

1

2

3

DENALI OVERFLIGHTS COUNCIL

4

5

March 24, 2011
MTS, Talkeetna, Alaska

6

9:05 a.m. to 5:17 p.m.

7

8

Advisory Council Attendees:

Sally Gibert, State of Alaska

9

Charlie Sassara, Mountaineering Community

Erika Bennett, Commercial Aviation

10

Joan Frankevich, State and National Environmental
Community

11

Suzanne Rust, Authorized Air Taxis

Tom George, General Community Aviation Users

12

Nancy Bale, Local Environmental

Mike Yorke, FAA

13

Tim Cudney, Scenic Air Tour Operators

Amanda Smith, Backcountry Users

14

Brian Okonek, Local Landowners

Miriam Valentine, Designated Federal Officer

15

16

Audience Members:

Kris Fister, National Park Service

17

Eric Denkewalter, Talkeetna Aero

Paul Roderick, Talkeetna Air Taxi

18

Randy Kilbourn, K2

Shawn Peterson

19

Sue Deyoe, KTNA

Dave Wiewel, Talkeetna Air

20

Beth Pike

Barry Stanley, Denali Flying Service

21

Mike Weller, MatSu Borough

David Lee, Sheldon Air

22

23

Reported by: Leslie J. Knisley
Shorthand Reporter

24

25

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. We're
2 going to start with a quick roll call of the
3 Council. I did hear from Scott Babos who
4 unfortunately is in Georgia this week and so is
5 not able to make this meeting.

6 Nancy Bale.

7 NANCY BALE: Here.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Erika Bennett.

9 ERIKA BENNETT: Here.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tim Cudney.

11 TIM CUDNEY: Here.

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Joan

13 Frankevich.

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Here.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tom George.

16 TOM GEORGE: Here.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Sally Gibert.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Here.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Brian Okonek.

20 BRIAN OKONEK: Here.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Suzanne Rust.

22 SUZANNE RUST: Here.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Charlie

24 Sassara.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yes.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And our new
2 representative, six months in the making, Amanda
3 Smith.

4 AMANDA SMITH: Here.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Mike
6 Yorke.

7 MIKE YORKE: Present.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Great. Thank
9 you.

10 TOM GEORGE: Just like school.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm Miriam
12 Valentine from the Park Service. Unfortunately
13 we do not have a superintendent who could make
14 the meeting today, but we have a lot of Park
15 Service representation. There's three of them.
16 Unfortunately through some family issues as well
17 as hosting a VIP trip, they weren't able to make
18 it today.

19 So, Sally, it's to you.

20 SALLY GIBERT: I don't really
21 have anything to say, any grandiose remarks. I
22 think we should get to looking at the agenda.
23 We have a lot on the agenda. There's a lot to
24 do. So some of us have been talking about
25 rearranging, taking some of the member reports

1 or taking all of the member reports and maybe
2 putting them after the various Park Service
3 reports to make sure that we don't burn up too
4 much time, for example, on the JPARC thing. We
5 usually spend too much time on that.

6 Is there any problem with doing
7 that? Joan, is that okay with you?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That's fine
9 with me.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Any other
11 suggestions related to the agenda? Okay. So we
12 can move 5 down to between 13 and 15, in there
13 somewhere.

14 TOM GEORGE: Why don't we just
15 carry it forward and then if there's a break in
16 the action, like if some of your speakers
17 haven't arrived, we can just insert it wherever
18 conveniently.

19 SALLY GIBERT: That's true.
20 Okay. We don't want them to get lost. I don't
21 think any of it's going to get lost.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That sounds
23 good.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm sorry, I
25 moved through that just a little quickly. I

1 want to welcome the public who are attending and
2 mention that if you need to use the restroom,
3 they're downstairs in like the midsection of the
4 building. There's coffee down there. Please
5 help yourself. I would encourage people to sign
6 in, please.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Can we start over
8 here and go through introductions?

9 PAUL RODERICK: I'm Paul
10 Roderick, director of operations, Talkeetna Air
11 Taxi.

12 DAVE WIEWEL: Dave Wiewel with
13 Talkeetna Air.

14 RANDY KILBOURN: Randy Kilbourn
15 with K2.

16 BETH PIKE: Beth Pike.

17 KRIS FISTER: Kris Fister, I'm
18 the public affairs officer at Denali.

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Eric
20 Denkwalter.

21 DAVID LEE: David Lee, Sheldon
22 Air Service.

23 MIKE WELLER: Good morning. My
24 name is Mike Weller. I work for the MatSu
25 Borough in the planning department.

1 BARRY STANLEY: Barry Stanley,
2 Denali Flying Service.

3 SUE DEYOE: Sue Deyoe, reporter
4 here in Talkeetna, and I apologize because I'm
5 going to run in and out all day long.

6 SHAWN PETERSON: Shawn Peterson.
7 Bored, just wanted to come in and listen to
8 what's going on. Concerned citizen.

9 TOM GEORGE: Barry, aren't you
10 also here in your capacity on the MatSu Aviation
11 Advisory Board?

12 BARRY STANLEY: Yes. I forgot
13 that part.

14 TOM GEORGE: Because many people
15 here may not realize. The MatSu Borough now
16 actually has an aviation advisory board. I
17 think you've kind of hesitated to track this
18 group or something; is that right?

19 BARRY STANLEY: Yeah, yeah. I've
20 been trying to make one of these meetings for
21 quite a while.

22 TOM GEORGE: And we appreciate
23 that he finally did.

24 BARRY STANLEY: Hopefully I can
25 get a little better notice. So far I think

1 three days is the longest notice I've been able
2 to get, so it's hard to get in there on a
3 schedule with that kind of notice. So I signed
4 in and hopefully I'll get better notice.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Maybe at the
6 break we can share with you how to access the
7 web page and sign up to get a notice directly to
8 you.

9 BARRY STANLEY: Okay. Thanks.

10 TOM GEORGE: Actually, Miriam, at
11 some point, so we're not taking up meeting time,
12 you might send the whole Council an e-mail as to
13 how that process works so that we could pass
14 that on to other people.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Where you sign
16 up for it?

17 TOM GEORGE: Yes, yes. That
18 might help a bunch of people that are interested
19 just to be aware of when the meetings are.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So do we
21 want to -- does anybody have anything to say
22 from a public comment perspective before we
23 launch into some of the meat of the agenda?
24 Okay. You'll have more opportunity later, as
25 you all know.

1 So, Best Practices. How's it
2 going Tom, Tim and Suzanne?

3 TOM GEORGE: On this first item,
4 plans for a north side feedback working group, I
5 believe the action there was -- you know, on the
6 south side we've kind of had this arrangement
7 with the backcountry rangers in terms of them
8 looking at the Best Practices that have been
9 adopted so far, and then if they're seeing
10 things that are big excursions from that, where
11 and how to report that information so the
12 operators get a head's up while it's fresh
13 rather than three months later.

14 So the interest is to do a
15 parallel thing, perhaps, on the north side so
16 that any Best Practices we adopt there, again,
17 we'd have a feedback mechanism to be able to
18 tell, are they making a difference? Are they
19 making it better? Are they making it worse?

20 It's my understanding that,
21 again, we're waiting kind of for Parks Service
22 personnel to be filled to then figure out how
23 that would work. Miriam could perhaps talk to
24 this, but I don't believe that has happened yet.
25 So I think we're kind of on hold on that front

1 waiting for kind of staffing changes and stuff
2 from the Parks Service.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, there
4 are two positions that are in the process of
5 being filled. One is our -- we're creating a
6 backcountry ranger district within the park,
7 which will be the backcountry as well as the
8 wilderness coordinator position. That should be
9 filled this summer, as well as we have a
10 resource specialist position whose primary role
11 will be the monitoring or implementation of the
12 Backcountry Plan commitments we've made. That
13 position, I know that they've gone through
14 interviews, but they haven't selected someone.
15 So there's actually two critical positions that
16 are needed for what was being suggested by the
17 Council and some of those folks should be on in
18 summer.

19 I was mentioning to Tom that once
20 they got their feet wet a little bit in the
21 park, that by December when we have our typical
22 December meeting, that would be a great time for
23 them to come and present and to maybe even work
24 with a working group before then once they have
25 a feel for the park and their staff and what

1 their capacity is.

2 TOM GEORGE: You said two
3 positions, but you then rattled off three
4 positions.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The
6 Backcountry District, like, ranger position.
7 We're going to have a Backcountry District now.
8 So formerly Joe Van Horn as the wilderness
9 coordinator kind of oversaw that.

10 TOM GEORGE: So you're splitting
11 those two?

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: We're actually
13 combining -- maybe making it more official that
14 the Backcountry District also is responsible for
15 our wilderness issues in the park. So that's
16 one person. That will be a law enforcement
17 person.

18 TOM GEORGE: Then what was the
19 final position you mentioned?

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Resource
21 specialist. It's somebody who's responsible for
22 when you suggest, like, should we be doing
23 surveys? How is the soundscape monitoring? How
24 does this all relate to the Backcountry Plan?
25 That position is specifically being hired to

1 look at the monitoring commitments made under
2 that Backcountry Plan and ensure that we're
3 following through on that.

4 TOM GEORGE: Well, maybe instead
5 of waiting until December, if you can at least
6 just let the Council know when those positions
7 are in, realizing it's going to take them a
8 while to come up to speed. But then we can,
9 again, maybe make a little progress prior to a
10 meeting or something to start that.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So we're saying
13 we're not going to get something in place this
14 summer because these positions --

15 TOM GEORGE: That's what it
16 sounds like to me.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right. I
18 don't think so, Joan. I don't think there's
19 anybody who has the ability to -- first of all,
20 I don't think there's staff capacity and then I
21 think you'll need the people who will be
22 implementing to be at the table helping.

23 TOM GEORGE: But the good news is
24 maybe we can work with those people early on to
25 actually design that in rather than just kind of

1 tag it on to some miscellaneous detail after
2 they've already got everything lined out. So as
3 much as it's painful to see a delay, we can
4 actually get up front with that process. I
5 think that will be good in the long run.

6 MS. GIBERT: Okay.

7 TOM GEORGE: So I can move on to
8 the next one, which is continued evaluation of
9 north side "hot spots." The aviation working
10 group has not met since our last meeting,
11 probably due to lack of energy all the way
12 around. What we're going to talk about later in
13 the meeting is kind of a listening/monitoring
14 session in May actually on the Stampede Road
15 side, which will actually be one of the next
16 inputs to how we might think about proceeding
17 with that task. So, again, I'd say no progress
18 on that at the moment, but we'll keep that in
19 mind when we come back to the May 21 listening
20 session and discussion.

