ANDERSON: We get about 4,000
19 comment cards a year. I read every one
20 personally and we do all of the responses.

21 TIM CUDNEY: What we do is we
22 solicit comments.

23 PAUL ANDERSON: We don't.

24 TIM CUDNEY: What I do is I address
25 the complaints, all two of them, but I'm -- what

1 I'm saying is I expect all of our comments to be
2 good, but the ones that aren't good, that are
3 negative, are the ones you want to address. Out
4 of the 4,000 you mentioned at the last meeting,
5 how many were negative on aviation? Do you
6 recall that?

7 PAUL ANDERSON: A small number.

8 TOM GEORGE: Five or six out of
9 those 4,000 comments?

10 PAUL ANDERSON: Of comments plus or
11 minus. But I do read every comment. To say we
12 don't solicit them isn't quite right. We make
13 comment cards like this available to the public
14 at the visitors centers or whatever. We don't
15 hand them out. It's like, I have a complaint, I
16 have a comment, then we give them a card and have
17 them fill it out.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It also asks if
19 you would like a response.

20 PAUL ANDERSON: Some people say
21 nice things and want a response, and we try to
22 respond to everyone that asks for one. But we do
23 respond to every complaint if there's an address.

24 TIM CUDNEY: We had this discussion
25 yesterday. A lot of people go into the

1 backcountry and they're fresh. They're hot for
2 some reason or other and they do write the
3 comment. That's going to be the far side of the
4 negative of the comments. If they wait two
5 weeks, it's not a big deal because it's kind of
6 softened a little bit or they don't send in a
7 comment at all or send in a lot milder of a
8 comment.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We don't use
10 this as our only method for gauging.

11 TIM CUDNEY: You have the resource
12 at the visitors center when people are actually
13 checking in and they have the opportunity to say,
14 how was your trip? Right then is an opportunity
15 if there was something that was negative, then
16 you could solicit and say, could you write that
17 down? Or when they say, I had a great time,
18 everything was good. Same thing, write it down,
19 tell us. I know folks get busy, but there's a
20 very good avenue for getting valid comments.

21 PAUL ANDERSON: It's sort of like
22 some of the things Jared was talking about with
23 the soundscape. If you want to make base
24 decisions on, quote, statistically valid or
25 scientifically valid information, complaint cards

1 aren't a good thing to base it on. The
2 statistics say that nine out of ten people who
3 are pissed off won't write it down. So for every
4 complaint card you get, there's nine more out
5 there that were upset and didn't write it down.
6 When you look at complaint cards, you're looking
7 at -- especially in that context -- you're
8 looking at a very small slice of the overall user
9 population and you're not taking into
10 consideration, for example, in this case that
11 there's a huge population out there that didn't
12 have to go out at all or maybe will enjoy it or
13 whatever it was. Because we're not soliciting
14 everybody to write their evaluation of the trip
15 and because they're not being directed to answer
16 a question that makes their responses comparable
17 to each other, it's difficult to use complaints
18 in a scientifically valid sense. It's much
19 better to use survey, scientifically valid
20 surveys that solicit input. So basically what we
21 use these for is to kind of keep a pulse on what
22 the visitors are thinking and if there's specific
23 things that we can correct. The toilet paper
24 wasn't in the bathrooms this week, we can check
25 and get it taken care of. You can hear sort of a

1 sample of what people might have to say about
2 aircraft overflight impacts in the park, but I
3 wouldn't use that information positive or
4 negative to make decisions on. It's not a
5 scientifically valid survey.

6 SALLY GIBERT: What is interesting
7 is that two out of the five had to do with
8 basically one incident, which sounds like it was
9 obviously problematic. So there is a difference
10 between a really significant overdoing it versus
11 kind of the general background noise that seems
12 like for the most part is not as an obvious, that
13 were not as problematic. It's interesting the
14 way it came out.

15 PAUL ANDERSON: I'm surprised we
16 don't get more of this.

17 TOM GEORGE: And that is an
18 area where actually -- a lot of airports, if they
19 have noise-sensitive areas, will write up
20 information just to bring to people's attention
21 the sensitivity, hey, there's a campground just
22 off the west side of whatever it is of the
23 airport. I think that would definitely be
24 something worth doing there because there may be
25 some reason, they're fulfilling some official

1 requirement if it is somebody that's doing touch
2 and goes and they're not realizing they're
3 disturbing a bunch of people. Oh, look at all
4 those people waving at us; they're only waving
5 one finger. Again, that's a legitimate way to at
6 least try and address that problem. It's hard to
7 keep that air strip open. Now, my question is:
8 Do you personally write -- the response we heard
9 to that, do you write that or who generates that
10 response?

11 PAUL ANDERSON: Probably the
12 backcountry staff drafts the response and sends
13 it to me and I review it, edit it and then sign
14 it.

15 TOM GEORGE: My thought here is
16 that while all the things you said in there were
17 true, no where did I hear any mention of the
18 positive benefits that aviation provides to this
19 park mentioned in that response. Again, in terms
20 of dealing with the reality and the whole
21 spectrum of things, I would hope the Park
22 Service, where appropriate, actually does mention
23 that, which gets me back to my pet peeve of the
24 study that was done where half the visitors were
25 advised, educated on aviation before they went

1 into the park and sure enough in that half of the
2 visitor survey people were much more disturbed by
3 aviation than the folks that weren't reached at
4 all. If you look at the details of what they
5 were told in that briefing, I'm not surprised
6 they were more unhappy. We are dealing with
7 visitor perception and this is where eventually
8 this education piece is absolutely crucial. It's
9 not going to make all the problems go away, but
10 at least hopefully it puts some things in
11 context. Yeah, there's noise, but also there's
12 benefits in those areas where we can't reduce the
13 noise below a certain level.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: Not being a hundred
15 percent able to tell you who it was, the visitor
16 that we responded to had in fact flown to the
17 mountain on an airplane and probably flew out on
18 an airplane as well.

19 TOM GEORGE: Certainly, yes. Which
20 is where a comment along those lines to me could
21 and should be included in responses like that
22 just to get perspective. I think that's another
23 dimension of this that you guys internally need
24 to look at to make sure that what you're putting
25 out is as balanced as it can be. I realize when

1 you get somebody that's mad, you're probably not
2 going to make them happy, but nonetheless you
3 shouldn't miss an opportunity to put the whole
4 thing out there on the table.

5 Are you going to tell Charlie about
6 the person you sicced on him? While you were
7 absent, we reviewed the six or five complaints
8 that have been received regarding aviation. That
9 response not only identifies the Overflights
10 Council, but you by name. We're curious if that
11 person got ahold of you and shared with you his
12 frustration with summit flights. We can look at
13 it on the break.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I was going to
15 do Question 7 from your information. Is that
16 okay?

17 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, please.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So the
19 information request regarding Amanda Peacock's
20 thesis. The question is: Does the thesis model
21 account for differences between an aircraft
22 climbing versus cruising? Diana reported: No,
23 it does not.

24 Now, the last two requests, Sally:
25 Stemming from a discussion of information and

1 data requests under new business, can seasonal
2 concentrations of animals be depicted on a map?
3 It says: Sally Gibert will attempt to gather
4 ADF&G information on sound impact to wildlife,
5 which Sally presented this morning. We did not
6 pursue that.

7 NANCY BALE: There's some
8 winter/summer dot plots and things that I'm sure
9 you have because I have them for caribou and
10 stuff.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The information
12 didn't get sent to Tom Meyer. So if you're
13 feeling that you need something like that, I'll
14 need to route it to somebody else.

15 SALLY GIBERT: I think that's a
16 good question as to how far we want to go with
17 wildlife. I'm not sensing that that's our
18 highest priority and that we just don't need to
19 pursue wildlife right now. If we want to get
20 back to it within a year or two, that's a whole
21 other area.

22 TOM GEORGE: Well, the only thing I
23 can see is that you run the risk, if you don't at
24 least consider it at a high level, is, oh, gee,
25 we displaced a problem over here in one area into

1 a problem over here in another area. Not asking
2 anybody to do a bunch of work, but if there are
3 already some existing available materials that
4 show specific concentrations, that would not be
5 bad information to share with the group. So as
6 they're looking at designing alternatives, we're
7 at least aware that if something we're planning
8 to do to make people happier might cause a
9 problem somewhere else. I agree, we shouldn't
10 delve into and do a big project on animal
11 research. I'm sure we'll be hearing more about
12 that in years to come. But, again, if there's
13 some readily available information you could come
14 up with, I don't think that would be a bad thing
15 to at least bring forward and share with this
16 group. I know climbers are animals, but in this
17 case I mean caribou.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And then the
19 final one, though it said this was -- this was
20 yours, Tom. It says: Request to Tom George
21 and/or FAA. Can any generalities be made
22 regarding the types of aircraft that most
23 commonly fly over Denali? What are the planes
24 used by general aviation and determine what the
25 sound signatures of the various planes are.

1 TOM GEORGE: As I reported earlier,
2 I don't really have any information at this
3 point. I will continue to keep my eyes open for
4 anything that might be out there, after looking
5 at that long list of aircraft types.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So that was
7 our --

8 SALLY GIBERT: Do we want to put on
9 the thing up here readily available information
10 for seasonal and summer concentrations of
11 wildlife?

12 TOM GEORGE: Before we leave this
13 whole area in general, then the question, again,
14 is taking some of this data and throwing it on a
15 map and asking again if there's any seasonal
16 pattern to it that we should be aware of.

17 SALLY GIBERT: I heard that we
18 could maybe turn that map we saw into more of a
19 graphic. There are two ways to look at it.
20 Both, I think, would be helpful. One just the
21 raw numbers, high and low numbers, and the other
22 one was a percent of capacity.

23 TOM GEORGE: Percent of capacity.

24 SALLY GIBERT: There you go.
25 They're required to be very low numbers, but may

1 fill up every single night of the season.

2 TOM GEORGE: Right.

3 NANCY BALE: Is that an information
4 request?

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yes. It's basically
6 a visual interpretation of these numbers. I
7 think the high, medium, low is probably a good
8 way to do that.

9 TOM GEORGE: We're talking maps,
10 right?

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

13 TOM GEORGE: Then the final one of
14 that was whatever information you can derive out
15 of the landing, the drop-off reports for the
16 south side glacier areas.

17 SALLY GIBERT: The nonclimbers.

18 TOM GEORGE: We've got numbers that
19 show where the people that get backcountry
20 permits go. This gets into addressing your
21 concern about Ruth and/or other areas on the
22 south side about what are the biggest
23 concentrations of people in there, whether there
24 was a way to get at that.

25 SALLY GIBERT: It won't be

1 comparable to this, but the relativity is what's
2 more important.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Anecdotally we've
4 identified right now. There they are.

5 TOM GEORGE: Fine with me.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I would be
7 interested in knowing how much of the use -- what
8 percentage of the use is overnight and how much
9 is the state's.

10 PAUL ANDERSON: We don't have that.
11 Of course you could force us to collect that data
12 and then we would have to go set something up and
13 collect it.

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That's okay. You
15 have enough to do. For those of you who fly, a
16 lot of you what's your -- generally. You know,
17 is it 50/50?

18 PAUL RODERICK: Overnight people
19 versus the scenic people?

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yes.

21 PAUL RODERICK: The scenic people
22 far outweigh the -- it's more than two to one.
23 Probably not 100 to one. It would have to be ten
24 to one? More?

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: If you have 2500

1 climbers a year, let's say 15 on the Denali
2 complex and 600 -- so 2,000 people at most,
3 probably average ten days.