21 And then the final thing in that
22 list, outreach and education about Best
23 Practices. We talked at the last meeting about,
24 okay, we've been working with the major air tour
25 operators in the area, so taking the current

1 Best Practices we have and figuring out how to
2 start to broadcast those out to more of a
3 general aviation audience or some other
4 audiences. I've been trying to connect with
5 Colin Malone, park pilot, who also is the
6 creator and maintainer of the Denali Flight Map,
7 which is one tool that we could perhaps start to
8 include some soundscape information in.

9 Mike Yorke and I have talked and
10 actually I've got a diagram of a product from
11 another part of the country on kind of mapping
12 past conditions, which we'll be talking about.
13 But the idea of being here to try and see where
14 we can -- rather than trying to create some
15 whole new set of soundscape materials that don't
16 fit anywhere within the aviation paradigm, to
17 take a look at other kinds of information on
18 mountain passes and/or Colin Malone's flight map
19 and try and start introducing soundscape
20 awareness in there. So that's kind of our next
21 step.

22 Just this morning at breakfast I
23 got a call from Colin Malone, which is the first
24 time we've actually been able to communicate.
25 So after this meeting, I'll be trying to get

1 ahold of him and Mike and he and I are going to
2 sit down and try and at least take the next step
3 in looking at where we can inject some of the
4 information that the Council has already
5 developed and the aviation working group already
6 developed into some existing products as the
7 first step in kind of pushing that out to a
8 broader audience. So that's the extent of
9 progress on that, unless anybody else has
10 anything to say.

11 MIKE YORKE: We had talked about
12 adding something in the supplement and getting
13 the mountain traffic frequency published in
14 there at 227.75 and then we had some discussion
15 about getting a link to FAA safety dot gov.

16 TOM GEORGE: Or the Park Services
17 map directory.

18 MIKE YORKE: Or the Park Services
19 and I'll talk to you a little bit later about
20 that. I talked to Colin about it. So the
21 decision was to get it to go to FAA gov go fly
22 Alaska. The reason is FAA safety dot gov sees
23 the whole United States. We're trying to get a
24 place for Alaska on that. May not happen. But
25 they've actually done it pretty nice, and this

1 will also appear in the aviator's handbook that
2 way. That was one of the requests to get going
3 on, so I think we've done that.

4 We are looking at putting a -- I
5 call it a bubble or a place on the map, a little
6 section box there up in the Denali area and
7 maybe we can talk about where we want to put
8 that. I think these things can be accomplished
9 in short order. This will be out in June if we
10 can agree on it, which shouldn't take too much,
11 and then we can get a chart done up too.

12 TIM CUDNEY: The last discussion
13 we talked about the new aviator's handbook.
14 That's going to replace this?

15 MIKE YORKE: Actually it's not
16 going to replace it. The salmon will stay. The
17 aviator's handbook, which was supposed to be out
18 in December, mailed to everybody, is still at
19 the printer's because everybody came in with
20 some changes and corrections. I do have a copy
21 of it. I'd be glad to show everybody. You bet,
22 I've got it on a thumb drive if you'd like to
23 take it with you.

24 BRIAN OKONEK: So, Mike, the Best
25 Practices will actually be in the new sectional

1 or just a reference to the Denali Park aviation
2 map?

3 MIKE YORKE: The reference here
4 will be listed in the supplement to the map.
5 The Best Practices we would like to see in the
6 Salmon.

7 TOM GEORGE: No. Actually, no.
8 We talked about that and decided that just
9 dropping that straight into the supplement
10 doesn't make a lot of sense. We need to talk
11 more about that. I don't think we're at that
12 stage yet. Because the Best Practices are
13 something that were crafted very specific to
14 commercial operators. These documents go out to
15 a much broader group, so we'd keep having to
16 either have a rewrite or put context on these
17 things to do that. That's why this next step of
18 going beyond just the high-frequency users that
19 are there most often to the lower frequency
20 people from all over the place, there's work
21 that needs to be done to figure out how to put
22 that material in a way that makes sense and is
23 helpful. So that's work we've got to get
24 together and still do.

25 MIKE YORKE: And that's where I

1 was going. The Best Practices that we see for
2 the commercial operators may be worded
3 differently for the infrequent traveler and we
4 haven't got there yet.

5 NANCY BALE: Just to catch me up,
6 what's the status of the Great Gorge
7 recommendation in terms of is it actually now in
8 the Best Practices document?

9 TOM GEORGE: Yes, it is.

10 NANCY BALE: And I can find it?

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: December 2010,
12 I think, is the last version.

13 NANCY BALE: It was developed at
14 that meeting? Sally, did you happen to send
15 that out to us after with the Great Gorge added?

16 SALLY GIBERT: I did.

17 TOM GEORGE: I'm pretty sure it
18 did go out. Now, I don't know whether that's --

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Probably in
20 January it went out, Nancy.

21 NANCY BALE: Okay. I'll check.

22 SALLY GIBERT: It was formally
23 sent to the Park Service on December 3rd as our
24 recommendations. It was an attachment to a
25 December 3rd letter, which I probably sent out

1 the same day.

2 TOM GEORGE: So what we need to
3 do is check and see if that's made it onto any
4 of the Denali web site stuff yet or not.

5 BRIAN OKONEK: I couldn't find it
6 anywhere.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I don't think
8 it's ever been posted on the web site. I think
9 it's the same as what you're working with, Mike,
10 is we haven't felt like, one, it's ready and,
11 two, that it's for the general audiences. The
12 Best Practices haven't been publicly displayed
13 that I'm aware of.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Should they
15 be?

16 TOM GEORGE: Why don't we just
17 take a look at that. We'll add that to the list
18 of things we'll take a look at.

19 SALLY GIBERT: I was assuming
20 they would be on the Council's web site, but not
21 necessarily advertised for -- I mean, I think
22 it's a product of our group.

23 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, I think it's a
24 product of the group. I have no problem with it
25 being posted on a web site. Now, to take it and

1 just drop it without other context into broader
2 materials, I think that's not very helpful. But
3 I don't see a problem with that being available
4 as a document that's come out of this Council.
5 It has come out of the Council and therefore it
6 should be there.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's a type of
8 document that's going to evolve and so --

9 TOM GEORGE: Which is why we
10 already put a date on it.

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah. And if
12 we're talking about the context, then it should
13 be that this is a dynamic process. There's
14 concern about if you do one particular practice
15 and the conditions change, now what do you do
16 about it? And so -- I think that we want to
17 build in the flexibility to change these things
18 and that looking for perfection, we're never
19 going to -- we really can't get there because
20 conditions change.

21 TOM GEORGE: Well, I don't know
22 about the last part of it, but I think you'll
23 find in the introductory paragraph it
24 specifically does mention that this is a dynamic
25 document, work in progress, et cetera. So I

1 think we've built at least part of that into the
2 introductory section. I don't have a copy of it
3 in front of me to be able to quote that chapter
4 and verse.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: What was
6 recommended? The Best Practices recommendation?
7 So did the Best Practices have enough of an
8 introduction that reflects that it is a dynamic,
9 you know?

10 SALLY GIBERT: The cover letter
11 does. It says: As you know, our work as a
12 Council is not done. These recommendations for
13 Best Practices represent interim conditions that
14 remain subject to change based on continued data
15 gathering, monitoring practicality of the
16 recommendations.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So maybe we
18 just merge that language?

19 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, we probably
20 ought to have something like that actually on
21 the Best Practices.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Maybe the very
23 title is Interim. That's a good word.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: But push to get
25 the information out. Can we publish it?

1 TOM GEORGE: Put it on the web
2 site, yes.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, put it on
4 the Council's web site.

5 TOM GEORGE: On the Council's web
6 site. It's a product of the Council.

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So in the past
8 years also there would be a link to the Denali
9 parks aviation piece. So fully agree, on the
10 Council web site in a manner that represents it
11 in a way of your dynamic process. So if it
12 were -- is it okay to then link it to the
13 aviation page?

14 TOM GEORGE: I would hold off on
15 that until, again, we can look at this broader
16 context. Because that information is intended
17 and is advertised and will be advertised through
18 several FAA publications to the general public.
19 So, yeah, we may need to do something different
20 there.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: What do you
22 think the decision-making -- I mean, what do you
23 think the issues would be to work through? I'm
24 pushing a little bit to make it published. I
25 mean, what do you think those issues are that

1 are -- outside the standing questions?

2 TOM GEORGE: Without sitting down
3 and looking at the document, I don't have a good
4 answer for that. I think that's something we
5 need to sit down in a working group and go over.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: But how about
7 putting a date on it and saying we'll make a
8 commitment to having it out by X date? I'm
9 pushing for a commitment to publish, you know.

10 SUZANNE RUST: I think one of the
11 things that could happen is we could work at it
12 on the next work group. I do think we have to
13 really look at the audience and look at the
14 recommendations.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Or audiences.

16 SUZANNE RUST: Audiences, yeah.
17 It was funny, because I think when we started
18 this discussion, we thought it was going to be
19 easy. Oh, yeah, let's get this and let's put it
20 here. But I think that the audiences are so
21 different and diverse that we need to really sit
22 down and think about it. I think that we could
23 work on it -- you know, we could make that a
24 goal for the next work group meeting if we
25 wanted to do that. We could at least begin the

1 process. I don't know how difficult it will be.
2 It doesn't seem like it would be something
3 unattainable.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think some of
5 the difficulties again too is some of them we're
6 going into our third summer on some of these on
7 the south side. So they're working; they're not
8 going to change. But there's others, like the
9 north side, that are totally in flux and are
10 probably going to change a great deal. So I'm
11 afraid of putting something out there -- you
12 know, getting it too far out there that then
13 completely changes. So the Best Practices is a
14 mix of things that, I think, have really been
15 tried and we're pretty certain, pretty solid on
16 it, and things that are very in flux and your
17 average reader wouldn't know that.

18 SALLY GIBERT: It could be that,
19 for example, the north side might get linked
20 later than the other side, for example.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And that could
22 be.

23 BRIAN OKONEK: At the same time
24 the things that have been proven to be workable
25 for the aviation community so far and have

1 helped the users on the ground, it would be nice
2 to have that information out because there are
3 flightseeing services that are flying around the
4 mountain that aren't involved with a concession
5 permit and stuff, so they don't know what's
6 going on. There is general aviation flying
7 around the mountain. I'm sure if they knew that
8 these conditions existed, they could voluntarily
9 do them too. They are voluntary procedures.
10 These are recommendations because of the high
11 use on the mountain May through July we
12 recommend.

13 ERIKA BENNETT: I have a list of
14 operators that have been known to show up in
15 Denali National Park occasionally. I can shoot
16 just, this is what we're working on and this is
17 what's -- you know, it's what we're testing out
18 this summer so to speak. So that if somebody
19 comes up with a charter, Spurnack or someone
20 wants to take their 207 up there. Oh, yeah,
21 wait a second. Michael, go back in the back and
22 rifle through the paperwork and pull out the
23 sheet and give it to the pilot in a perfect
24 world.

25 BRIAN OKONEK: But at the same

1 time the flying public goes to this FAA
2 sectional and then gets a reference to the
3 Denali Park aviation map, the next step should
4 be they should be able to find this information.
5 It shouldn't be a hidden thing that's not out
6 there.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: And we have the
8 obligation to get the information out there.
9 And the season is about to occur, so let's not
10 let this season go by. Because when we have the
11 practices out there and we're in a season, then
12 we have an opportunity to measure them which is
13 a big part of whether or not we're being
14 successful. So the timing is important.

15 SUZANNE RUST: Just to add to
16 that, I think that really looking at doing
17 something well and getting a set of what would
18 be appropriate for the audiences is important,
19 and then the next step is getting it out there
20 and then the next step is educating. I mean, we
21 have a process to go through. I'm saying we
22 need to start it.

23 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's taking too
24 long.

25 TOM GEORGE: I'm sorry. None of

1 us have full time to devote to this Council.

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: I know.

3 TOM GEORGE: I've been playing
4 telephone tag for weeks with Colin Malone, the
5 keeper of the Denali map, which is probably one
6 of the prime places to get some pieces into it.
7 So I apologize it's not further along, but it's
8 the best I can do. I think we are working this
9 stuff. We'll keep working it. Sitting here
10 right now trying to push it to a date certain
11 isn't going to get it done any faster and I
12 apologize for that, but that's just the way it
13 is.

14 SUZANNE RUST: But I think we
15 could. I do think that by the next meeting -- I
16 think we could set a meeting and work on really
17 looking at our audience and trying to work it.
18 I mean, the Internet is a great thing because we
19 can get things out quickly. I think that
20 there's more to it than that. I think if people
21 don't know -- if you're not presenting at the
22 different aviation and general aviation forums,
23 you have to figure out a multi-faceted approach
24 so that people are aware, that we create an
25 awareness that they really should go look, that

1 it is important. So I think that we might get
2 halfway there by getting it published on the
3 Internet, but I think that there's more to it
4 than that. So that's what I'm trying to say. I
5 certainly think that it's something we can work
6 on and I don't think that it's too difficult of
7 a task.

8 TOM GEORGE: There's no
9 reluctance to work on it. It's just a matter of
10 how many hours in a day do we have that we can
11 work on it.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: But there's a
13 progression of certain things you can do and
14 certain things that take a lot of work, which
15 you were referring to. So what can be done now?

16 SUZANNE RUST: One thing that's
17 in our control is people meeting. We could get
18 together and take the time to go through this
19 and look at the audiences. That's obviously the
20 first step. But that takes everyone being able
21 to give the time to do the meeting and
22 participate. Then there are things that are
23 more challenging, like tracking down people and
24 getting connected. Those take time as well.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right now are

1 our Best Practices on this web site?

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: They're not.

3 NANCY BALE: I'm taking
4 responsibility for sort of starting this
5 discussion. Mainly what I was looking for was
6 the most recent document, and I think that at
7 the last meeting we decided on a firm Great
8 Gorge recommendation, but it hasn't made it into
9 the document that I have. So I may not have a
10 current document. The document that I have that
11 I've located is entitled, Denali Air Tour
12 Operators Best Practices to Minimize Sound
13 Impacts. Introductory paragraph. Then, Area 1,
14 Triple Lakes Departures and Arrivals. Area 2,
15 Park Road corridor and entrance. Area 3, Mount
16 McKinley Summit Flights. Area 4, Kahiltna Pass.
17 Mine is dated April 13th, 2010, so I'm sure
18 there's a more recent one.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, there's a
20 No. 5, December 3rd, 2010.

21 NANCY BALE: Does it have the
22 Great Gorge in it?

23 SALLY GIBERT: Yes.

24 NANCY BALE: And when was that
25 sent out? Because I'm sure it's somewhere on my

1 computer, but I --

2 SALLY GIBERT: December 3rd,
3 2010.

4 NANCY BALE: December 3rd? Was
5 it sent out with the agenda?

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: This was after
7 the meeting.

8 NANCY BALE: I switched computers
9 and that's one of my problems. I lost some of
10 my e-mails, so it's possible that I lost that.
11 So when you sent out the meeting notes, you
12 attached the Best Practices document?

13 SALLY GIBERT: I can do that.

14 NANCY BALE: No. When you did,
15 is that how it came out?

16 SALLY GIBERT: No, it was a
17 stand-alone. I think I sent it out as a
18 stand-alone. It was after the meeting. So
19 everybody was saying, okay, this is what we want
20 to send, call it good for now, the
21 recommendations.

22 NANCY BALE: And that had the
23 Great Gorge on it?

24 SALLY GIBERT: Yes.

25 NANCY BALE: I would suggest -- I

1 would move that we pdf it and put it on the web
2 site, the document the way it is. We don't have
3 to put any north side information on it, or
4 there were some other things you talked about.
5 That's all still pending? But I think that's a
6 firm document and we don't need to hold it back.

7 SALLY GIBERT: And what I would
8 propose is that the appropriate introductory
9 language from the cover letter actually get
10 incorporated on the Best Practices itself, which
11 I can easily do and then that can be pdf'd and I
12 can send that to you.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: What I'm
14 hearing is that the group is comfortable with it
15 being at the Council link, but it's not going to
16 be linked to the Denali aviation page.

17 TOM GEORGE: Correct.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: Why not?

19 TOM GEORGE: For the very reasons
20 we just talked about. We need to sit down and
21 look at audiences and design products and stuff
22 for the general aviation world, and that's a
23 product for the general aviation world. So
24 that's something the aviation working group will
25 sit down and start to look at where and how we

1 can flow either portions or all of it into
2 appropriate, like that Park map, which is an
3 existing very good product that's already in
4 wide usage by the GA community that Mike has a
5 copy of in his hand right there and in some of
6 the other publications and maybe even in some
7 new products that describe aviation things.

8 SALLY GIBERT: In the meantime,
9 individual Council members can be networking
10 with other people that they know, Spurnack, for
11 example, to get the word out informally to other
12 pilots that are known to use the area.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tom and
14 Suzanne, do you think you'd have a level of
15 comfort if on the Denali aviation page there's
16 some sort of mention regarding the work of the
17 Council so if there was somebody who was
18 interested --

19 TOM GEORGE: Sure. You bet.
20 Absolutely.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It would
22 satisfy what Charlie is asking for. Get the
23 word out.

24 TOM GEORGE: I think that would
25 be a great idea.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. We'll
2 do that. Does that kind of satisfy this first,
3 like, let's take a step?

4 SALLY GIBERT: So the aviation
5 page would reference the work of the Council.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right. So it
7 would link you to the page.

8 SUZANNE RUST: And it would
9 explain the work and a quick sentence about what
10 these Best Practices were designed for, what
11 audience they were designed for would be
12 worthwhile. They were designed for air tour
13 operators. The Council is working on general
14 aviation guidelines.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'll let you
16 and Tom provide that information that you want
17 to put on the aviation page.

18 SUZANNE RUST: We'll provide
19 wording; how about that?

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Perfect.

21 NANCY BALE: I guess I would
22 suggest that there's no way that something can
23 be supremely vetted. The Park Service is a
24 strong experiencer of putting out ideas and
25 having the public jump all over them at the

1 eleventh hour. So we can be confident that
2 anything we put out might get jumped on and
3 maybe putting it out is the best way to get that
4 feedback. So I'm not afraid of these
5 recommendations. They're all solid. I don't
6 mind circulating them widely as a work product
7 of this group. Then we have to be ready for
8 some people going, I can't do that. Always,
9 always that happens. Blue-ribbon councils
10 develop recommendations after years and they get
11 jumped on at the eleventh hour.

12 TOM GEORGE: I don't have any
13 worry about that. Absolutely.

14 NANCY BALE: If it happened, it
15 doesn't bother me. If someone came in and said,
16 no, we can't do this, then I'd listen to them.

17 TOM GEORGE: I guess I thought
18 that the recommendations that had been adopted
19 at the last Council meeting were on the
20 Council's web site. If they aren't, yeah, we
21 definitely need to get them there ASAP. I think
22 this additional step of putting the link back
23 from the pilot information back to the Council
24 is a great idea.

25 NANCY BALE: Maybe we could put

1 it out as a press release from the Park Service
2 that we placed these Best Practices
3 recommendations that have developed specifically
4 over many years and give a link to that part of
5 the site. We might want to beat our chest a
6 little bit.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: We have the
8 press here -- or the press is going to be back.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It sounds like
10 perhaps three points that we want to make sure
11 on the Best Practices that's linked to the web
12 site. There should be in the beginning that
13 it's interim and ongoing, that it's primarily
14 geared toward air tour operators and that it's
15 voluntary, so that people have a framework
16 before they start reading them and get freaked
17 out, that I'm general aviation and I don't even
18 know what you're talking about, how can I do
19 this?

20 TOM GEORGE: Yeah. Or why
21 haven't you done something in this area?

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I agree, they
23 should be out there and people should follow
24 them in the air.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: Interim implies

1 that they become permanent, which is a problem
2 we talked about as far as the impact of it.
3 Maybe a different way of framing it would be
4 maybe something along annual. This is what
5 we're going to do this year or something like
6 that which changes it. I know you guys are
7 concerned about it becoming fixed in stone, but
8 the market changes, the climate changes, your
9 equipment changes, but it's the adaptive
10 element.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Except that that
12 implies that you have to --

13 TOM GEORGE: The first one we put
14 out we put a year on and I took that off when we
15 made the next recommendation so we could start
16 to take a step toward more generic. So
17 dynamic -- I mean, there's some word in there.

18 SALLY GIBERT: What about
19 recommendations that are subject to change?

20 TOM GEORGE: That's right. And
21 that's the notion. I think we put wording in
22 there, but we'll double-check, that points out
23 that these are subject to change as more
24 information becomes available.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: So part of the

1 background and why I was thinking about that is
2 that there's resistance that we want to make
3 sure it's perfect, but it's never going to be
4 really there because the situation changes every
5 year and the circumstances change. So to build
6 that flexibility into the communications so
7 that --

8 TOM GEORGE: And if we haven't
9 already, we need to take another look and make
10 sure it's there. I thought we had done that
11 already, but we can look at it again.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Well, it would
13 make sense that at each meeting prior to a
14 season --

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: We say, this is
16 what they are.