4 PAUL RODERICK: Ten days average,
5 probably about right, maybe more. Then how many
6 landing people? We have that number somewhere.
7 Does anybody know it offhand?

8 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Do you know how
9 many landing people we had?

10 PAUL RODERICK: 10,000, 20,000
11 maybe.

12 SUZANNE RUST: I thought it was
13 9,000. I don't remember from the --

14 PAUL RODERICK: Last I remember it
15 was like 8500. That might have been in '05.

16 SUZANNE RUST: 8500 passengers.

17 PAUL RODERICK: I think as a
18 company we did 8,000 in one season.

19 SUZANNE RUST: I'd have to look.
20 You're right. I think we should look it up.

21 PAUL RODERICK: So I'm just saying
22 20 at the most.

23 CHARLIE SASSARA: So 10 percent is
24 climbing, backcountry skiing activity, and the
25 rest is -- that's total landings, about 20,000

1 landings, 10 percent.

2 PAUL RODERICK: No, people.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Excuse me, I
4 misspoke -- 20,000 people, 10 percent are
5 overnight users that go from one to three weeks
6 and everybody else is just day use.

7 JAY HUDSON: That's acceptable.

8 PAUL RODERICK: That's close.

9 NANCY BALE: Paul, is there any way
10 to know the landings at Kantishna Air Strip?
11 That's not really a park air strip, is it?

12 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah, it's a park
13 air strip.

14 TOM GEORGE: It's a state park air
15 strip. Let's leave it at that.

16 PAUL ANDERSON: We do know the
17 number of commercial landings, but we don't know
18 the number of general aviation.

19 NANCY BALE: Which may be quite a
20 bit larger than the general aviation landings on
21 the south side proportionally?

22 TIM CUDNEY: In Kantishna I think
23 it's minimal. To go to Kantishna you have to
24 have a reason to go there outside of maybe just a
25 day trip.

1 NANCY BALE: People who own
2 property and own planes for their private use,
3 friends of theirs?

4 TIM CUDNEY: Mining claims, going
5 to one of the lodges. The lodges are providing
6 all the transportation.

7 PAUL ANDERSON: I think it's very
8 low.

9 NANCY BALE: So you do have a
10 number for that, though?

11 PAUL ANDERSON: Oh, yeah. We
12 probably have a number for all the other
13 commercial landings as well. There's not that
14 many commercial.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: I know you guys
16 are sensitive about sharing numbers because of
17 the commercial nature of this. But what's the
18 order of magnitude of the flights? We have a
19 rough order of magnitude for people landing, but
20 how many --

21 SALLY GIBERT: Like percentages of
22 overall use? How much of the flying --

23 JAY HUDSON: I think there's 40 or
24 50,000 people that fly over the park.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: So is that in

1 addition to the 20 or does that include the 20?

2 JAY HUDSON: I'm sorry I said that.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Do you think that
4 that's in addition to the 20,000 or is that
5 including the 20,000 that we had for people
6 landing?

7 PAUL RODERICK: I don't think we
8 really know.

9 SUZANNE RUST: You're asking if the
10 overflights and the number that Jay just said,
11 which we're not real sure about but we know it's
12 somewhere in the ballpark, we think, if that
13 includes the glacier landing passengers in that
14 number? Is that what you're asking?

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yes.

16 SUZANNE RUST: I think it does.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: So 50 is an
18 overall number?

19 SUZANNE RUST: And we're not sure
20 about that number.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Just for
22 discussion purposes. That's all. So 30 percent
23 of your people are landing on the glacier --
24 30 percent of the people are landing on the
25 glacier?

1 SUZANNE RUST: There are fewer --

2 PAUL RODERICK: Depends on the
3 company. Most of our flights are landings.
4 Probably 90-plus percent.

5 SUZANNE RUST: For instance, for us
6 it's a smaller percentage because we do a lot of
7 flights without landings. We have an option.

8 SALLY GIBERT: That's interesting
9 to know that it varies so much. That's good to
10 know.

11 TIM CUDNEY: We can't land unless
12 the Park Service asks us to. We'd be in the
13 50,000 number, but not the landing. Had to throw
14 that in. Everybody loves to see you when they're
15 hurt.

16 SUZANNE RUST: I think what it does
17 demonstrate, though, is how many people are
18 experiencing the park via airplane, that there's
19 a population that that's their only access, their
20 only experience. They may go to the north side.
21 I know that one thing I've seen happen with tour
22 operators, there's been a shift. There was a
23 shift because of what's happening on the north
24 side of people trying to build a Denali program
25 on the south side that includes the flightseeing,

1 and I think it's a perspective that it's
2 important for us to take into account because
3 those people -- some folks want to kind of get an
4 "I went to Denali." And that meets their need
5 and they don't end up on the north side. So it
6 does provide probably some relief there. Well, I
7 know it does. So I think it is something that we
8 need to think about.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So you're saying
10 you're seeing an increase in people who instead
11 of experiencing both a bus trip on the north side
12 and flightseeing are just flightseeing and end up
13 with a tour company. That's a good perspective.

14 TIM CUDNEY: They have changed the
15 patterns particularly in the last ten years. At
16 one time it was three-night stays. Now it's
17 two-night stays and one-night stays. They have
18 one-night stays where it will cover both. You
19 have the weather issue where say somebody stays
20 at the south side and they're weathered out.
21 They had a booked tour and all of a sudden
22 they're going to the north side, they completely
23 change their itinerary and want to see the
24 mountain via the aircraft or the bus tour. So
25 they have the same -- I think the patterns right

1 now are 60 percent northbound, 40 percent
2 southbound tours. Is that correct?

3 SUZANNE RUST: You mean coming from
4 Fairbanks?

5 TIM CUDNEY: Yeah.

6 SUZANNE RUST: Yeah.

7 TIM CUDNEY: One group goes north,
8 one goes south.

9 SUZANNE RUST: But there are some
10 that just stop. I think it's working on that
11 movement of south side Denali, you don't have to
12 go up and get into this part of the park; you can
13 have your experience here in Talkeetna starting
14 building some of that infrastructure. You have a
15 hotel there to accommodate folks, so everyone is
16 not rushing to the park doing the bus tour. So
17 this is an alternative and it meets that
18 psychological need people have to see Denali.

19 TIM CUDNEY: They either see it by
20 the bus tour or by an air tour and sometimes both
21 because the bus tour is not always available.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: A lot of times
23 neither.

24 TIM CUDNEY: Exactly. Last year it
25 was neither.

1 SALLY GIBERT: For those people
2 that leave Talkeetna, tour the park by air, don't
3 land, those are not even included in your visitor
4 number?

5 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, they probably
6 are.

7 TOM GEORGE: What's the order of
8 magnitude of bus visitors a year?

9 PAUL ANDERSON: About 400,000.

10 TOM GEORGE: Thank you.

11 SUZANNE RUST: In our deliberations
12 thinking about this, we are looking at a
13 long-term look. If South Denali goes forward
14 we'll see more of that -- see more of that, you
15 know, tour operators looking for ways to separate
16 because there's been, I guess, a bottleneck in
17 how many people can get in on the park road and
18 access.

19 TIM CUDNEY: Also, last year it was
20 rare, but there's some days in summer that you
21 can't get an air flight because everything is
22 booked. We don't have 40 helicopters. There's a
23 lot more people there on those banner days and we
24 turn down a lot of business. It's just the way
25 it is. Same thing with the buses. Only so many

1 buses go into the park. Look at why they've
2 built all the extra hotels just within six years,
3 the amount of room nights between Princess and
4 Holland and Westmark and all that. Where are all
5 those people going to go? They aren't all taking
6 raft trips. They aren't all there for horseback
7 riding. They want to see the park.

8 SUZANNE RUST: One of the things
9 that keeps Denali and flightseeing Denali
10 different than other locations is the weather.
11 We are constantly fighting the weather and the
12 ability to -- so many days of bad weather. You
13 do have days when you can't flightsee everyone
14 who would like to go, and there are lots of days
15 when you don't flightsee anybody at all for good
16 lengths of time. But it keeps the growth more --
17 I think the weather and the economics of it.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. Okay. So
19 moving on.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think I've
21 exhausted the list.

22 SALLY GIBERT: So these three
23 things on the agenda were meant to address 1
24 through 9.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Yes.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Great. Thank you.
2 Anything more on this list from this group? I'll
3 ask you guys the next question.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think we said
5 we could take off that drop-off reporting for the
6 south side?

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Since you've
8 already identified the Pika, Kahiltna base camp
9 and the Ruth. Do you want those numbers?

10 NANCY BALE: If you have exact
11 numbers, it would be great.

12 PAUL ANDERSON: They're in the
13 Backcountry Plan.

14 NANCY BALE: That's right. You
15 told me that. That's right. Thank you.

16 TOM GEORGE: It's all in the plan.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Any public comments?
18 Any other things that --

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I couldn't hear
20 exactly. If I could know the number of
21 backpackers and the average length of stay in
22 those areas. Is that available at all?

23 PAUL ANDERSON: I think we would
24 have that.

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It would be

1 interesting to know the numbers.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Are you talking
3 about per group?

4 ERIC DENKEWALTER: No. How many
5 people actually went in there. If a person went
6 in there and spent ten days, they get ten. If
7 it's 300 people and they spend one night, that
8 would be nice to know.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The average is
10 two user nights. I asked that question: What's
11 the average?

12 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Overall for all
13 this? Okay. That's good. Thank you.

14 WAYNE FULLER: I recall that there
15 was some statistic, though, about backcountry
16 users on the north side statistically never go
17 like beyond a mile from the road or something to
18 that effect. So with regard to the vast number
19 of them, is that accurate?

20 PAUL ANDERSON: No, it's not
21 because backcountry users have to go more than a
22 mile from the road to camp.

23 SALLY GIBERT: I think you might be
24 thinking of people that step off the bus to do
25 day hikes.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Yeah. As part
2 of the road EIS, the Denali Vehicle Management
3 Plan, we're actually exploring because we don't
4 feel we have very good data on the number of
5 people who get off the buses and go for a day
6 hike and then get back on the buses. We should
7 have that data available in the next three
8 months. We have to hand input all of the
9 drivers. They put a checkmark every time
10 somebody gets off a bus at a certain location as
11 a hiker, so we should have more information on
12 that. According to Karen, there's pretty much --
13 and not to oversimplify the backcountry
14 experience, but let's say in general, and I think
15 Joan pointed this out, there's a ten-mile
16 corridor that runs on the side of the road that
17 receives the most use from the backcountry users.
18 It doesn't receive all the use, but most of the
19 use. It's concentrated in that area.

20 SALLY GIBERT: For those people
21 getting off the buses.

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right.

23 PAUL ANDERSON: But we don't have
24 good -- because we don't collect information on
25 day users; we only collect good information on

1 backcountry overnight users. So the information
2 that we get on day users, we're going to try and
3 get some. It's problematic. It won't
4 necessarily be that accurate.

5 WAYNE FULLER: So what you're
6 saying is five miles either side of the road?

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No. She was
8 saying ten miles either side. I'm referencing
9 Karen.

10 WAYNE FULLER: So 90 percent of the
11 users are within 10 miles of either side of the
12 road?

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right.

14 WAYNE FULLER: Okay.

15 PAUL RODERICK: It would be really
16 helpful if we had a map. We've talked about it
17 before, but I have yet to see it. In the hiking
18 areas themselves, the most concentrations and
19 where people overnight the most. It would be
20 nice to know if people are camping like on the
21 Upper Tek. I don't know if they are. I've never
22 seen that many camps on the upper Teklanika. All
23 the rivers that run off -- the hiking corridors
24 that run off the park road itself. So you know
25 basically where everybody camps every night or

1 not?