17 SALLY GIBERT: -- to sort of say,
18 okay, now, are we good on this stuff or -- and
19 then refresh the data.

20 SUZANNE RUST: I think that's a
21 great idea and totally a great procedure too.
22 That provides us the opportunity to review and
23 to discuss and to bring up. I like the concept
24 of ongoing. I don't know if that's the right
25 word, but I like that this process is ongoing.

1 We're taking a long-term look at this and at the
2 same time we're being flexible enough to change
3 as we need to. So I don't know what another
4 word for ongoing is, but I do like that.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: We could say on
6 this piece that we reviewed the Best Practices
7 and these are what we're recommending for this
8 year.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Current
10 recommendations.

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: Current
12 recommendations for Best Practices. Then that
13 could be a piece of the -- if you wanted to do
14 the press release or something, you know. We're
15 talking about awareness. That's an imprecise
16 document, but it's a -- I mean, medium,
17 imprecise medium.

18 SUZANNE RUST: But if it's
19 presented in that way, I think it's a really
20 good opportunity to get it out there that we
21 review them annually. That's kind of our
22 process and that we get them out. I think that
23 one of the things is that general awareness is
24 really important that, oh, I can go to this
25 site. It can't be just published because then

1 people have to know that they need to use it. I
2 mean, we have to approach it from a number of
3 different ways. So that's where the
4 brainstorming and sitting down in our meeting
5 and maybe that's the next aviation work group
6 meeting agenda.

7 TOM GEORGE: So, Suzanne, you can
8 start working on dates for that meeting.

9 SUZANNE RUST: Well, let's find
10 out when Charlie's available.

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm available
12 today, tomorrow, the next day.

13 SUZANNE RUST: I think that we
14 should look at that.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: So what are the
16 actions that could be taken today? Is there
17 anything in this?

18 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I'm going to
19 reframe the current recommendations based on
20 this discussion. You know, current
21 recommendations, ongoing. If you want to send
22 around a draft of that language and I'll send it
23 to Miriam and it will get posted on the page.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: On the
25 Council's page.

1 SALLY GIBERT: The ones that we
2 formalized.

3 ERIKA BENNETT: The ones that are
4 on there as Best Practices.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, it's on there.

6 ERIKA BENNETT: I found it.

7 BRIAN OKONEK: Sally, I think it
8 needs to go on the Current Projects page, not
9 just -- when somebody goes to Denali National
10 Park, there's the Current Projects. That's the
11 easiest place for the public to find what this
12 Overflights Council does.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Can you say
14 that again?

15 BRIAN OKONEK: The Denali
16 National Park Current Projects page. Nobody is
17 going to find the Council page.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I will fully
19 agree with you that our web page is not very
20 intuitive, because we have to stay within a
21 framework. We're told how it looks. So I'm
22 interested in just telling people, you know when
23 you use the search function, if we could give
24 them the right word, like Denali Overflights or
25 Overflights and then, boom, the page pops up.

1 That's what I would prefer to happen. We
2 haven't been successful yet at making that
3 happen, but we can certainly work towards that.

4 SUZANNE RUST: Why can't we have
5 our own web page? I mean, just our own
6 independent --

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You're a
8 government-sponsored charter, and we'd have to
9 ask about that. My first sense is that we
10 couldn't as the government support what was
11 on -- so in terms of credibility, the government
12 isn't going to say, well, yeah, because are you
13 monitoring it? Is everything factual? I mean,
14 we'll take responsibility for what's on our web
15 page. But if the Council creates their own web
16 page -- my hope, Suzanne, is we'll make a
17 commitment and put effort towards working within
18 the structure that we're given to try and make
19 it more intuitive for the users. So if you're
20 making an effort to get out to these various
21 audiences, that we can make it easier on our web
22 page.

23 SUZANNE RUST: But your web page
24 is hard.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Oh, very much

1 so.

2 ERIKA BENNETT: There's not a
3 link from the aviation page. There's no link to
4 the Overflights. There's nothing on that page
5 at all that says anything about Overflights.

6 TOM GEORGE: That's what they
7 just committed to change. I think largely we're
8 talking about indexing your page that you have
9 there today so that search engines can find it
10 easier. I don't know what constraints you have
11 as a federal agency on that. But that would be
12 the easiest thing to do. Rather than creating
13 some new thing, just get the indexing on that so
14 if you do the search for Denali Overflights
15 Council, boom, that's close to the top of the
16 queue of things that came up in a search.

17 BRIAN OKONEK: And the link from
18 the Current Projects page to this Council and to
19 the aviation page.

20 TOM GEORGE: Yes, to connect
21 those together.

22 BRIAN OKONEK: If you Google
23 Denali aviation, what you come up with is Denali
24 Park Current Projects, and then when you go to
25 there, it's a very short page without -- very,

1 very few links. It doesn't link to this
2 Council's page. It doesn't link to the aviation
3 page. So it's really very -- it's useless.

4 TOM GEORGE: I'm glad we have the
5 public affairs person with us today that will
6 make all these things better.

7 KRIS FISTER: I don't deal
8 directly with the web site, but I will work with
9 Miriam to figure out how to make it better. She
10 is correct in that we are concerned for a
11 certain format that the Park Services provides,
12 but we keep trying to figure out how to make
13 Denali fit into some of the categories that
14 we're doing.

15 TOM GEORGE: Well, Miriam, I
16 guess the request would be for you to work on
17 that. But if you find governmental reasons why
18 you can't improve upon it beyond what it is, let
19 us know and I think at that point we should
20 consider whether the Council itself in some
21 manner wants to have a web site. But there's a
22 lot of work in doing that, so that's not
23 something we should just throw out there as a
24 category. Oh, yeah, in our spare time we should
25 do that.

1 SALLY GIBERT: We also might be
2 able to make a formal Council recommendation for
3 a specific tweak to the web site to do what
4 needs to be done and see if that gets traction.
5 We're here to advise the federal government.

6 I also need to correct the date
7 that this letter went out. It was actually
8 January 4th. It was the December 3rd
9 recommendations, but the e-mail would have been
10 January 4th.

11 NANCY BALE: Thanks, Sally.

12 TOM GEORGE: Maybe you could just
13 resend that e-mail to the Council.

14 SALLY GIBERT: I'll do that with
15 the new introduction where these things are
16 merged, so it's not an attachment. It would be
17 one document.

18 NANCY BALE: So you're saying to
19 merge the introduction onto the pdf?

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, the
21 recommendations with the cover letter. So I'll
22 take the relevant stuff from the cover letter
23 and stick it on the recommendations.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'll offer one
25 more thought. At our last meeting folks were

1 supposed to provide me with by March 1st
2 thoughts about the web site. Now we have
3 something tangible that you would like to see
4 more available. So I'm going to give you three
5 weeks to give me suggestions, so by April 15th,
6 tax day. Everybody will remember.

7 TOM GEORGE: Not tax day. You're
8 being nasty now.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm trying to
10 figure out a date you'd know before we got into
11 the season really heavy. Go to the web site.
12 Take a look at it. Just send me a list.
13 Miriam, this so doesn't work. Okay? Because we
14 can start tweaking it now to make it available
15 in a timely manner for people to actually get
16 the information for this season.

17 SALLY GIBERT: The No. 1 thing is
18 cross-linking the aviation page and the Council
19 page.

20 SUZANNE RUST: Are you guys
21 comfortable with Tom and I to send out the
22 language? We're just going to write a couple
23 sentences for the aviation web page.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Sally may have
25 already accomplished that when she writes the

1 abbreviated intro to the recommendations.

2 SUZANNE RUST: It's a different
3 perspective, talking to a different audience.

4 SALLY GIBERT: That language
5 might help you, but, yeah, it is different
6 language I think.

7 TOM GEORGE: I think what would
8 help us is whatever list of IOUs we commit to
9 today, knowing that we did this last time and
10 that we're all guilty of probably not having
11 done the work, would be if like shortly after
12 the meeting the IOU list went out to everybody.
13 I think that might help us all be more cognizant
14 of whatever that IOU list is rather than maybe
15 getting it a week before the next meeting.

16 SALLY GIBERT: Well, this IOU
17 list went out a long time ago.

18 TOM GEORGE: Well, either it got
19 bundled in with other things or something, but I
20 certainly missed it.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So I am going
22 to put Suzanne and Tom down for providing that.

23 TOM GEORGE: Judging on the
24 response of everybody else, as far as I can
25 tell, I'm not the only one who missed it.

1 TIM CUDNEY: We're all in the
2 same boat.

3 SALLY GIBERT: So, IOU list.

4 TOM GEORGE: Just that and
5 nothing else so that that is the focus.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And to answer
7 your question, Suzanne, yeah, I'm fine if you
8 guys want to write it. I don't think we need to
9 send it around. Just get it done.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Maybe what we
11 ought to do by the end of the day is go back
12 through our previous IOU list and see how we're
13 doing, whether we've already covered it or we
14 need to redo something.

15 NANCY BALE: I think every time
16 we have these meetings the members of the public
17 are present, and I don't want the members of the
18 public to be very confused to be drawn into --
19 we're talking about our products, but we're not
20 describing our products. So it's important for
21 us to describe to the public, especially new
22 people or old people who have been here before,
23 on what we actually have done. That's why I
24 think it's important that the Best Practice
25 document get on the web site. I don't know if

1 people in this room understand what we've just
2 been talking about. Do you? Pretty much?

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Some people
4 looked at my copy. I think we're good.

5 NANCY BALE: I don't want people
6 to be confused. You know, if someone in the
7 audience is confused, I suppose they could raise
8 their hand. What are you talking about? It
9 seems like we go into our -- we get into a
10 confusion sometimes about what we're doing and
11 the public's here. So I just want them to be
12 sure they know what it is we are doing.

13 SALLY GIBERT: I think most of
14 them are up to speed.

15 Any more for Best Practices or
16 any more sort of to-do lists? So the next thing
17 you're going to do is schedule an aviation
18 meeting?

19 SUZANNE RUST: Yes. Work group.

20 SALLY GIBERT: With the idea
21 toward getting things out. Okay.

22 SUZANNE RUST: Objective of
23 getting the Best Practices.

24 TOM GEORGE: Working on reaching
25 out to the GA, the broader GA.

1 SUZANNE RUST: Yes.

2 RANDY KILBOURN: Can I add
3 something to that, on the GA part of it. This
4 will clear up something for Charlie. I think
5 the Best Practices have been used for the air
6 services and incorporated into training for the
7 past few seasons at least. But the general
8 aviation, we find -- I think it's going to take
9 some work. I mean, even with a map in their
10 hand they barely know where they are. They have
11 trouble even pronouncing the word Tokositna for
12 one thing. So we're going to have to really
13 come up with something that's going to really
14 simplify. Like a flow or a pattern or -- you
15 know, because we know the area so well, I think
16 it's -- we can write these detailed practices
17 and they're fairly easily followed by the
18 operators, but the general aviation, I think
19 we're really going to have to kind of make a --
20 we're going to have to figure out the best way
21 to simplify it.