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We know by unit
3 where they are.

4 PAUL RODERICK: Oh, just the unit
5 itself. They can camp really anywhere they want
6 in the particular units.

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Oh, yeah.

8 PAUL RODERICK: So we do know the
9 unit. So they never really report back on where
10 they camp or anything?

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Like when people
12 come and check back with a mountaineering permit,
13 they say we spent -- we were here and we saw
14 trash here. You know, so many days out. The
15 only thing that Karen did also state was that
16 people tend to gravitate towards the main river
17 drainages, but not specific -- I mean, the whole
18 idea of the Denali backcountry being a trailless
19 wilderness really is you have all that freedom.
20 You can go anywhere and camp and choose to stay
21 there four or five days or one night and move on
22 to something else.

23 PAUL RODERICK: Then it would be
24 nice to know, though, how many user days people
25 were, you know, off of the main camping areas or

1 off the road. Like I did kind of a personal
2 survey this year. We did a trip into the park,
3 did a personal survey trip in a Cub just to kind
4 of take a look around mostly for information that
5 I could divulge in this meeting. I couldn't
6 really find a backcountry camp, and this was
7 towards the end of June. I had a hard time -- I
8 flew the drainages and rivers, and I had a hard
9 time figuring out exactly where people camped
10 besides along Wonder Lake area and the frequency
11 or how many people were camping in those areas.
12 So I think it would be nice to know just the
13 areas, like the units of where people do
14 overnight or where they hike the most. Like the
15 time of the year and frequency because we can
16 avoid them if we could.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So like what we
18 provided today in the handout, which kind of
19 showed which units received quantity of overnight
20 use? Did you receive one of those?

21 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It's a pretty
22 big area, so it's hard to tell where were they
23 really congregated.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And, you know,
25 we don't know.

1 PAUL RODERICK: That's what I'm
2 trying to figure out, if there's a popular area
3 in one of the units where people are camping
4 consistently. It seems to me you can only hike
5 so far in a day. If people are averaging two
6 nights, we can kind of almost predict around the
7 area that they're going to be to the best of your
8 ability.

9 NANCY BALE: It's good to avoid
10 Glacier Creek.

11 PAUL RODERICK: We know that now.
12 We didn't know that for a bunch of years.

13 NANCY BALE: Right. Probably
14 between five and ten miles up the Toklat, good
15 place to avoid. Sunrise Creek, good place to
16 avoid. But that's all anecdotal.

17 JAY HUDSON: That's okay. At least
18 it's something to go on.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I can say to some
20 degree for you, Paul, for one thing about finding
21 a tent, most of these units have pretty small
22 numbers. There's probably two parties in that
23 whole upper Toklat drainage. You're maybe
24 looking at two backpacking parties. They could
25 be anywhere in that unit. Now, generally people

1 are going to follow the river bars to some degree
2 up to the base of the glaciers and around on the
3 bottom part of the glaciers and they're going to
4 take the valleys between units, the passes. I
5 have spent five summers doing a lot of hiking and
6 backpacking and I have a map where I went. I can
7 bring it in and show it to you, because that
8 would be somewhat indicative because I went all
9 over where common areas are. I think what you're
10 going to find is pretty much on those core units
11 on either side of the road you can count on
12 people being everywhere. Basically every unit
13 that touches part of the road is going to have
14 people in it pretty much everywhere. Paul, I'd
15 be happy to show you my map. That would give you
16 an idea because if you're not a backpacker, I
17 understand, you don't really know necessarily
18 where people are.

19 PAUL RODERICK: Right. On the
20 south side we camped a lot, but not on the north
21 side. We did notice that people -- almost every
22 person that we saw were following the river. We
23 hardly saw evidence of camping, but that can be
24 hard to spot.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: I just thought

1 another way we can get anecdotal evidence is from
2 guide books. Everywhere is a guide book.
3 They're going to go where the guide books tells
4 them, the majority of them. They're like sheep,
5 you know.

6 PAUL RODERICK: If you don't know
7 an area, sometimes that's all you've got.

8 JAY HUDSON: I'd like to ask if
9 there's a consistent -- the sound standards, are
10 we breaking the sound standards consistently and
11 where would that be happening? What are the
12 standards and where are they happening and when?
13 Are the sound standards being broken according to
14 the -- I take it we're doing this from the
15 Backcountry Plan.

16 SALLY GIBERT: That information was
17 presented by Jared.

18 JAY HUDSON: He told us when and
19 where the sound standards were broken?

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. There's some
21 graphics that show that. It will be posted on
22 the web site.

23 NANCY BALE: Are they on our disk
24 as well?

25 JARED WITHERS: They're on the

1 disk.

2 SALLY GIBERT: You guys can get it.

3 JARED WITHERS: The standards are
4 not in the PowerPoint, but they're in the
5 Backcountry Plan.

6 NANCY BALE: The executive summary
7 gives them all.

8 JENNI BURR: I don't know if this
9 is where you want it in the meeting, Sally. But
10 related to the presentations getting posted on
11 the web site, there's a couple points that I
12 e-mailed out to you that I think you distributed
13 to the group. One was about video conferencing,
14 which we need to decide before the next meeting.
15 Then, also, presentations getting posted on the
16 web; there's some problems with that. I don't
17 know where you want to put that down, but I think
18 it's important to address that today because
19 otherwise it's going to further prevent us from
20 getting it up.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, I have a note
22 on that. We need to do that today.

23 Anything else on data? So we can
24 pick up where we left off with our discussion --
25 or the deliberative part of our discussion that

1 we had going before lunch or we could tackle 12
2 on the agenda. Did we find out when we had to be
3 out of here?

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: There's a sign in
5 the parking lot that says they lock the gate at
6 5:00.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Let's decide what
8 we're going to do after the break and then take a
9 break. Shall we hit No. 12 and get it out of the
10 way, because we have to do it and then use up the
11 rest of our time on what we want to do with the
12 rest of our time today in between the next
13 meetings?

14 TOM GEORGE: I think we ought to
15 work a little bit on the deliberative part and
16 especially see if we can craft a working group or
17 whatever to tackle the near term stuff, because
18 if we can frame that and roughly figure out what
19 the steps are, that kind of dictates when we need
20 the next meeting or when we're ready for the next
21 meeting. For that reason I'd suggest we try it
22 in that order. If we run out of time, we can
23 stop at some point.

24 SALLY GIBERT: So maybe what we
25 ought to do is after the break, first of all,

1 tackle the technical problems of posting
2 PowerPoints on the web site and then move into
3 the deliberative stuff about how we're going to
4 use our time and then make sure we save room
5 before we close out for planning our next meeting
6 or meetings and make sure we get out of here when
7 we're supposed to. Let's find out when we have
8 to be out of the building and more particularly
9 out of the parking lot. There may be an issue
10 with that.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I did prepare a
12 preliminary list of problem areas. I can present
13 that.

14 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Let's take a
15 ten-minute break. No more than ten minutes.

16 (Break.)

17 SALLY GIBERT: We're going to
18 start.

19 Jenni, did you want to talk about
20 the PowerPoint problem?

21 JENNI BURR: Sure. Hopefully this
22 isn't the first time you've heard this. The main
23 problem for the Park Service with posting things
24 to our web site is that any image that we post on
25 our web site has to have a release form for every

1 single picture, basically, that says it becomes
2 public domain. So you can see the challenge with
3 all the presentations because they all have
4 pictures in them and we have no release forms for
5 them. It doesn't even matter if we create a PDF
6 of the presentation in hosting; we don't have
7 rights to be posting. So that's one of the
8 challenges. The other challenge is that the
9 presentation really doesn't hold a lot of value
10 without the words that everybody spoke about it,
11 so really the only way to have it be valuable is
12 if everybody were to fill in the notes at the
13 bottom of the PowerPoint, and then we would still
14 need to PDF the file even if we have the
15 pictures. Once we do that, the comments show up
16 as a little floating bubble. So it's not the
17 most user-friendly version of seeing it. Based
18 on all of that, my suggestion would be that we
19 move towards having instead -- did everybody see
20 this in the e-mail that went out? There's
21 basically like a one-page summary form that would
22 have title, presenter name, date of presentation,
23 the presentation summary and then a point at the
24 bottom that would say basically, if you have
25 questions or would like more information, please

1 contact, and it would be whoever the presenter
2 was. So at that point they could contact you
3 directly and get clarification or see a graph or
4 see something out of that presentation. Then it
5 would come directly from you and the Park Service
6 wouldn't be implicated in doing something
7 illegal. So I don't know how that sounds to the
8 group.

9 SALLY GIBERT: So we could PDF --
10 make our PowerPoint file sizes smaller through a
11 PDF and it could be e-mailed perhaps if somebody
12 wanted it.

13 JENNI BURR: Right. That's
14 basically what I did is just took everybody's
15 presentation thus far, PDF'd them and put them on
16 a disk. I could do that and give it back to each
17 of you so you would be able to distribute it.
18 The other nice thing if we went to having the
19 summary forms is that then we could take
20 everything being distributed into the meeting,
21 collate it into one PDF and have that be what
22 people download. It would include meeting notes,
23 any handouts from the meeting in electronic
24 format, and then the summaries, and it would be a
25 nice neat little package that people could go to

1 the web site and download.

2 SALLY GIBERT: That's a good
3 suggestion. I was wondering how to deal with it,
4 so that's good. Any thoughts, questions?

5 TOM GEORGE: I guess I'm still
6 confused. You're saying you wouldn't put
7 PowerPoints up at all; you would put these
8 one-page summaries.

9 JENNI BURR: Right. And then if
10 you wanted to have the capability of if somebody
11 asked for clarification and you wanted to be able
12 to send them your PowerPoint from you, I could
13 then facilitate, if you don't have what you need,
14 the PDF of your PowerPoint if that's something
15 you want done before sending it out.

16 SALLY GIBERT: She could PDF or you
17 could PDF and you could send it to that person
18 directly with the pictures without actually
19 posting it.

20 SUZANNE RUST: The only problem
21 with a summary is some of the information can get
22 lost, and I did learn a lot from the last
23 presentations. Is there any way just to cut and
24 paste the text. We did that obviously today with
25 the presentation. And maybe write a summary, but

1 if somebody wants more detail, because there is
2 detail in the presentations that give you -- and
3 most of the presenters have been organized enough
4 that you can follow the general ideas. You may
5 not be able to get the conversations, but you'll
6 get the general ideas. I mean, it's just a cut
7 and paste then of the document.

8 SALLY GIBERT: That's what this
9 thing is. So this could be posted in lieu of a
10 PowerPoint.

11 SUZANNE RUST: Or what you could do
12 is you could post the summary. I like the idea
13 of a summary, a short synopsis of it, and then
14 somebody could click on it to read more in depth
15 of how --

16 JENNI BURR: The other way to look
17 at that is if they want more information, having
18 that contact name would then allow them to
19 contact you.

20 SUZANNE RUST: I just don't think
21 that really if somebody calls me, that I'm going
22 to just -- it's going to be as easy as having
23 them actually read through a document.

24 SALLY GIBERT: It is nice to have
25 sort of a typical executive summary or abstract,

1 that would be good, or more if that's all there
2 is, but to be able to click on the more and get
3 the whole three-page thing. If it's three pages,
4 it wouldn't fit on the summary sheet.

5 JENNI BURR: Where would the three
6 pages come from?

7 SALLY GIBERT: That's what this is.
8 This is the text of Suzanne's PowerPoint that she
9 gave this morning.

10 JENNI BURR: The other thing we
11 could do is make this be a longer form so you
12 could add in additional information so you could
13 as much of the text as you wanted. I don't think
14 everybody has text that they were going off of.
15 For some people, certainly if you have it, that
16 would be easy enough. This could be a two- or
17 three-page fillable form that you just dump the
18 text into.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So far we have a
20 transcript. So we do have a word-for-word
21 presentation available.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Initially that
23 wasn't -- some of the presentations -- all of the
24 ones that were given on the last Sunday, there
25 was not a transcript. We did have notes which we

1 can convert that way, but like the pictures were
2 not -- there were a lot of pictures, but there
3 wasn't a whole lot of verbiage on the screen, but
4 we were talking from notes. So we could put
5 those notes out and make it a mini transcript of
6 the PowerPoint presentation. It's more sort of
7 for future reference to keep these constraints in
8 mind, so there's some kind of documentation
9 without having to dig in a transcript if you just
10 want that section.

11 JENNI BURR: Would that work then
12 to make this be a longer form, like two to three
13 pages?

14 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's fine.

15 JENNI BURR: If anybody needs it to
16 be longer, I can always make it a longer document
17 if you don't have enough room.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Is it like an
19 electronic form?

20 JENNI BURR: It's a field. It will
21 make it easier to collate it all together. It
22 will be a standard format and then it's already a
23 PDF that I merge together.

24 SUZANNE RUST: Who's going to do
25 this, put all the presentations that have been

1 given so far?

2 SALLY GIBERT: I think she's going
3 to compile them, but whoever gave them is
4 responsible for trying to summarize their
5 PowerPoint into this format, so a lot of us are
6 going to have a piece of that.

7 TOM GEORGE: I have to say this is
8 a horrendous step backwards in information
9 exchange. I'm sorry. This is bullshit, to use a
10 technical term and we need to find a way around
11 this.

12 JARED WITHERS: Can we just bring
13 CDs every time?

14 TOM GEORGE: So much of this is
15 graphics and other things. To boil this down and
16 have words be the thing that stands out there and
17 otherwise then throw the burden on actually
18 distributing -- I'm looking right now at the size
19 of these. Some of these are up to like -- even
20 after the PDF, two of these are nine meg files.

21 JENNI BURR: That's because people
22 aren't shrinking their photos. I can give you a
23 best practices for making your PowerPoint
24 smaller, which would make them be much, much
25 smaller. Because if you could shrink it down,

1 you would be looking at probably the maximum size
2 of them being a thousand kilobytes max.

3 TOM GEORGE: We should experiment
4 with that a little, because I think that would
5 help a lot.

6 SALLY GIBERT: For things that
7 don't have pictures, I don't think it's an issue,
8 right?

9 JENNI BURR: Right. If it's just
10 text or if it's a graphic that you created or if
11 it's a graphic that NPS created, that's not a
12 problem, or if you're willing to get release
13 forms for everything that's on there, we're good
14 to go.

15 TOM GEORGE: Would this work if one
16 of our organizations took this material and
17 posted it on their web site? It's not the Park
18 Service web site anymore. We do it on a
19 voluntary basis. Throwing it out as an idea.

20 SALLY GIBERT: I thought about
21 that. We could do that -- I could do that on our
22 ANILCA web page for the State. I don't think we
23 have those kind of constraints. In fact, I
24 checked and we don't.

25 TOM GEORGE: I think we're really

1 running the risk of degrading the information
2 flow, and if we could avoid that and not create a
3 whole bunch of extra work, too, to make these
4 derivative products and then have to go dig
5 deeper to find the real materials. I just think
6 we're making work for ourselves. If there's a
7 reasonable, legal way to not get caught up in
8 that quagmire, we should explore that and save
9 everybody the time and effort and keep the
10 quality of information flow as high as we can
11 make it.

12 JENNI BURR: With that, I would
13 also suggest that you would want to fill out the
14 notes section because a lot of the PowerPoints on
15 there are pictures that have no words, just as
16 Sally was saying.

17 TOM GEORGE: I think actually the
18 idea -- if you put out a little deal on best
19 practices for PowerPoints, like on how to reduce
20 images and make comments on the notes, because I
21 think if we are building PowerPoints which we
22 know specifically will be used in that way, then
23 we should put notes in there. Sometimes the
24 notes I make to remind myself aren't necessarily
25 the things I want to broadcast to the world. I

1 think that would be a very good idea.

2 SALLY GIBERT: That would be
3 helpful. Question back there?

4 DAVE WORRELL: I was going to make
5 a suggestion. Maybe the way to do it is to
6 create like a Google group for this Council and
7 that would allow you a public space where you
8 could put your documents, you could restrict
9 access. You just need a volunteer to set it up
10 and it's literally a 15-, 20-minute job to
11 distribute that address and then you have a place
12 to put all your documents.

13 SALLY GIBERT: We don't want to
14 restrict it.

15 DAVE WORRELL: But I'm just saying
16 you could.

17 PAUL ANDERSON: That makes the most
18 sense.

19 TOM GEORGE: We should look into
20 that a little bit. We don't have time to do this
21 today, but that might be a way to do something.

22 DAVE WORRELL: That way the Council
23 has its web site that's not specifically a Park
24 Service web site.

25 JENNI BURR: We would probably need

1 to ensure that that's within the bounds of FACA.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Are there any
3 Council members that have web comfort to be able
4 to work on something like that?

5 TIM CUDNEY: That's a good one,
6 Tom.

7 DAVE WORRELL: I would be happy to
8 work with someone on the Council to help, if that
9 would be useful. I'm in Anchorage.

10 SALLY GIBERT: What was your name
11 again?

12 DAVE WORRELL: I'm Dave Worrell
13 with ATIA.

14 JAY HUDSON: Thank you, Dave.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. He's offered
16 to help. Who's he going to help? I'm the last
17 one.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm second to
19 last.

20 JENNI BURR: Do we want to like
21 check the FACA first?

22 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, we're going to
23 need to find out if that's okay.

24 Tom, can he help you?

25 TOM GEORGE: I'll explore this.

1 TIM CUDNEY: I can get with Dave,
2 too, in Anchorage. I may need you to kind of
3 hold my hand on it.

4 DAVE WORRELL: Absolutely. That's
5 what I'm offering to do. I'm happy to do that.

6 TIM CUDNEY: I'll work with the
7 other folks, too.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So we have a
9 working group of three. Dave, what's your
10 number?

11 DAVE WORRELL: I've got cards I'll
12 give out. I was thinking about offering ATIA's
13 web site, but I better not.

14 SALLY GIBERT: And if for some
15 reason the Google approach doesn't work, if it
16 can be hosted on the State site, that's another
17 option. Anything more on this topic? Thank you
18 very much. Excellent.

19 It's 3:30. Let's kind of assess
20 where we're at at 4:30 so we don't run out of
21 time.

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You can
23 physically stay in this room until 5:00 because
24 Jenni checked. They're going to be having an
25 evening event here, so the gate isn't an issue,

1 but we've only rented the room until 5:00.

2 SALLY GIBERT: So we should adjourn
3 five or ten minutes before 5:00 so we can clean
4 up.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Probably
6 physically we need to be out of this room at
7 5:00.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So by 4:30 we
9 need to be thinking about our next meeting. That
10 gives us a little less than an hour.

11 TIM CUDNEY: Want to do it now?

12 SALLY GIBERT: The whole idea was
13 we need to have our discussion about what we're
14 doing before we do that. So, where were we at
15 here? Going back to our substantive stuff here.
16 I know that at the break Joan was saying she was
17 ready to talk about where some hot spots are in
18 terms of potential noise problems, and you were
19 working on that. Do you guys have a map? You
20 have a map. Would you like to talk about your
21 map?

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Sure. I just now
23 took my yellow Magic Marker. This is
24 preliminary. Put it over there. Let me just
25 talk first. So people asked: What are the

1 primary areas of concern? This is preliminary.
2 I haven't had a chance to talk with some people,
3 not a lot of people. This is my sense on top
4 areas of concern. I broke it into three areas,
5 the mountain, the rest of the park slash
6 backcountry, and then outside the park, which is
7 kind of iffy because that's not really our area.
8 So in the mountain area, the Ruth Amphitheater,
9 the Great Gorge, the Summit, Upper Kahiltna along
10 the climbing route, Little Switzerland and
11 basically all the landing areas. We won't solve
12 every problem, but, hey, if we solve some, we are
13 gaining ground.

14 SUZANNE RUST: Mountain, Ruth,
15 Great Gorge, Little Switzerland.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: The summit. I
17 said the Ruth Amphitheater, the Great Gorge, the
18 Summit, Upper Kahiltna along the climbing route,
19 Little Switzerland and all the landing areas with
20 the Ruth being the worst.

21 Anything to add to that, Charlie?

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: No.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: For the rest of
24 the park backcountry area, I mean, ideally for me
25 it would be all the designated wilderness, as I

1 hopefully made clear in my last presentation as I
2 hold that to a higher standard and I think
3 there's higher expectations by the public.
4 Realistically, within that area, the backcountry
5 unit from the sanctuary to the Muldrow on the
6 south side of the road, and I would include in
7 that on the north side of the road -- and I have
8 to look more specifically -- maybe three to five
9 miles. There's a couple of peaks that are pretty
10 common to hike, Primrose, Mount Wright, Igloo,
11 those type of areas, Stoney Hill.

12 ERIC DENKEWALTER: What was that?
13 Igloo?

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Igloo, Stoney
15 Hill. I'd have to look at a map. What's the one
16 across from Eilson? Fair Mountain. Some of
17 those are common day hiking areas. Also, the
18 Triple Lakes. Obviously the road and the park
19 entrance area, but I don't think those are
20 problem areas. I get the sense that people are
21 avoiding those. In general, the road and the
22 park entrance area are not a problem, that people
23 tend to avoid those areas already. Sounds like
24 Triple Lakes Trail is sometimes a problem, and
25 then Wonder Lake, Kantishna areas are again

1 obvious areas. A lot of use in that area,
2 obvious areas to avoid. And the McKinley Bar
3 Trail, which goes from Wonder Lake to McGonagall
4 Pass up on the Muldrow is fairly popular.

5 JAY HUDSON: Fairly popular. Maybe
6 100?

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's one of the
8 few places that has an absolute developed trail
9 that you can follow the whole way, which is
10 unusual in Denali. I wouldn't put it as heavy --
11 I wouldn't put it in the top tier of the areas I
12 mentioned before of the units on the south side.
13 But if people aren't aware, there is a trail that
14 gets well-used there. And I don't know, Charlie,
15 what about the climbers climbing up the north
16 side of the Muldrow? Is that a problem area?

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: No, because
18 nobody does it. Nobody is there.

19 PAUL ANDERSON: There was 55
20 users -- user nights on that trail last year.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: 55 user nights.
22 I've had constituents and other people mention to
23 me -- this is outside the park -- but a lot of
24 people have mentioned Denali State Park and
25 especially Peters Hills is a common place to hike

1 and it gets a lot of traffic, I guess, coming
2 back pretty low sometimes when people are
3 returning from the Ruth to Talkeetna. You know,
4 it sounds like a lot -- I put it on the map, but
5 with a few exceptions I think some of these areas
6 might be workable. In a conversation I had last
7 week with Charlie we were saying the greater the
8 distance between the people and the plane,
9 whether it's flying higher, flying over a
10 different valley over, you know -- I don't know.
11 Brian sent us some specific suggestions
12 especially for the mountaineering group, knowing
13 he wouldn't be here. I can read those or
14 summarize those if we desire at this time or not.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Did I see those?