22 SUZANNE RUST: I want to add to
23 that. I think that's where the education
24 component is. There may be opportunities to
25 present a seminar about flying in Denali at

1 different forums and creating a buzz in the
2 community. I think that that might be effective
3 then in driving somebody to a document or to
4 something that's simplified to where they could
5 understand it. I think it's going to be kind of
6 a multi-part solution versus getting this out
7 and it being very effective. I think it's going
8 to be a little more challenging than that.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Anything
10 else on No. 7?

11 Another opportunity for anymore
12 public comments. That was a good one right
13 there.

14 SUZANNE RUST: I think Eric had
15 something to say earlier.

16 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah. It
17 takes quite a while, but I've got some ideas
18 when you get ready to do that. If you're trying
19 to reach GA, then putting it on your web site,
20 no, if that's who you're trying to reach. I've
21 got some ideas.

22 BRIAN OKONEK: This might be a
23 good time to go over it. I mean, we're talking
24 about it right now.

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: What about a

1 special use air space? All you got to do is
2 look at that and go, huh, read over on the
3 sidebar. It refers to the things that are going
4 on up there. Refer to this map, whatever it is.
5 I mean, a lot of places have that. Pilots
6 coming into the area are going to look at the
7 sectional, okay, special use air space. All
8 they got to do is refer to something, see note,
9 whatever it is. They go down and look at it and
10 it says, go pick up a chart at the flight
11 service station. On the chart you have those
12 things.

13 You can list the Best Practices
14 in general. You could put something in the
15 supplement. Put something in there and say,
16 refer to the supplement page. Whatever the hell
17 it is. If we're serious about reaching them
18 about all of those areas, then that's an
19 expandable way to reach general aviation. They
20 do look at those things. They're not going to
21 look at the web site. That's not where I'd
22 refer to if I were a general aviation pilot.

23 A suggestion. I know it takes a
24 little bit of work to walk through that, but
25 those guys are slow as molasses too on making

1 those changes. They moved the Ouzinkie airport
2 about two miles. If you didn't know that, you'd
3 go, what the hell? Where did all these logs
4 come from? So it takes them a while to do those
5 things, but it's a positive step to reach the
6 general aviation audience. It may not happen
7 this year, but it could happen on a further
8 revision in the sectional.

9 MIKE YORKE: I think you're right
10 on, Eric. We've kind of discussed this before.
11 If I may offer a suggestion. I think Suzanne is
12 completely right. It's something that probably
13 should go to the working group. It's something
14 that should be done talking and -- I've read
15 here that it says, Best Practices have been
16 recommended for the Gorge. I know recommend is
17 not completed. Work in action, I think we all
18 know that.

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I'll take that
20 as an IOU.

21 MIKE YORKE: And I'll join you in
22 that.

23 I did look at the chart here. I
24 did talk with Darrell Burke. He's one of these
25 guys that can get things done. The verbiage

1 over here, it does say -- and you're correct --
2 special use air space information service
3 available on 25.3, See Alaska Supplement. We
4 thought something like this for flight in the
5 Mount McKinley area, See Alaska Supplement for
6 Denali flight information. We would put a web
7 site on there because it's easy to do. Yeah,
8 you're right, if you're flying, you're not going
9 to do that, but if you're going to go maybe next
10 week or something, that would be an added. I
11 don't think that's the only way to get
12 information out. I think the Salmon, which is
13 going to stay, is -- we carry it, you know.

14 PAUL RODERICK: Is it going to
15 stay or not?

16 MIKE YORKE: It's going to stay.
17 We were looking grim.

18 PAUL RODERICK: I think most of
19 us think it should because it gets refreshed.

20 MIKE YORKE: The information we
21 got was incorrect, that it was going to go away.

22 PAUL RODERICK: That would be a
23 great place to put it. I mean, if we could get
24 it in the Salmon, it would be worth it.

25 MIKE YORKE: We actually have a

1 page there, Denali Flight. You guys know it all
2 better than I do. If you look to the left, it
3 says, Denali Flight Advisory and it does say
4 some issues there. And maybe -- I don't know if
5 we can get Best Practices in there, but we could
6 get a reference to somewhere and that's where
7 the link would come in that -- I'm similar to
8 you in that context, Eric, that I don't like all
9 of that, but we can only get so much going in
10 there.

11 TIM CUDNEY: Outside of the
12 aviation handbook that you talked about, wasn't
13 there some direction that it was all going to go
14 electronic eventually?

15 MIKE YORKE: That's still on
16 hold, which we think is a good thing. There was
17 a move --

18 TIM CUDNEY: Was it the cost
19 involved? Obviously a lot of things are going
20 electronic now, but where did it evolve from,
21 this production to electronic?

22 MIKE YORKE: To going electronic,
23 was it cost-driven? I don't know.

24 TIM CUDNEY: Because obviously
25 the aviation handbook is not cheap, if it's as

1 big as you say it is.

2 MIKE YORKE: It's pretty big --
3 8,000 and they'll be mailed out again. That was
4 some money that was set aside to runway safety.
5 The ideal, for those of you not familiar, is --
6 I think Airmans Association did it years ago.
7 They had one and it said, flying up the highway,
8 this is --

9 ERIKA BENNETT: It's called the
10 Logbook. We're still in the middle of updating
11 it right now.

12 MIKE YORKE: Yeah. So this was
13 to parallel that. It was going to be mailed to
14 all eight dozen aviators in the State of Alaska.

15 TOM GEORGE: So you're competing
16 with the Alaska Airmans? Is that what I'm
17 hearing?

18 MIKE YORKE: No, but I think
19 something for no cost that can get the
20 information out when the government has the
21 funding.

22 TOM GEORGE: I'm teasing you. In
23 fact, many years ago the FAA had some kind of an
24 Alaska flying publication, but it went the way
25 of all these one-time publications. It was

1 there and for the first few years it was
2 abundant; it was fresh. Then in the latter
3 years it was less abundant and it was stale and
4 it eventually fell off the face of the earth.
5 So that's a typical cycle we go through with
6 these one-time things. They're great. If we
7 can do them, that's fine, that's wonderful.
8 They're not necessarily a long-term solution
9 unless people really budget for it and very
10 seldom do they budget to keep glossy
11 publications going.

12 MIKE YORKE: And that's why I
13 support the www world, because this is the
14 long-term solution to publications. Whether we
15 want it or not, it's the long-term solution to
16 publications.

17 TOM GEORGE: The good thing about
18 the web, even though it's not accessible in the
19 cockpit necessarily, is that you can have a
20 richness of detail on the web, color, videos,
21 animation, all kinds of things that you can't
22 get in some of these other publications. We
23 need to design several layers of information
24 which all kind of play off each other rather
25 than thinking that any one of these by itself

1 does the job. The Salmon document, yeah, it's
2 going to be with us for quite a while in the
3 future. But even that, it's a black-and-white
4 publication. Even gray scale doesn't come
5 through very well. So we put the things that we
6 can in there that make sense. We put links to
7 the richer information that's available on the
8 Internet and much easier and cheaper to update.
9 I mean, we need that whole spectrum of products
10 to really have a campaign to reach the audiences
11 we're talking about.

12 TIM CUDNEY: Echoing Tom, I
13 remember when we were involved in this the first
14 go-round was '99 and then it took ten years to
15 get the next version. I certainly don't want to
16 see another ten-year lag between the information
17 that we've been working on and obviously having
18 an advocate like yourself to push it through is
19 beneficial. We're also inundated with
20 documentation these days.

21 Sure, everybody likes to have a
22 piece of paper that they can quick reference.
23 We're sitting here in Talkeetna. I just went to
24 look up. Well, there's no wireless. And I've
25 even got a data card and I can't access it here,

1 so we're kind of on that little edge of how much
2 of this information is available electronically
3 and how much is still in a practical world of
4 where we could carry something around in our
5 flight bag. I think, again, we're still not
6 quite there yet, but to get the information that
7 we have to the public -- Paul is right on.
8 People are flying around in the park, you know,
9 haven't got a clue of where the heck they are.

10 PAUL RODERICK: Even if you
11 detailed it as well as you possibly could, it
12 would be difficult. Because it takes a few
13 seasons to really get to know the area. We go
14 over this thing for the general aviation, it's
15 going to have to really be a simple type flow
16 pattern, real easy to understand.

17 TIM CUDNEY: Let's not lose sight
18 of the safety side of things. Some of the
19 fatalities and some of the data will show some
20 of the more prevalent accidents in the National
21 Park are from -- pardon the expression -- the
22 weekend warriors. It's an education.

23 PAUL RODERICK: Although one
24 thing we have to say, I think the Best Practices
25 are being used by probably 95 percent of the use

1 up there because it's really just the commercial
2 operators out of Talkeetna and Denali Park
3 itself. So the general aviation, while they're
4 still up there, it's pretty small. I'd say
5 general aviation aircraft --

6 TIM CUDNEY: On the scope of
7 things.

8 PAUL RODERICK: Yeah, on the
9 scope of things. On the scenic flights, it's
10 pretty rare actually. We're up there, but it's
11 still a percent, maybe 2. I don't know if
12 anybody's ever documented it.

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's an
14 interesting perspective right there, which is if
15 it's so rare, then why would we put that much
16 effort into communicating for such a small
17 benefit.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Because of the
19 behavior.

20 PAUL RODERICK: It's a red flag
21 for all of us.

22 TIM CUDNEY: It's a big safety
23 concern.

24 PAUL RODERICK: The reason is
25 because they could say they're somewhere and

1 they actually will say, I'm over this glacier
2 and they won't pronounce it right, but they will
3 be there. I mean, they won't be anywhere within
4 ten miles of it, so it does get your attention.

5 TOM GEORGE: But it is a head's
6 up to you guys that there's somebody in the area
7 that's not familiar with it and therefore we
8 should be extra vigilant.

9 PAUL RODERICK: Even though they
10 say they might be a mile away from you or less.
11 We need to really figure out the most simple
12 means. We haven't really addressed this yet and
13 that's why Tom was saying that we need some more
14 time to design.

15 TOM GEORGE: To really design
16 products for that audience. Our strategy, which
17 I think has been a good one, is to focus on
18 people that are there the lion's share of the
19 time first. Work out some of these practices,
20 work with them. Then as second and third steps,
21 reach out to the other audiences. There's some
22 audiences in between too. That's where we're
23 delighted again to have Gary here. There are
24 people that are commercial operators that
25 probably are there more often than the regular

1 GA pilot, but not as often as the
2 Talkeetna-based folks. Erika mentioned this
3 too. There are a number of audiences that we
4 can through time kind of subset and the
5 campaigns to reach those different audiences may
6 be very different. Some we can identify exactly
7 who they are and go directly to them. Others
8 we're going to have to work on this more general
9 information and a different level of
10 communication. These are all good things; they
11 just are going to take time to roll out in some
12 order. But I think the order in which we're
13 working on them is very sound.