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: He sent them to
17 Charlie and I was gathering information and he
18 sent them to me. He just said, if it's
19 appropriate at the meeting, could you read that
20 for me?

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. I'll just
23 summarize. His first recommendation was:
24 Recommend pilots refrain from flying near the
25 summit of Denali during the main climbing season

1 of May 1st to July 7th. Instead keep a distance
2 of three miles or more. He said, I don't know
3 what the exact distance would be. The idea would
4 be that aircraft is not an overriding presence
5 from the summit and stay below 17,000 feet.
6 Denali is huge and very impressive from this
7 distance and altitude. Stay below 17,000 feet
8 and three miles or more, so they don't feel the
9 presence as much.

10 Second one: When circumnavigating
11 Denali, fly over the pass from Kahiltna Dome and.
12 He said flying west of Kahiltna Dome would
13 significantly reduce airplane noise on the most
14 commonly climbed west route of Denali. Next one
15 is: I recommend pilots make a special effort to
16 fly far enough and high enough from Keets (ph) to
17 reduce the disturbance to climbers in popular
18 areas like Little Switzerland. For example,
19 planes can land at Tekla Glacier and the park
20 without actually flying through Little
21 Switzerland but instead approach via Kahiltna
22 Glacier. Next one: I don't know what the
23 solution is for reducing aircraft noise in the
24 Great Gorge of the Ruth Glacier. It's the
25 obvious route for return flights to Talkeetna.

1 It's also one of the most popular routes for
2 flying to the mountain. Traffic, rock walls has
3 made it perhaps the noisiest place to ski or
4 climb in the Alaska Range. The type of aircraft
5 will help reduce noise issues. Opening up
6 another portal could reduce the number of
7 landings. Number of landings at Ruth Glacier
8 would be another possibility to reduce the
9 landings at the current places. The next one:
10 Recommended minimum altitude. Most air taxi
11 operators say they operate above this, but my
12 experience on the ground and from other people I
13 have heard dictate that not everybody flies above
14 the minimum altitudes. Except for eliminating
15 all flights or reducing the number of flights,
16 the single-most factor to eliminating -- the most
17 important mitigating factor for reducing aircraft
18 disturbance between people and wildlife on the
19 ground is the distance the two activities are
20 from each other. The higher planes fly, the less
21 disturbance there is. Flying high does not
22 decrease the experience of flightseers. With the
23 tremendous increase in air traffic, pilots should
24 pay special attention to ridges, passes, and
25 summits in order to reduce the impact of those on

1 the ground. Next one: In keeping with the idea
2 mentioned in No. 5 -- that was that long one
3 above -- recommend pilots avoid flying directly
4 over the Peters Hills. Instead stay over the
5 Tokositna Valley or maintain an altitude of 6,000
6 feet when passing over Peters Hills. This is a
7 popular hiking destination that is experiencing
8 heavy air traffic and its associated sound.

9 SUZANNE RUST: Could you repeat
10 pilots avoid flying over Peters Hills?

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: Why don't we
12 bring it in and give it to everyone.

13 SUZANNE RUST: That would be
14 helpful.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah. I don't
16 think Brian has any problem with this going
17 around. It said: Stay over the Tokositna
18 Valley. Two more: Between Talkeetna and
19 Tokositna there's many recreational cabins and a
20 few year-round residents. The higher the pilots
21 fly, the less disturbance there is. Planes
22 heading to Alaska Range are seldom a problem as
23 they are gaining altitude. Planes returning from
24 the Range often fly very low. Those are the ones
25 that are definitely causing conflicts.

1 SALLY GIBERT: That seems strange
2 to me. You would think if they were climbing
3 they would be making more noise. Seems strange.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: The problem is
5 there's a scattering of cabins all through the
6 area south of Denali Park. No matter where
7 planes fly, they are passing over somebody's
8 cabin. The last one: I believe it's really
9 important to set aside the mountainous glaciated
10 area in Denali National Park where scenic flights
11 are not allowed, a place where mountaineers can
12 explore the Alaska Range with reduced aircraft
13 traffic. I suggest the Yentna and Dall Glacier
14 region.

15 Those are Brian's suggestions. And
16 for the wilderness portion, two suggestions I
17 would have is fly higher, perhaps fly higher over
18 the wilderness than the other areas. And this is
19 off the top of my head. I don't know if this is
20 a good idea or not. But maybe a scatter approach
21 so that either different -- so that not all
22 planes are going the same route the same day.
23 Throughout the day, if there's 20 flights, maybe
24 only five of them are going over people in this
25 area. I don't know if that's possible. There

1 you have it.

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: Share the map.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So, the map. I
4 don't know if you can see it. I'll pass it
5 around. There was something you passed around
6 months ago. There was another list.

7 SALLY GIBERT: It was back in like
8 April or something like that, and I didn't even
9 think about that. I haven't looked at it.
10 Something else to refer to for more specific
11 examples. It may duplicate some of the stuff
12 we've already said. Okay.

13 Having done that, I'm not sure what
14 we do next.

15 ERIKA BENNETT: Do we need to put
16 together the aviation working group?

17 SALLY GIBERT: Is that the next
18 step? Okay.

19 ERIKA BENNETT: Do we need to make
20 a motion or something?

21 MR. CUDNEY: How many do you want
22 in the group?

23 SALLY GIBERT: I think the first
24 thing is to figure out what that group is going
25 to do, and once you know what the group is going

1 to do --

2 SUZANNE RUST: I think we have
3 somewhat of an outline on there.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: You have an
5 outline and have a starting place. Those are the
6 areas; tell us how to do it.

7 TIM CUDNEY: Right.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

9 NANCY BALE: I would say that all
10 the suggestions made by Joan were under 3,
11 aviation best practices, somewhere in there.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Would it make
13 sense to have two working groups, one for flights
14 that originate out of Talkeetna and flights that
15 designate out of the park entrance?

16 SUZANNE RUST: I would say all one,
17 because it's going to be difficult --

18 TIM CUDNEY: There's a lot more
19 resource with one.

20 SUZANNE RUST: Absolutely. We can
21 all work together. We do. We go to the north
22 side. It's a good idea.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

24 SUZANNE RUST: And I think my
25 suggestion is at least I would want to see -- I

1 would suggest that all air taxis that are
2 involved, seven listed, the folks flying over the
3 park should have somebody representing them if
4 that's a good starting place, because that's
5 really where -- Tom should be on it definitely as
6 well for the working group.

7 TOM GEORGE: I think anybody from
8 the Council that's interested is welcome. The
9 big thing is to expand to include the principal
10 operators.

11 SALLY GIBERT: By definition it has
12 to be open to the public. It's not so much
13 identifying -- yeah, it's just who you want to
14 make sure is there. So do you want all seven air
15 taxis?

16 SUZANNE RUST: I think ATIA should
17 be there as well, the travel industry. They
18 should probably attend just from a tourism
19 perspective.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Who are the Council
21 members that would be interested in participating
22 in that? You two and you?

23 TIM CUDNEY: Absolutely.

24 TOM GEORGE: And we need Joan and
25 Charlie, if they're willing.

1 NANCY BALE: I think we all receive
2 notice, right?

3 TOM GEORGE: Absolutely, yeah.

4 NANCY BALE: And we can come?

5 TOM GEORGE: Scott has to bring his
6 Air Force planes.

7 Looking at item 3 -- you know,
8 first, I was going to look and see, well, should
9 we focus on one bullet so we don't get too
10 diffuse. If we develop a map -- take that map
11 you've started and maybe refine it a little bit,
12 this would be a wonderful tool for the GA
13 community to be able to have to understand that,
14 hey, there's some sound-sensitive areas in this
15 park. We get people in Fairbanks all the time
16 that, well, I just flew to Alaska, I want to go
17 see Mount McKinley. What do I need to know about
18 that? Well, there's the opening. So generating
19 some materials is one way. The GA community is a
20 very broad, diverse thing. It's going to be a
21 multi-year project. The biggest return from this
22 will be with the operators that are both in the
23 room and working there every day. But I think we
24 can make some progress probably on all these
25 bullets. But I do think we also have to look at,

1 again, some kind of monitoring in some areas
2 that's part of this so we can try and tell what
3 difference are we making, if any? If we're not
4 doing that, I'm fearful in the long term we're
5 going to have residual problems, but that can be
6 a discussion for the working group itself. We
7 don't have to get into that here necessarily.
8 That means there needs to be Park Service
9 participation in that.

10 SALLY GIBERT: You can start -- at
11 any level people can start brainstorming stuff.
12 So we need to avoid the term subcommittee and use
13 the term work group.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Administratively,
15 yes.

16 TOM GEORGE: Yes, we do. The
17 answer is yes. Subcommittee apparently has a
18 formality that's associated with blessing who's
19 on it and other requirements, which would
20 definitely impede our ability to get together and
21 make things happen.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Yes. The whole
23 point is to not have to do that, yes. Okay.

24 Where is monitoring on that? Is
25 that on this list?

1 NANCY BALE: I think it's
2 incorporated in the visitor feedback section,
3 although I would maybe name that No. 1. I would
4 give it a different name.

5 TOM GEORGE: I guess what I was
6 wondering -- to me, this visitor feedback thing
7 under No. 1 is something I think we ought to come
8 back in the future and consider in more detail as
9 a stand-alone item parkwide. Therefore, I guess
10 I'd suggest that we add a bullet under the
11 aviation best practices. Let's see. Maybe under
12 the recommendations or something to include some
13 kind of monitoring.

14 NANCY BALE: I wouldn't put it
15 under aviation best practices. I would have it
16 be its own thing because aviation -- it's not
17 really an aviation best practice; it's a Park
18 Service duty really.

19 TOM GEORGE: That's why we broke up
20 the big topic as a whole stand-alone bullet. I
21 thought we were maybe trying to focus on the meat
22 of this item No. 3 so we weren't tackling
23 everything all at once. I'm willing to leave --
24 the big aviation education is a piece for down
25 the road in order to focus on doing something

1 sooner. Did the number fall off that? 4 should
2 be in front of aviation education.

3 SALLY GIBERT: So is aviation
4 subcommittee work group, is that part of 3?

5 TOM GEORGE: Yes, that was the
6 recommendation as part of 3. This is a little
7 bit the danger of stripping things out of
8 PowerPoint.

9 SALLY GIBERT: I understand.
10 That's okay. So there's a recommendation for No.
11 3 and a recommendation for No. 4. Got it.

12 NANCY BALE: How are 1 and 2
13 different? Isn't 2 kind of under visitor
14 feedback, or is it not so much feedback as an
15 education piece?

16 TOM GEORGE: Actually visitor
17 feedback was intended to try and get at this
18 notion that in order to be responsive when
19 there's a problem reported, that information has
20 got to get through the Park Service and into the
21 operators' hands. With that in mind, I guess I
22 would move that whole bullet as part of this item
23 3 because I think they do have to go hand in
24 hand, otherwise they're not getting that
25 feedback. I mean, we were thinking that was

1 something largely the Park Service would need to
2 do. They would, I think, take the lead on
3 something like that as opposed to the operators.

4 NANCY BALE: Definitely. I was
5 just wondering how visitor perceptions and
6 visitor feedback are different. Just tell me. I
7 think they are, but --

8 TOM GEORGE: Visitor perception, to
9 me, is the notion of there's a range of
10 disturbance caused by sound from a distant
11 overflying jet versus an airplane that just took
12 off 50 feet from you, and somewhere in there
13 there's some break points that let you know what
14 percentage of the population is annoyed by what.
15 To me, that's the visitor perception piece of
16 this, which is different from feedback, saying,
17 hey, when a complaint comes in, it needs to get
18 routed expeditiously to the people that can do
19 something about it.

20 SALLY GIBERT: This is like being
21 responsive to the threshold --

22 TOM GEORGE: Yes.

23 NANCY BALE: The human being. This
24 may be a literature search. This may be bringing
25 an expert in who's done research. If it's

1 already been researched, this may be proposing
2 research. This is maybe more of a longer term.

3 TOM GEORGE: It's a longer term,
4 absolutely.

5 SUZANNE RUST: And the first one,
6 the feedback part, is a process for us to be able
7 to respond and to be able to understand what's
8 happening currently.

9 TOM GEORGE: Very similar to what
10 Scott described as their noise complaint process
11 where they've got a phone number. They not only
12 do follow-up within a prescribed period of time,
13 but then they track. They tell them at the end
14 of the year how many of them they had. In my
15 mind the concept is very similar, even though the
16 specifics might be a little different.

17 NANCY BALE: So, Paul, how would
18 this fit into the Park Service monitoring scheme?
19 Would it be better that every operator carried a
20 generic comment card from the Park Service that
21 asks soundscape questions, or is this already
22 done, or would this have to be something new?

23 PAUL ANDERSON: I don't think
24 that's what they're asking for. I mean, I
25 think -- I don't know. The point, as least as I

1 read it, if somebody wants to make a comment on a
2 problem or an observation or a compliment, that
3 they would have an expedited and simple,
4 straightforward, highly visible methodology for
5 following that. So that we would separate out
6 comments that are coming in on aviation and
7 soundscape related comments and handle them in an
8 expedited manner and get the information back out
9 to the committee.

10 TOM GEORGE: Yes.

11 NANCY BALE: And that would be a
12 Park Service duty more than an operator duty so
13 it would be standardized across all the different
14 operators?

15 PAUL ANDERSON: Yes. Right.

16 NANCY BALE: So that would be a
17 suggestion that the Council could make to you.

18 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah, and we would
19 follow up on it.

20 NANCY BALE: Could it be
21 electronic, for instance?

22 PAUL ANDERSON: Yes.

23 SUZANNE RUST: We want to be
24 careful in everything that we construct, that
25 it's -- like surveys, that we do it in the right

1 way.

2 PAUL ANDERSON: I wouldn't --

3 SUZANNE RUST: Talking about

4 electronic or --

5 PAUL ANDERSON: I'm thinking about

6 back here. I'm not sure -- this isn't a survey.

7 ERIKA BENNETT: We're getting the

8 information that's already coming in.

9 PAUL ANDERSON: If Joe comes in and

10 says, there's an airplane flying over my campsite

11 and I don't like it. If Julie comes in and says,

12 I just had the best night of my life, then we

13 would record that and put it in there too. There

14 wouldn't be any Park Service what did you think

15 of your trip kind of thing.

16 SUZANNE RUST: Right.

17 PAUL ANDERSON: I don't think the

18 military is saying: Did you really enjoy this

19 intrusion? So I would see that part of the

20 process of trying to make sure that these kinds

21 of comments that are unsolicited, if you will,

22 have a track just like the military does to

23 follow up and keep them separate from everything

24 else. If we wanted to do surveys, that's what I

25 guess might be different. It's a perception of

1 something.

2 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, that's a survey
3 type of thing. This is where there are
4 complaints, to get them passed on quick enough
5 that hopefully operators can actually -- instead
6 of the end of the season saying, oh, man, there
7 were a bunch of people unhappy.

8 PAUL ANDERSON: I did ask the
9 scientists about the survey. First off, we don't
10 design the surveys. They're designed by
11 academia. So they're not Park Service surveys,
12 if you will. We tell them generally what kind of
13 information -- what kind of information do we
14 need to run the park, so they design the survey
15 so it meets the scientific part. We don't do
16 that part and don't really have any significant
17 control over how the thing is written, the
18 context that it needs to be scientifically valid.
19 So we didn't write the survey questions for the
20 survey that's going forward next year.

21 Secondly, OPM has to approve all
22 these surveys and OPM issued a moratorium on
23 approving any surveys until 2010, so we're not
24 sure it's going out next year.

25 SALLY GIBERT: So who is the judge

1 of bias or lack thereof in these surveys?

2 PAUL ANDERSON: Scientific peer
3 reviews done by objective scientists under
4 contract. So I don't understand all the details,
5 but apparently the survey that we're talking
6 about was in fact peer reviewed, et cetera, et
7 cetera, et cetera. Whether the survey -- there
8 was some question about the survey that you guys
9 saw or used or whatever. There was some question
10 about whether that survey was suitable. It's not
11 a survey that we did. It was somebody else that
12 did it.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: There was
14 confusion because there was a question that was
15 displayed, and I can't remember who was giving
16 the presentation, that assumed you were disturbed
17 and how disturbed were you. And people said,
18 that's a biased question. It was never very
19 clear -- when they were flipping through, that
20 was a secondary question. People had already
21 answered a nonbiased question about how did you
22 feel about the planes. And then they only got
23 things like love to see them, neutral, disturbed.
24 And it was only those people who had the previous
25 question who then got the second question. It

1 was unclear. So I think it was perhaps not as
2 biased as it appeared at first when it was first
3 presented to us.

4 SUZANNE RUST: Going along with
5 that, even the methodology is really important
6 because just the folks that were briefed in
7 whatever way they were briefed -- maybe it
8 wasn't -- but I think it's important to look at
9 the methodology because they came back with a lot
10 more said about airplanes the folks who were told
11 ahead of time than the folks who weren't. We
12 want to get good information and to feel that
13 it's valid.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: I guess the point
15 is this: I don't have control over the survey
16 questions as they're written. Those people that
17 do the surveys are the professional social
18 scientists either initiating that on their own
19 part of research work at the university or under
20 contract. These are professional scientists that
21 do whatever it is. The survey in question was
22 done not by the Park Service but by people in
23 Idaho. It wasn't done by the Park Service and we
24 didn't write the survey nor develop it. You can
25 choose whether to use the information or not and

1 make your own value judgments on the questions,
2 et cetera, as can I. But I don't have the
3 ability scientifically or professionally to go in
4 and say, that's a bad question, you can't use it.
5 I can only say, that appears to me to have been a
6 biased question and I'm not sure this information
7 I've gathered is useful for me in the
8 decision-making process. Do you see what I'm
9 saying?

10 SALLY GIBERT: So it's a tool that
11 you can choose to not use.

12 TOM GEORGE: Are you telling us
13 that you pay good money and you guys don't get a
14 chance to review the questions and comment on
15 them before they go out?

16 PAUL ANDERSON: We comment on the
17 focus of the questionnaire. What kind of
18 information do you need? We want to know what
19 people's perceptions are when they go on a scenic
20 glacier landing. Okay. We're concerned about
21 crowding, noise, safety, whatever. We review
22 those kinds of things, but we don't say, this
23 question is scientifically invalid; this question
24 is biased in the way it's written. Because these
25 things are scientific instruments. They're not

1 something that I might throw together to ask
2 questions of every visitor. That's the problem
3 we're dealing with. They're peer reviewed as
4 well just like any scientific document is done to
5 make sure that they're scientifically developed.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You said that's a
7 problem. To me, it seems like that's a good
8 process. If one of us wrote it, they would
9 probably be biased.

10 PAUL ANDERSON: Not me. When I
11 write it, it's never biased.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It sounds like a
13 good process. Whether it was followed through
14 and there were questions, I don't know, but -- it
15 seems like it's good to have somebody removed
16 from the system to write the questions.

17 PAUL ANDERSON: The discussion I
18 had with our scientist about the whole issue,
19 because I wanted to be able to address it here --
20 the discussion that we had, this survey in
21 question didn't come up in specific questions per
22 se, but the survey did, the instrument did, and
23 they expressed some concern about the scientific
24 validity and quality, if you will, of those
25 questions for that survey.

1 TOM GEORGE: So my question is:
2 Did this Cascadia Field Station College of Forest
3 Resources, University of Washington Seattle study
4 referenced in the Backcountry Plan, did this go
5 through the peer review process that you were
6 taking about?

7 PAUL ANDERSON: Yes.

8 TOM GEORGE: Okay. Thanks.

9 PAUL ANDERSON: By the way, the
10 people that did that study are the best in the
11 world in that kind of work. They're recognized
12 in the world as leaders.

13 TOM GEORGE: Having worked in the
14 scientific community for the better part of 30
15 years, I discovered that of course scientists are
16 only human. So nobody has the absolute lock on
17 any of this stuff, which is where a collaborative
18 process, I think, gets the best result. I
19 understand the need for some degree of isolation
20 and objectivity, but I also understand that there
21 are perceptions that are not intended, which is
22 where I think a reasonable and broad review
23 process actually helps that. We all want
24 information and we can sit and fight over whether
25 that's good or bad information; just use the

1 information to take the next step. Whatever
2 process that we can use to legitimately and
3 fairly do that, I think we should explore.

4 PAUL ANDERSON: I guess I think the
5 message would be, practically speaking, if this
6 group -- if there's social information that this
7 group feels they need to do their job, one, it's
8 going to take us a while to get it. Two, we need
9 to be able to write it up in a way that we can
10 turn it over to whomever that's going to do the
11 survey for us and that's the best way to make
12 this happen.

13 SALLY GIBERT: And to be as
14 specific as possible.

15 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah.

16 NANCY BALE: The NPS through their
17 sound center in Denver might have done some
18 research into this topic -- not Denali-specific
19 research -- into the topic of sound perception.

20 PAUL ANDERSON: There's a
21 tremendous body of knowledge in Denver, Colorado.

22 NANCY BALE: I was going to ask if
23 we felt like we wanted to have someone from
24 Denver Science Center come up and talk to us at
25 one of our future meetings. Maybe invite them

1 for summer, not winter. Colorado people like
2 winter, but I would like to pick their brain
3 because I think there's a lot of research out
4 there. We don't have to reinvent the wheel.

5 TOM GEORGE: Further down the road
6 I think that would be a good idea. It would be
7 nice for us to try some things first. I think
8 definitely in the future that would be a good
9 thing to do.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Sticking to
11 our agenda and trying to make progress. We need
12 to have another public comment period before we
13 conclude our meeting. I think now might be a
14 good time. It will be short, so we can use that
15 to wrap up what we want to do and figure out the
16 next meeting. Given the information that you
17 have about the subcommittee, it seems like that's
18 the direction we're going. We haven't actually
19 made the decision. Based on that, do any of you
20 have any particular thoughts about that or
21 suggestions or alternate recommendations? Sounds
22 like you're anxious to get into that process,
23 which I understand. It's a good thing. That's
24 good. That reinforces that we're on the right
25 track.

1 So what kind of timing -- how are
2 we expecting that to work timingwise relative to
3 the February 26th meeting, if that's still on the
4 table. Tim, you were saying you couldn't make
5 that February 26 meeting.

6 TIM CUDNEY: I'm narrowing it down.
7 It's probably close. Depends on where it is.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Fairbanks.

9 TIM CUDNEY: I can probably
10 rearrange my schedule.

11 TOM GEORGE: Let's look at what we
12 need to do prior to that. If we're going to get
13 a working group together and sit down and take
14 the map here and some other things collected and
15 have some discussions, there needs to be time for
16 a meeting for that, maybe even a couple meetings,
17 and then see if they can package any results,
18 even any preliminary results to that to bring
19 back to the full Council. I think you're talking
20 about two working group meetings between now and
21 the next meeting of this Council. Is that
22 reasonable to do between now and February 26th
23 given the holidays? And I nominate Suzanne to
24 chair that working group.