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: This is just an
15 observation. The original premise for this was
16 about sound mitigation. So with the commercial
17 operators we get -- basically we accomplish that
18 mission when the guys -- or you guys are moving
19 in different places or whatever the practices
20 are. So now the safety question, your
21 interaction with the private aviation is a
22 secondary -- even though safety is important,
23 it's actually second to the original mission.

24 SUZANNE RUST: No, no, no.

25 TOM GEORGE: No, no.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm not really
2 in -- in my position, in particular, because I'm
3 not a pilot, I'm not going to dictate what is
4 safe or not safe for the operator.

5 SUZANNE RUST: But I want to add
6 something. I think we really have to go back to
7 why this group was created. If you go back to
8 the mission statement, safety -- it was safety
9 and for mitigation. It's both. And what I was
10 going to point out, this may be important from
11 what small bit or whatever sound impact that
12 they create, but it's also secondary and
13 probably a really important benefit is the
14 safety.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: For sure.

16 SUZANNE RUST: That's very
17 worthwhile. Since we go back again to the very
18 beginning of this group and that mission that
19 safety was -- the group was created for safety
20 and to help mitigate, you know --

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: When you guys
22 were talking about the working groups and that
23 really is where you guys are -- this Council's
24 responsibility -- it seems that I'm not doing a
25 very good job of articulating this. But I see

1 the --

2 TOM GEORGE: Madam Chairman,
3 we've been going at this over an hour. How
4 about a five-minute break, and that will give
5 Charlie a chance to think about what he's saying
6 and spit it out.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

8 (Break taken.)

9 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. We're back.

10 Next on the agenda is John
11 Leonard who's going to talk about the south side
12 monitoring.

13 JOHN LEONARD: Well, I don't
14 really have an agenda. I think we discussed in
15 the meeting at Denali some of the feedback we
16 got from last season -- the late summer or fall
17 meeting. I am more here, I guess, to offer -- I
18 don't know if you call them our services, but in
19 the last year I think you guys are familiar with
20 the fact that you had asked us to monitor Best
21 Practices, and we're more than willing to do
22 that again this year. We have our schedules out
23 for the year, where we'll be in different parts
24 of the range, Denali and the Ruth and Little
25 Swiss. I think we're scheduled right now for

1 about 55 days, so there may be a chance to
2 monitor for Best Practices for those areas if
3 you'd like.

4 Last year there were a couple of
5 things. We got the Best Practices and then we
6 kind of left it open-ended on how do we get
7 information back. As I got some information
8 back from the field, I thought it most important
9 to pass that information on to Suzanne because
10 she was on the group. And I thought from at
11 least the couple of instances, and there were
12 only a couple that were discussed at the last
13 meeting at Denali. After that information got
14 back to Suzanne, things got fixed. I didn't get
15 anymore information from the field than what was
16 passed along. That was only early in the
17 season.

18 One thing that would help us and
19 was kind of a part of the discussion you guys
20 had earlier, but if there was a way that you
21 guys could take this Best Practice document, the
22 words, and somehow project that on a map, that
23 would be helpful. We can help with that, but I
24 figure it was something that was more intuitive
25 and more visual that could be used as a

1 reference. I think that would be helpful for
2 the people out there in the field looking at it.
3 I don't think that document -- I have very
4 little skill in GIS work, but even something as
5 easy as one of the pilots flying that route and
6 I can give you a device that would record the
7 bread crumb or that track for that. Even
8 something like that that we can use as a
9 reference would be helpful. Even one of you
10 guys drawing it on a map and then we could
11 produce a product potentially that would get
12 passed back and forth, that would be good for
13 the people out there. Essentially if you guys
14 have things that you'd like us to look at and
15 pay attention to and get information back, I'm
16 open to it and you can let us know what we can
17 do.

18 BRIAN OKONEK: I just want to
19 talk about encouraging in talking to the
20 military pilots, when they start their
21 practicing here, about both the mountain stuff
22 and approach to town and approach to the airport
23 itself, you know. So incoming as they're coming
24 to Talkeetna about flight paths and altitudes.
25 And then also about the Park Service helicopter

1 for the season, I know last year there were a
2 few people saying they were approaching the
3 airport coming right over town and departing the
4 airport right over town. If it could go south,
5 weather permitting, before heading over to the
6 mountain, but taking it right over town. I
7 think that would be nice for everybody in town.

8 JOHN LEONARD: Absolutely. I
9 guess it's outside the focus of the group. As I
10 sat here and thought about the comments after
11 the fact last year, it's pretty clear that we
12 need to talk with the military beforehand.
13 They'll be here about April 12th and I'll make a
14 point to talk with them before they buzz some of
15 these houses and break windows, so we avoid some
16 of the unintended consequences we had last year.
17 Even though it's outside of the charter of the
18 group, I guess I would look for feedback on how
19 the community -- and maybe this isn't the right
20 forum -- but how we can do that so we have the
21 least impact as possible.

22 Last year we had a new pilot, so
23 there was part of a learning curve there, both
24 here in town and in the operations we were
25 doing. We have a different mission, but as best

1 we can on our flights, we try to adhere to the
2 Best Practices as well.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: My recollection
4 from last year is some of the problems with the
5 military is not that initial, because they got
6 kind of initial training, but it was when the
7 crews transferred later on. So somehow that
8 seemed to be the missing piece of information.
9 I don't know how you correct that, but --

10 ERIKA BENNETT: Change-out modes.

11 JOHN LEONARD: Last year we had a
12 lot of military aircraft and air crews in town
13 and they did switch out. It was that
14 change-out, they'd been doing it good for quite
15 a while and then a new crew came in and they
16 went right over Ed's house and we took a big
17 step back. Ed gave us some pretty immediate
18 feedback on that, the pilots and me. I think
19 it's on everybody's radar screen. We'll have to
20 reaffirm that for sure.

21 TOM GEORGE: Just to clarify.
22 We're just talking about the base camp move-in,
23 or is this something that goes beyond that?

24 JOHN LEONARD: With the military
25 we're kind of a benefactor to their training

1 operations. So they'll come down for two weeks,
2 like I say, the 12th through the end of April
3 and they train. We have an MOU with the
4 military and they use park lands to train their
5 crews for missions, and then as part of that
6 they insert our camps for us.

7 TOM GEORGE: So it is just in
8 that time? We're not talking about something
9 that progresses throughout the season? It's
10 just during that time pretty much? There was a
11 crew change-out in the middle of that?

12 JOHN LEONARD: Yeah. They bring
13 in -- last year they did at least one. I think
14 they do two now, change-outs. They'll leave --
15 actually they had five C-47s down here and I
16 think the most at one time was three or four
17 Blackhawks as well, and so they had multiple
18 crew switch-outs.

19 NANCY BALE: What were the date
20 sidebars on that?

21 JOHN LEONARD: I believe it's
22 April 12th to the end of the month, a little
23 weather dependent. I can tell you that other
24 interactions with the military that I've had
25 this last year, I was impressed with how aware

1 they are of flying inside of the park. They had
2 a VIP trip that they wanted to fly somebody
3 around the park and they called the park first
4 and said, hey, is it all right if we fly down
5 the Park Road? We said no, and they were very
6 responsive to that. I don't know how the call
7 came to me, ended up with me. They were asking
8 if it was okay. It's not my call, but I can
9 tell you I don't think it is. They seemed to be
10 very aware of regulations and AGLs -- is that
11 the proper term?

12 TOM GEORGE: Well, back to the
13 use of your staff to provide feedback on Best
14 Practices. I know last time you talked to Scott
15 Babos and he provided a little information on
16 some of the aircraft recognition. Is that
17 something that some part of the aviation
18 community could provide you any additional
19 assistance? You know, we want you to know what
20 Eric's planes look like versus somebody else's.
21 Again, this notion of the best feedback is, A,
22 you understand the Best Practices and, B, you
23 can -- instead of just assuming that any twin
24 engine airplane is a Navajo, perhaps be able to
25 be more specific about recognition. Is that

1 something that we or the FAA or whoever could
2 provide any additional assistance with to make
3 your observations as accurate as possible?

4 JOHN LEONARD: Yeah, I think so.
5 We talked about this in Denali too. To us,
6 anything with two engines is a Navajo because
7 that's what we know; that's what we see. So if
8 it's a Citation -- or not a Citation. What's
9 the pressurized -- Conquest, that's a Navajo to
10 us. So if there is some -- Scott had a little
11 flip chart that he --

12 TOM GEORGE: Of the military
13 aircraft?

14 JOHN LEONARD: For distances,
15 just kind of for pilots to gauge if it looks
16 this big, it's that. But if there were some
17 easy little thing. I mean, I could picture on
18 one side of this little cheat sheet a map of
19 what Best Practices look like and on the back
20 side there were outlines.

21 TOM GEORGE: Silhouettes or
22 something. At a break maybe we can talk more
23 about that just to see if we can fix you up with
24 any better information for that.

25 PAUL RODERICK: What about

1 military Best Practices? We're going to do the
2 ones for general aviation, but we see the
3 military up there as much as we see general
4 aviation.

5 TOM GEORGE: Well, let me add
6 since Scott Babos isn't here -- and later we're
7 going to talk about the JPARC, which I'm
8 delighted we're going to talk about. Let me
9 just say without getting too keep into it that
10 in those scoping meetings we discovered that we
11 actually have some problems in the civil world
12 with some of the military. One of the problems
13 is the civil world doesn't know who to call to
14 report a problem. Sure, you can call the FAA
15 and now it becomes a legal action and flags go
16 up in the air and nobody wants to talk other
17 than to the lawyers.

18 I'm sure if Scott was here he
19 would be telling you, and I'm sure at the next
20 meeting he will be telling you, that they are
21 working on refining a phone number, an 800
22 number, I believe it will be, that the civil
23 world can use if they see some practice that
24 they consider a problem or an issue. Just like
25 we're talking about here. That needs to be

1 reported now, the day it happened or the day
2 after, not six months later at the next general
3 meeting when somebody stands up and waves their
4 hand and says, we sure had a lot of problems
5 last summer.