25 SUZANNE RUST: Thanks.

1 TOM GEORGE: Well, it principally
2 focuses on the commercial operators and you're
3 their chief stakeholder. I'm not trying to give
4 you a bad time personally.

5 SUZANNE RUST: No, as long as
6 you're going to be there.

7 TOM GEORGE: I will.

8 SUZANNE RUST: I'll be glad to work
9 on that. I'll be gone all of January.

10 SALLY GIBERT: The month of January
11 is off the table. Do one before Christmas and do
12 another one earlier in February? It's up to you
13 guys.

14 SUZANNE RUST: My sense is February
15 is really soon for us with the holidays coming,
16 and then I don't know if anybody else has things
17 going on, coming back and trying to squish it all
18 in. Having two meetings, one and then another to
19 distill is a little much. I'm willing to give it
20 a try.

21 SALLY GIBERT: To try and squish
22 two work group meetings in before February 26th.
23 Tom?

24 TOM GEORGE: Are there things on
25 this list that we need to get as input for this

1 process? That's the other thing that might drive
2 it. Projected placement of '09 sound stations,
3 time and duration of sound monitored by area,
4 maps.

5 SALLY GIBERT: I think that last
6 one on this page would be helpful.

7 TOM GEORGE: And the second one,
8 projected placement of stations, goes to the --
9 if there's already a station planned to be placed
10 in an area that starts to build in a monitoring,
11 that may influence where you decide to do things.
12 Those two are definitely needed.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Is No. 2 -- is that
14 information from the Park Service to us?

15 TOM GEORGE: That's Park Service to
16 us.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I have a
19 commitment to have the backcountry information
20 that's requested by the group prepared by the
21 February meeting. So in this trying to get ahead
22 of the curve so that people have the information
23 available, January is a tough month. Just like
24 everybody else, for people who are here during
25 the holidays, they tend to take leave in January

1 or vice versa. What I got was a commitment by
2 February, but if that doesn't -- you know, that
3 could be like February 1st is what I could ask
4 for. I don't know how that information -- how
5 valuable that information will be to your working
6 group process. I don't know if you'll need it if
7 you decide to hold a December meeting. It
8 probably won't be available.

9 SUZANNE RUST: Would it make sense
10 to move the meeting back to early March?

11 TOM GEORGE: I think you should
12 define the timing of the two meetings that you
13 think the work group needs first and then
14 schedule the Council meeting. Otherwise, I think
15 we're spinning our wheels, aren't we?

16 SALLY GIBERT: Unless there's other
17 things we can use the Council meeting for.
18 Sounds like the more important part of it is
19 that -- I think the work group needs to do its
20 work next. Sounds like it's going to take two
21 meetings and sounds like it's going to be
22 challenging to do that by February 26th, so it
23 sounds like we might need a different meeting
24 date.

25 TOM GEORGE: Try to get those in

1 early February and then kick off the working
2 group meetings and have two of them maybe --
3 what's the spacing? A month apart?

4 SUZANNE RUST: I think a month
5 apart. We could have one in mid-February and one
6 in early March. Depends on when you want to have
7 the next meeting.

8 TIM CUDNEY: The next formal
9 regular meeting. April?

10 SUZANNE RUST: Gives us some time
11 to work and then you're also trying to pull
12 people together with schedules of travel. From
13 Tom coming from Fairbanks, folks from Denali or
14 Talkeetna, so it makes it difficult.

15 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Do you want
16 to have two working group meetings before that
17 group goes off too far without coming back as a
18 group? If they get together for one full day,
19 eight-hour discussion as a work group and start
20 looking at some of these -- there were some
21 voluntary measures put up there. That may be a
22 long, drawn out conversation and then obviously
23 at some point the air carriers may put their own
24 suggestions. The only thing on the table so far
25 was the list that Joan laid out for the nonflying

1 group and they're waiting still for the flying
2 group to say, okay, we agree we can fly a little
3 bit higher here. You want to just do one meeting
4 and have the air carriers come up with some
5 more -- just, again, we're not even close to
6 deciding whether that's good or not, but having
7 more voluntary measures put on the table for
8 discussion to see if they're viable. If you guys
9 have two meetings without the rest of the group,
10 are you guys already going down the road that the
11 rest of the group may want to check in with?
12 It's something I'm throwing out because you want
13 to make sure that you guys have two meetings in a
14 row, do your own thing and then come back to us,
15 but my suggestion is maybe you guys do one
16 meeting, talk about voluntary measures or what
17 you've heard. We're going to make a lot of
18 progress in that meeting, then we'll come back,
19 we had a one-hour meeting and this is where the
20 real sticking points are. And it may give us
21 more direction to go on. That's a suggestion. I
22 don't know if anyone agrees or disagrees.

23 TOM GEORGE: I think we were kind
24 of counting on the fact that there would be a
25 high degree of participation with this Council

1 and not to go too far off the reservation or to
2 blow a whistle if we feel that's happening. I
3 don't know that I'm terribly concerned. I think
4 it's more important to allow enough time to go by
5 in a more technical working environment to see if
6 we can't hammer out some concrete things than to
7 see how fast they can be implemented.

8 SUZANNE RUST: I think there's
9 value in doing it either way, but I do think with
10 this type of stuff it's nice to not try to do it
11 all in one day, but it's also nice to kind of
12 process. How I work is to have some time in
13 between a couple meetings, process it and come to
14 a conclusion and something that we could bring
15 back. We would hope to have some recommendations
16 from this and we could get steered in a different
17 direction.

18 SALLY GIBERT: The other value, I
19 think, of two meetings is it may be difficult to
20 get everybody at both meetings.

21 TOM GEORGE: At any one single
22 meeting.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Any one meeting. It
24 will still be one agenda. It won't be like half
25 of recommendations and another half is going to

1 be fine-tuning and getting more involvement. I
2 don't think that's going to be a problem.

3 TOM GEORGE: I think we should
4 shoot for a working group meeting in February and
5 another one in March and trying to get whatever
6 we can before that time and this map scanned in
7 electronic. And then if the full Council met
8 again in mid-April, early April, either to
9 formalize whatever has been come up with there,
10 but also to take up some of these things that
11 we're maybe not taking up right now. Pretty much
12 leaving the other items, I think, on the table
13 which I think is a pretty good idea and focus in
14 this one area.

15 NANCY BALE: Easter is April 12th.
16 Sunday is April 5th. But March 26th is kind of
17 before those holidays or it could be April 2nd,
18 which is the week before Easter week. Do people
19 know when their kids have break? That's kind of
20 early. March 30th to April 5th probably isn't a
21 school break week.

22 SALLY GIBERT: I'm out for the week
23 of March 30th.

24 NANCY BALE: Could we meet the last
25 week of March, or is that a school break week?

1 Might be.

2 SUZANNE RUST: We want to stay away
3 from spring break.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think it's the
5 third week.

6 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: 9th to the
7 13th of March is Anchorage spring break.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Isn't MatSu the
9 week after the 16th?

10 NANCY BALE: So the 26th of March
11 is a possibility.

12 JAY HUDSON: Did we already set the
13 26th because of the rules of the charter last
14 meeting?

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: No. We need to
16 be careful. We set that up so we could have the
17 date picked so that we could put it in the
18 federal notice. We are required to have the
19 meeting published in the Federal Register before
20 we can hold the meeting. That process takes us
21 at least 60 days out to make that happen. Once
22 we do that, we can always change the meeting
23 through notification, but getting it in the
24 Federal Register is a requirement. So I
25 appreciate people thinking about the value

1 because it's certainly financially expensive to
2 bring people together, but more importantly
3 everybody who's giving their time, which to me is
4 even more valuable. When you come together, you
5 want it to be as productive as possible. If you
6 really don't feel it's going to be productive in
7 February, I would choose a time when you feel it
8 would be for everybody involved, the constituents
9 and yourself.

10 SUZANNE RUST: Nancy, you had
11 mentioned there were things out in April. Why
12 can't we get together in mid-April?

13 NANCY BALE: The week of the 30th
14 through the 5th Sally is out.

15 TOM GEORGE: What about the week of
16 the 6th of April?

17 NANCY BALE: People don't have a
18 problem with -- I mean, Easter is on that Sunday.
19 That words for me. If we're doing it on
20 Thursday, that's April 9th.

21 SUZANNE RUST: We're going to be
22 traveling to Fairbanks?

23 SALLY GIBERT: Yes.

24 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, April is
25 probably a little nicer time.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So Thursday,
2 April 9th?

3 ERIKA BENNETT: So the official
4 FACA meeting we're looking at Thursday,
5 April 9th?

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's Passover and
7 the next day is Good Friday, if that matters to
8 anybody. Probably not.

9 SUZANNE RUST: Why don't we make it
10 Wednesday, then.

11 TOM GEORGE: There's other aviation
12 issues on Wednesday. Tuesday.

13 SUZANNE RUST: Tuesday?

14 SALLY GIBERT: Tuesday the 7th?

15 SUZANNE RUST: And that keeps you
16 away from Easter weekend.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So Tuesday
18 the 7th. Everybody good with that?

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Since
20 February 26th -- some people have already set
21 that aside, we might want to make that a working
22 group date. Not that we need to wait until then.

23 TOM GEORGE: I would go for
24 something sooner than that.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: Use it as one of

1 them since it's already allocated.

2 SUZANNE RUST: That would be two
3 meetings in February.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's better to
5 keep the momentum for that kind of stuff.

6 SUZANNE RUST: I'll just be getting
7 back. It's going to be hectic.

8 TOM GEORGE: Maybe 7 April as a
9 target?

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: How about a
11 working group meeting the week of February 9th or
12 February 16th and one the week of March 2nd?

13 ERIKA BENNETT: I thought we were
14 going to try to use February 26th.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We said that and
16 then we said maybe sooner.

17 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's going
18 to be -- I don't know. Guys in the audience -- I
19 would do it mid-February and then do it in --

20 SALLY GIBERT: Do you want to use
21 the 26th as the first one?

22 SUZANNE RUST: Sooner than that.

23 TOM GEORGE: Like the second week
24 of February maybe?

25 SUZANNE RUST: I would do the

1 second week of February.

2 ERIKA BENNETT: Thursday the 12th.

3 NANCY BALE: Any opposition to
4 holding it on one weekend day, or that doesn't
5 work for people?

6 TOM GEORGE: Does it need to be an
7 eight-hour meeting? Would it be better if it was
8 like an afternoon meeting, half-day? Does that
9 work better for you?

10 NANCY BALE: It's would work better
11 for me.

12 TIM CUDNEY: Depends on how many
13 people we have and then we can identify.
14 Depending on how big it is, we have a conference
15 room also.

16 NANCY BALE: Could be
17 teleconferenced, I suppose.

18 TOM GEORGE: I'd rather have a
19 face-to-face meeting for this.

20 DAVE WORRELL: ATIA's conference
21 room may be available too. What dates are we
22 looking at?

23 NANCY BALE: The 12th of February.

24 SUZANNE RUST: We might be able to
25 play with February 12th if we had a comfy

1 conference room to use, because that is a
2 nice-sized conference room.

3 DAVE WORRELL: It holds 20 fairly
4 comfortably. I'll have to check tomorrow.

5 SUZANNE RUST: Do you want to
6 select two days in February and we'll let him
7 check those dates?

8 TIM CUDNEY: So we dropped the 26th
9 off.

10 TOM GEORGE: How about the 10th and
11 12th of February as two dates?

12 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: 12th
13 primary, 10th secondary?