6 SALLY GIBERT: He did give us an
7 800 number.

8 TOM GEORGE: Well, they're
9 revising that because we've made some more
10 points. We discovered that sending it to their
11 Public Affairs wasn't necessarily the right
12 answer. So I think you're going to see a change
13 in that that will be helpful to all of us in
14 terms of just getting feedback. This isn't a
15 matter of necessarily saying the sky's falling,
16 but it came out a lot in those follow-up calls I
17 made from those JPARC meetings. This isn't just
18 in military air space. It's on the north side
19 of Denali that people are having unexpected
20 encounters with military aircraft.

21 Now, it doesn't mean that every
22 unexpected encounter of an aircraft is
23 necessarily illegal or even a bad thing, but to
24 have a way to get that information in and figure
25 out where it was and do one of two things:

1 Educate us why that airplane was there and why
2 it's okay, or correct the action so that it
3 doesn't continue to happen in the future. So I
4 think we've got something and we'll make sure at
5 the next Council meeting it gets brought back
6 and refreshed, because I think they're having
7 some developments on the military side just
8 because of the JPARC stuff that will also
9 benefit us in the Denali arena.

10 SALLY GIBERT: And I would think
11 when that has stabilized and there is a
12 protocol, that we ought to put that on the
13 Denali Overflights web page.

14 TOM GEORGE: Potentially on the
15 Denali map is another tool.

16 As to the business of actually
17 helping you visualize those, I know -- and it's
18 on my list of things to talk about with Colin
19 Malone because the Park Service has been very
20 progressive. They already do have all the weigh
21 points that are shown on this in Google Earth
22 and in a GIS format. So it may not be much
23 extra work to take and crank out some products
24 specific to some key areas that could turn into
25 a hard copy or something that could be used for

1 your training.

2 What's the timing on your
3 training? Has it already happened?

4 JOHN LEONARD: No, we're just on
5 the front end right now. We don't have all our
6 staff on. So we will be in the range or on
7 Denali starting about April 25th. We'll be in
8 other parts of the range as early as next week,
9 but I don't think that's a concern with the lack
10 of overflights right now. So we're not going to
11 miss much.

12 I do want to mention this year we
13 do have a patrol that will be going up the
14 Muldrew Glacier. That happens about every three
15 years and we have ranger staff there. If you
16 guys wanted to take advantage of that for some
17 monitoring opportunities, you can let me know.
18 That's probably a good opportunity because it's
19 more resource-based. There's not a lot of
20 operational issues that come up then. So the
21 rangers that are on that, they can spend a fair
22 amount of time, I think, getting some good
23 monitoring data.

24 DAVID LEE: When are they
25 scheduled to go to the Muldrow?

1 JOHN LEONARD: They're going to
2 be there mid-April through the 10th of July.

3 TIM CUDNEY: They do the
4 traditional route in?

5 JOHN LEONARD: Yeah.

6 TIM CUDNEY: That would be good.

7 JOHN LEONARD: I know from a
8 number of years ago where I did that route,
9 there are different places where there does seem
10 to be quite a bit of traffic. One was coming
11 down the Muldrow and coming over Gunsight Pass
12 and then up at Carson's Notch there's a fair
13 amount of overflight traffic.

14 ERIKA BENNETT: That was the year
15 we went out and found you. I remember finding
16 you at Carson Pass.

17 JOHN LEONARD: That seems to be
18 the two places where there were planes coming
19 down. We'll be there again at the Ruth.

20 The thing last year on the
21 reporting was it was a little weird as far as
22 who the information went to. If we can tighten
23 that up. It seemed that it was most appropriate
24 to send it to Suzanne because she's on the
25 group, but as far as our relations with the

1 other operators here, it seemed like we were
2 excluding people. So if there's a way you guys
3 can just write that down.

4 SUZANNE RUST: Didn't we talk
5 about this last time? I think that we decided I
6 was going to still disseminate it, as I recall,
7 and that I would actually call folks on the
8 south side. We could write up a memo for
9 everybody too and I could send out something
10 like that. I'm glad to continue to do it or if
11 we can think of another way, I'd be fine with
12 that too.

13 AMANDA SMITH: I have a question
14 for the group of maybe how much -- because I
15 think there's other places that we can rely on
16 if we want to have others monitor. Especially
17 since the north side practices are new this
18 year -- you know, Best Practices or the
19 recommendations are going to be new. Having
20 that part, I think, would be key. There's
21 people who are consistently out that we could
22 reach on that north side who if they could
23 recognize -- knew what to look for and what to
24 recognize, they would be -- what I'm thinking of
25 is the staff members who are working in the

1 lodges out there. They're hiking on their days
2 off. They're trained to help with bird surveys
3 and any number of other surveys. You know, a
4 little bit of education for them, depending on
5 what kind of information we wanted back. These
6 people are on the ground hiking and listening
7 and pretty clued in.

8 So depending on if we wanted to
9 broaden the feedback that we're looking for, I
10 think that that would be possible, but needing a
11 cheat sheet would be integral to that, or it
12 doesn't have to just be people who are out on
13 that side all the time. We could go through the
14 backcountry office as well, randomly educating
15 users if they're going to be out for a number of
16 days or something like that. But I don't know
17 if we're interested yet in that kind of
18 feedback, so it's a question for the group.

19 ERIKA BENNETT: I think any
20 amount of feedback at this point, especially on
21 the north side would help, whether it be
22 educated or sort of like ad hoc. That seems to
23 be where we're lacking the most.

24 MIKE YORKE: A couple meetings
25 when we talked about the aviator's handbook

1 Scott Babos, the military representative here,
2 was talking about that publication that they
3 were going to put out. It's about 14 pages
4 long, similar to a salmon-sized book. I could
5 have been your hero and brought one, but it's
6 sitting on my desk today. But I can take an IOU
7 to get some of those to you, John. They are,
8 just as Tom talked about, this is a C-17. This
9 is a Raptor. And it does have some distance
10 issues there.

11 AMANDA SMITH: I think it would
12 also be helpful if someone on the ground would
13 be able to say -- and that, I know, is a trained
14 eye kind of thing -- but like, oh, I think it's
15 at 2,000 feet. Oh, it's 500 feet. Maybe that
16 would be too unpredictable because I think you
17 kind of need to know a little bit about aircraft
18 to be able to predict that.

19 MIKE YORKE: And that's kind of a
20 problem when you have everybody doing surveys.
21 There's no parameters, so what does look big?

22 JOHN LEONARD: One thing I just
23 wanted to reiterate from my point of view is
24 last year when I did provide feedback, I got a
25 little bit of Parks being a watchdog and I

1 really don't see us as that. We're trying to
2 put information in the system and that's
3 essentially all it is. I think, at least from
4 my perspective, that's obviously how I'm going
5 about it. I understand when we might talk to
6 them and pilots are going, oh, God, the Park
7 Service is out there watching us. That's not
8 our intention. We're just trying to provide
9 information for you guys to look at Best
10 Practices.

11 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, I think
12 that's good.

13 JOHN LEONARD: I don't know if I
14 passed this story along last year. We had a
15 couple of people that died while climbing and
16 their family wanted to come look at where they
17 passed away. So I asked one of the Navajo
18 pilots to help them go look at the place. The
19 pilot, I think, thought I was setting him up for
20 a sting. He said, I'm not going there, no way.

21 TOM GEORGE: I think you make a
22 good point. We want to be careful either with
23 Parks Service staff or well-intentioned
24 volunteers of not setting up a climate that
25 suggests that any time we see an airplane, this

1 is a bad thing, et cetera. So I do think we
2 have to be deliberate and a little bit careful
3 about how we design things like this. That's
4 where, again, starting with -- this is feedback
5 on some existing Best Practices. A, is it
6 improving the situation? B, are people not
7 following the Best Practice? This hopefully
8 helps us reach out to whatever audiences we
9 haven't got to yet to do some education. And,
10 C, is something we thought was a best practice
11 just displacing a problem and making it pop up
12 somewhere else, so we haven't solved the
13 problem; we've just moved it.

14 So I think those are some of the
15 goals of the feedback. We've got to be a little
16 careful how we do it so we don't just turn the
17 notion into that now everybody in the
18 backcountry is -- and any airplane seen in the
19 backcountry is a bad thing. I think that's why
20 we have an obligation, I think, to come up with
21 whatever information we have that helps you
22 visualize what those best practices are so that
23 your folks who may not be pilots and may not be
24 familiar with some of those routes have the
25 tools they need to then be able to say how this

1 is a problem or not. And we need to apply that
2 same logic, I think, to other people. So I
3 think we want to keep moving in this direction,
4 but we want to go just slow enough that we're
5 not creating a big problem out there that then
6 splatters back on all of us and keeps us from
7 making the progress that we hope to make by this
8 voluntary approach to identify the problems and
9 fixing them one at a time.

10 SUZANNE RUST: And we need to be
11 communicating clearly what this goal of the
12 feedback is. You know, it's to determine if the
13 Best Practices -- I think when you go with that
14 goal in mind and it's really clear, I think the
15 training and then the materials, having those
16 ready for folks will help us get a better
17 product back and more consistent.

18 TOM GEORGE: I guess I'd suggest
19 that using your staff, since that's a
20 well-defined group, at least as a starting point
21 to kind of work on that and maybe figure out the
22 best way to provide training and provide
23 feedback and the feedback mechanism, once it
24 gets to Suzanne or whoever, I think that is a
25 good way to kind of carefully move forward. We

1 already know on the north side because of the
2 structure of the Park Service, it may be a
3 different mechanism, but we can still probably
4 learn some pretty valuable lessons just from
5 your rangers and what does or doesn't work
6 there. So, to me, that's a real good starting
7 place for this effort. I think at a break or
8 whatever we should talk some more on some of
9 these details and see if we can -- you know,
10 through the FAA or some other mechanism get you
11 some additional materials on the aircraft ID
12 portion of it. And, again, it doesn't have to
13 be every aircraft, but the most likely ones
14 you're going to encounter, you know, Navajos
15 obviously. So I think we can work on that.
16 Then, do we need to do a little more work on the
17 feedback mechanism or do we think --

18 SUZANNE RUST: You mean as far as
19 getting the information out?

20 TOM GEORGE: Distributing that.

21 SUZANNE RUST: It might make
22 sense to have somebody on the north side -- you
23 know, there be a point person on the north side
24 if we got feedback and somebody on the south
25 side. I don't know. I'm glad to provide the

1 feedback and did so. Last year it could have
2 been either north or south side operators and
3 trying to figure out and make certain -- I made
4 calls to everyone and then followed up and got
5 back with John about what I figured out or what
6 I couldn't figure out.