14 TOM GEORGE: Either way. I know
15 I'm going to be in Anchorage the 11th for another
16 meeting.

17 SUZANNE RUST: Does it matter to
18 anybody, the 10th or the 12th? So then we want
19 to go into March. We have to stay away from
20 Iditarod and spring break. Joan, what dates are
21 spring break?

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: The 9th through
23 13th is what Scott said.

24 SUZANNE RUST: We want to stay away
25 from that.

1 TOM GEORGE: Maybe the third week,
2 the week of the 16th of March to shoot for.

3 ERIKA BENNETT: Iditarod starts on
4 the 7th.

5 SALLY GIBERT: I think MatSu spring
6 break is the 16th.

7 SUZANNE RUST: Do we want to do the
8 week of the 20th?

9 NANCY BALE: The 23rd you mean?

10 SUZANNE RUST: Yeah, the 23rd. Is
11 that too late for anyone?

12 TOM GEORGE: No, I don't think so.

13 ERIKA BENNETT: That's just two
14 weeks before the next meeting.

15 So we're looking at Monday,
16 March 23rd for the second working group meeting.

17 SUZANNE RUST: Let's pick two.
18 March 23rd or --

19 TOM GEORGE: How about the 23rd and
20 24th?

21 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's a
22 good idea.

23 TOM GEORGE: Of course working
24 group meeting two may get modified based on what
25 happens in working group meeting one.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What were the
2 tentative March dates?

3 TOM GEORGE: 23rd, 24th, Monday,
4 Tuesday.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

6 SUZANNE RUST: So doing an
7 afternoon meeting? In the afternoon for the --

8 TOM GEORGE: For the kick-off
9 working group meeting.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: How about 10:00
11 to 4:00.

12 TOM GEORGE: We were trying to make
13 it afternoon for her.

14 NANCY BALE: That's okay. I'll
15 deal with it.

16 TOM GEORGE: Over lunch is good.

17 NANCY BALE: I'll deal with it.

18 TOM GEORGE: 10:00 to 4:00. Okay.

19 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: We're saying
20 first working group meeting is February 12th,
21 10:00 to 4:00 in Anchorage.

22 SUZANNE RUST: The 10th or the
23 12th. We're going to try to find a conference
24 room.

25 TIM CUDNEY: The 12th is the first

1 choice, right?

2 DAVE WORRELL: Yes.

3 TIM CUDNEY: Staying with the 10:00
4 to 4:00? Noon to 4:00? 10:00 to 2:00?

5 TOM GEORGE: 10:00 to 4:00, yeah.
6 We'll know more after the first meeting.

7 SALLY GIBERT: For the FACA meeting
8 in Fairbanks, anybody know what the plane
9 schedules are? I think there's one that gets
10 there about 9:00.

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: You can get
12 up there before 8:00. There's 6:00 out of
13 Anchorage up there.

14 SALLY GIBERT: I know.
15 (Laughter.)

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Scott, how are
17 you getting there?

18 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Can't
19 disclose that at this time.

20 SALLY GIBERT: I think starting
21 something about 10:00 would give people time to
22 get there in a civilized manner.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: How about if I
24 check the schedule and let you know about the
25 flights.

1 SALLY GIBERT: There's a 5:30 or
2 6:30 flight out.

3 DAVE WORRELL: There's some extra
4 ones now that Era is flying.

5 TOM GEORGE: There are restaurants.
6 There are facilities.

7 SALLY GIBERT: I just don't want to
8 get up at 4:00 in the morning.

9 TOM GEORGE: Come the night before
10 then.

11 SALLY GIBERT: And then we also
12 need to discuss whether we want to have video
13 conferencing for the February meeting -- I'm
14 sorry, April meeting. This is partly directed to
15 you guys. You've been scooting around following
16 us everywhere and it's wonderful, but if you want
17 to keep doing that, it's great. If you would
18 like an option to video conference from a site, a
19 centralized site someplace, you can do that.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Let's say where
21 the sites are.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Where are the sites?

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The Murray
24 Science Learning Center in the park, Talkeetna
25 ranger station, the regional office here in

1 Anchorage and the APLA. The only request we have
2 is not -- it's labor intensive to set up the
3 video conferencing, so if people want to use
4 that, we want to offer that, but we're not going
5 to set up in all those places because it requires
6 staff to be there to turn on the equipment and
7 figure it out and get you set up. We would only
8 do it in locations if people said we will
9 definitely not be on the road and we want to
10 listen in. Video conferencing is available at
11 those locations and if there was a group that
12 wanted to say, we'll all just go to Talkeetna and
13 we'll have 12 of us there. That would be great.

14 SALLY GIBERT: So we're all going
15 to be in Fairbanks. Are you all interested in
16 going to Fairbanks if you want to participate in
17 the meeting, or do you want to consolidate
18 yourself in a secondary location and plug in by
19 video conferencing?

20 WAYNE FULLER: I won't be going to
21 Fairbanks. So if there was one off-site down
22 south here, it would be great. One video
23 conference center either in Talkeetna or in town
24 here, whatever.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

1 WAYNE FULLER: Seems like a lot of
2 folks from Talkeetna.

3 JENNI BURR: It is intensive, but
4 if there were a quarter of the people that wanted
5 to be at all those sites, it's not that much more
6 work to network all the sites together. It's
7 just that there's people at four different places
8 that need to set it up and make sure that it's
9 rolling.

10 SALLY GIBERT: You could do
11 Anchorage, Talkeetna, Fairbanks, that type of
12 thing?

13 JENNI BURR: Right.

14 SALLY GIBERT: So if it was split
15 up between Anchorage and Fairbanks, how many
16 people would be --

17 DAVE WORRELL: Sounds like
18 Talkeetna would be a better choice for the
19 Southcentral group.

20 PAUL RODERICK: Talkeetna would
21 probably be better.

22 JENNI BURR: That's rolling into
23 mountaineering season. We would need to check
24 with staff to make sure that -- that was the one
25 caveat that Talkeetna gave us, was that we would

1 need to make sure that a room was available.
2 It's probably early enough that it's not an
3 issue, but we would want to double-check that.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Sounds like the
5 preference is to do it in Talkeetna and if that
6 works with the climbing schedule, that's good,
7 and then a fallback would be Anchorage if that
8 doesn't work?

9 JAY HUDSON: Yeah.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Is there
11 anything else we need to do today?

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Just information
13 requests, so it doesn't get lost. Scott, did you
14 say you were going to find out information about
15 the military flights?

16 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: At the next
17 FACA, big one, I'll give a 20-minute presentation
18 on use of the MOA, information on chaff and
19 flares. I'll give you a description of the noise
20 complaint program, give you some data, give you
21 noise complaints that were filed against the
22 military in Denali, which I think might be
23 helpful. So I'll do a presentation at that one.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Thank you.
25 Do we want to talk about whether -- what happens

1 after April. Are we going to try and slip
2 another meeting in before the summer season?
3 Last year we went right from May to September,
4 sort of figuring that they really can't meet
5 during that time period. So does that mean if we
6 meet in April that we're not going to meet again
7 until September? Are people comfortable with
8 that? Do you want to try to fit a May meeting
9 in? I just wanted to throw that out.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's too soon to
11 know. In general, I would say skip the summer.
12 If things go well, we could be really rolling,
13 but not quite -- a five-month break might be a
14 little too long. We won't know that until we
15 have the April meeting.

16 TIM CUDNEY: If anything, May is a
17 better option. June, July, August is really
18 tough. September lightens up a little bit.

19 NANCY BALE: I like the idea of
20 meeting in Denali in the summer.

21 SALLY GIBERT: We can't wait until
22 April to decide to have a May meeting.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Can we kick
24 around, maybe by e-mail, a May date that I can
25 put in the Register and the location?

1 SALLY GIBERT: Why don't we do it
2 now?

3 TOM GEORGE: Don't we need to
4 vacate?

5 SALLY GIBERT: No, we do not.

6 TOM GEORGE: A May meeting in
7 Talkeetna?

8 SALLY GIBERT: At the last meeting
9 we talked about after the Anchorage and Fairbanks
10 meetings, after these two meetings we would focus
11 on meetings between Talkeetna and the park and
12 keep it close to home for the people that are the
13 most affected. So that would mean the May
14 meeting would be in Talkeetna.

15 ERIKA BENNETT: After the 15th
16 you're not going to find any lodging or any
17 rooms. Trade show is on the 2nd and 3rd this
18 year.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm out of town
20 the first week in May and possibly the second.

21 ERIKA BENNETT: The 15th of May is
22 when the Princess starts ramping up. That's the
23 date that hotels start filling up and booking up.

24 SALLY GIBERT: So the first two
25 weeks of May.

1 NANCY BALE: Which of us would need
2 overnight accommodations? My school is over
3 after the 15th, but I can't remember when it is.
4 Sometime in that week of the 18th to the 23rd.

5 SALLY GIBERT: The 21st is the last
6 school day.

7 ERIKA BENNETT: Where would the
8 meeting being held, Miriam?

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We would rent
10 space at CIRI again. That worked out well.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We might not need
12 a lot of lodging.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Especially that time
14 of year is light for driving conditions.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Then we could go
16 after Nancy gets out of school. You have to work
17 on the 22nd?

18 NANCY BALE: I do. I don't have to
19 have to, but I probably will need to.

20 SALLY GIBERT: The 25th is Memorial
21 Day.

22 TOM GEORGE: We should avoid that.

23 SALLY GIBERT: So the only thing --
24 that takes us to May 28th.

25 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: How about

1 May 14th? That's a month after the --

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We were so close
3 to Nancy not having a conflict with trying to get
4 out of school.

5 SUZANNE RUST: Once we get into
6 later May, I don't know that it makes a huge
7 difference.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Does anybody know
9 Brian's schedule?

10 ERIKA BENNETT: I have a feeling
11 that he would be gone by late May.

12 SALLY GIBERT: So, Nancy, does the
13 14th -- does that hinge on whether you can find a
14 sub?

15 NANCY BALE: Probably if I ask
16 ahead enough. I'm missing four days throughout
17 the spring. That's getting to be -- I might have
18 to think about missing four days from work.

19 SALLY GIBERT: For the
20 subcommittee, you may not miss very much on the
21 work group.

22 NANCY BALE: Yeah. So then I would
23 only miss two days.

24 SALLY GIBERT: I'm thinking there
25 are other people that aren't here that need to be

1 here. The farther we get into May, the more
2 likely people are to be away.

3 Want to try for the 14th of May?

4 TIM CUDNEY: Where, again?

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Talkeetna.

6 SALLY GIBERT: So that's a
7 tentative. If we think we need it and want to do
8 something between the April meeting and September
9 or we can cancel it if we don't need it and
10 aren't ready for it.

11 SUZANNE RUST: Are we thinking
12 10:00 a.m.?

13 SALLY GIBERT: Sure. 10:00, yeah.
14 10:00 to 5:00. Okay. I think that's it.

15 Do we know where we're going to be
16 in Fairbanks?

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: In the National
18 Park Services offices with video conferencing.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. I think we
20 are done with our obligations for today.

21 Anything else today? Okay. We're
22 adjourned.

23 (Proceedings adjourned at 4:48 p.m.)

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

I, LESLIE J. KNISLEY, Notary Public for
the State of Alaska, and Shorthand Reporter, do
hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were
taken before me at the time and place herein set
forth; that the proceedings were reported
stenographically by me and later transcribed by
computer transcription; that the foregoing is a
true record of the proceedings taken at that time;
and that I am not a party to, nor do I have any
interest in, the outcome of the action herein
contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand and affixed my seal this 21st day of
January, 2009.

LESLIE J. KNISLEY
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My commission expires: 02/02/11