7 TOM GEORGE: Maybe we should talk
8 about that at a break as well rather than tying
9 up meeting time. But it seems to me if you're
10 actually having to make individual phone calls,
11 that certainly can turn into an effort. I mean,
12 maybe e-mailing something to a distribution list
13 as a first wave of getting things out. But the
14 other challenge, again, is if we can run
15 anything to ground to figure it out, getting
16 that feedback back, I think, is also part of
17 this. So we're trying to close the loop.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Well, I think
19 especially since we're not going to get a north
20 side monitoring by the Park Service backcountry
21 rangers, maybe taking Amanda up on her idea with
22 the idea -- first of all, we haven't really done
23 anything on the north side, so what are we
24 measuring, but to get kind of a baseline and
25 then do it again. You know, realizing it's not

1 scientific, but I think more information is good
2 information. Height would be great, but I think
3 that it's very difficult to assess, but we could
4 do like a listening scale, Tom, like you
5 developed and we went on Petersville Road on,
6 you know, just a general 1 to 5, how loud it is,
7 how many did I see. It would be useful to know
8 and in this area on a clear day, did somebody
9 hear five flights or did they hear 35? Just
10 kind of general baseline information if people
11 are willing, in addition to what John's crew
12 will do on Muldrow Glacier. I don't see where
13 it hurts us any.

14 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah, I agree.

15 AMANDA SMITH: I do think that we
16 can expand the number of people who are
17 listening out there. I mean, Park Service only
18 has so many people out at any given time. I
19 think that it wouldn't be that hard to do with a
20 little cooperation and a little work from -- you
21 know, dare I suggest a working group of --

22 TOM GEORGE: She fell into that
23 trap. Wonderful.

24 AMANDA SMITH: -- a working group
25 of getting this information gathered. Because I

1 think, you know, maybe we're pitching it on a
2 three-year scale. You know, this is year 1
3 baseline, year 2 recommendations have been
4 made -- I'm mostly referring to north side
5 now -- year 2 recommendations have been made, so
6 2 and 3 are what we're collecting as
7 improvements. But it seems like we might as
8 well start that now and solicit the support from
9 the people out there so that they get used to
10 incorporating this into their spring training
11 and whoever we have go out there to train them
12 on it.

13 ERIKA BENNETT: If you had in
14 your hands a cheat sheet with the aircraft IDs
15 and kind of like the Best Practices overlay on
16 that stuff, how many people do you think you
17 could get that information out to?

18 AMANDA SMITH: Competent people?
19 At least -- I'd say probably 25 in the range of
20 where those people would be, would be from the
21 Wonder Lake area probably to Toklat and not much
22 further east from there. So it would be a
23 limited area, but they would be hiking on both
24 sides of the road.

25 ERIKA BENNETT: They would need

1 to know what a 206 looked like versus a --

2 AMANDA SMITH: They would not
3 have a clue, so they would need to know those
4 things, and also understand -- yeah, and maybe
5 working with Greg a little bit on that because
6 he's out there.

7 ERIKA BENNETT: I know it's
8 completely unscientific, but I like the idea a
9 lot.

10 TIM CUDNEY: Especially with the
11 users that are up there. Like I say, once we
12 get going, we don't change make and model.
13 We're there for the duration. It would be nice
14 to know that just because it's a red helicopter,
15 it's not a Park Service aircraft. It happens
16 all the time. The Park bird is red and silver
17 and that's not too far off from red and white,
18 but it's an entirely different make and model.

19 SUZANNE RUST: Is there a way to
20 form a group to work on some information that
21 would go out so that it could be easily
22 distributed and understandable and with certain
23 goals in mind?

24 SALLY GIBERT: I would think that
25 there's a lot of overlap between education for

1 the general aviation community, education for
2 the Park Service rangers and education for the
3 other volunteers. Everybody is going to kind
4 of -- general aviation doesn't need to know the
5 airplane types, but in terms of kind of the
6 graphic trail of Best Practices, I think there's
7 a lot of overlap there. So, yeah, I think that
8 would be good.

9 SUZANNE RUST: An education kind
10 of committee or --

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think we
12 already have one.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. There's the
14 existing outreach and education.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: I want to flip
16 over to the other side for a minute, which is --
17 like a perspective for the climbing contingent,
18 and I'm on this side of it. I think we want to
19 be attentive to the question that we're trying
20 to ask. What are we trying to get back?
21 Because you could inadvertently be making a
22 push-pull, which is not useful to this thing
23 here. And the reason that we're sort of here in
24 the big picture is that there were complaints,
25 right? They showed up without any system.

1 People said it's too loud or there's a problem.
2 You know, it was anecdotal. It came up and then
3 this group was formed, right? So let's be
4 careful with the question.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think this
6 is a good time -- I appreciate your enthusiasm
7 and energy and willing to think about a working
8 group. I think we're going to learn a lot in
9 the next presentations by Park Service regarding
10 the data that Park Service is intending to
11 gather, and that might help influence how you
12 proceed, the next step of this and how -- you
13 know, we would hate to have kind of like one set
14 of data that Park Service truthfully feels very
15 confident in because of how it was gathered, and
16 then you have this whole anecdotal set over
17 here, right, which I've got to tell you, Park
18 Service is going to give less value to that. So
19 if you really want to make a difference in terms
20 of -- we certainly want the two to inform one
21 another, but we have to work cooperatively as
22 the process goes. So the same question that you
23 have already asked Park Service to pursue in our
24 monitoring I would hope would be similar to the
25 ones that you would be looking at from the

1 volunteer group.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Or additive, or
3 maybe filling in missing holes perhaps.

4 AMANDA SMITH: It needs to be
5 working in conjunction. Any questions we're
6 asking which have been thought out and sort of
7 vetted by this group and the Park Service is
8 working in conjunction with the information
9 we're seeking on a scientific level to make it
10 as comprehensive as we can.

11 TOM GEORGE: With that in mind, I
12 think this is a good idea. I think we ought to
13 write down as an item to come back to later in
14 the day after we've been through some of those
15 other presentations, which will give us some
16 other ideas on what's going on already, and then
17 we can take a look at what we should or
18 shouldn't do or how we should or shouldn't do
19 it. Yeah, I think you make a good point. We'll
20 commit you later. You're not skating on
21 anything here. It's deferring the inevitable.

22 SALLY GIBERT: I think that's
23 good.

24 John, do you have anything else?

25 JOHN LEONARD: So I guess the

1 three questions I have is -- or answers is
2 monitoring, yes, same parameters as last year
3 and how we want to do the feedback. And then
4 the third, if we want monitoring in the Ruth and
5 watching Best Practices and then on that north
6 side trail, which I don't believe there's Best
7 Practices up there. I'm not exactly familiar
8 with the Muldrow corridor as far as Best
9 Practices. You want us to get you guys
10 information on the Ruth and on the Muldrow.
11 Muldrow, if I can get it to you guys by May
12 15th, that's plenty of time to be prepared for
13 it. Then the Ruth as soon as you can because
14 we'll have people out there shortly.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: Did you say a
16 Best Practice for those two?

17 BRIAN OKONEK: We have a Best
18 Practice for the Ruth and that would be
19 fantastic to monitor that.

20 TOM GEORGE: So our IOU, then, to
21 you somehow, through Colin or whatever, is to
22 come up with a better visualization of that Best
23 Practice that you can use in your training and
24 in the field to be able to see what the Best
25 Practice is and therefore what significant

1 excursions from it look like and we'll work on
2 that.

3 BRIAN OKONEK: As far as the
4 Muldrow trip, I think there aren't Best
5 Practices established right now for Gunsight
6 Pass area, Carson's Notch and stuff, but just to
7 report back what type of -- what the activity
8 was like, the aviation activity was like. Was
9 it -- were the flights really loud and really
10 frequent through Carson's Notch, or was it
11 infrequent and not loud? You know, it would be
12 nice to know what's happening. Definitely on
13 the Harper I would be interested to know how the
14 summit flights affect the experience on the
15 Harper Glacier.

16 ERIKA BENNETT: A lot of the Best
17 Practices up high actually have people on the
18 east side more than the west side now.

19 JOHN LEONARD: If you could, as a
20 group or whoever's responsible for it, just give
21 me a paragraph of what you want and then we
22 could put it out and gather the information for
23 you. I can come up with my own idea, but I
24 think we're on the track of having you guys ask
25 for specific stuff and we can get that back to

1 you.

2 TOM GEORGE: So, Sally, why don't
3 you put that on your list of things we need to
4 come back to and come up with what we're going
5 to do.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you.

7 Davyd, are you ready? Where are
8 you? Davyd Bechkel.

9 DAVYD BECHKEL: First of all, for
10 those who don't know me, my name's Davyd
11 Bechkel. I'm the soundscape scientist for the
12 park. I just took over for Jared Withers. He's
13 no longer with us. One of the projects we'd
14 been working on that you guys were interested in
15 was --

16 NANCY BALE: What is your title?

17 DAVYD BECHKEL: I'm a physical
18 science technician, is my official title.

19 NANCY BALE: Okay. But you're
20 the head of the soundscape monitoring.

21 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yes.

22 NANCY BALE: Do you have people
23 under you?

24 DAVYD BECHKEL: No. This is me
25 now. Just me.

1 NANCY BALE: Are you going to get
2 someone under you?

3 DAVYD BECHKEL: No, but they're
4 hiring a new backcountry ecologist, so that will
5 be my new supervisor.

6 One of the things that Jared and
7 I presented at the meeting earlier on was this
8 web app. Miriam asked me to talk to you a
9 little bit about the app. It's actually
10 currently live on the Internet right now. This
11 is not live on the Internet because I couldn't
12 get a connection, but it's in the current form
13 that you saw before and for those of you who
14 didn't see it, I can give you an example of kind
15 of what it allows you to do. It allows a
16 visitor to the web site to explore our data set.
17 I mean, would you like to see it again?

18 I'll show you just an example of
19 it. I'll give you a photograph. Biophony,
20 geophony, so natural and geological sounds.
21 Some of the metrics concerning the actual
22 natural ambient levels and then aircraft traffic
23 pertaining to each one of the standards and the
24 percentage of time audible, the number of events
25 per day over natural ambient level and the

1 maximum SPL. It will give you kind of a summary
2 of what you're looking at as well as some of the
3 basic meta data for each of the sites. So the
4 actual URL I've got if you want to write that
5 down. You can find it from our e-features page,
6 which is a new page that the audio-visual staff
7 put up.

8 NANCY BALE: Can you leave that
9 on there for just a second?

10 DAVYD BECHKEL: Sure. I'll leave
11 it up for a while. I've got a lot of
12 information and I don't mind e-mailing it out to
13 people if you give me your e-mail address later.
14 I can send you the information.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: How about
16 that's an item we just put on the Council's web
17 page.

18 DAVYD BECHKEL: I'm looking for
19 feedback too. I'm kind of worried, I guess,
20 about finding that on the web.

21 The second thing I'd like to talk
22 about today is our 2011 sound locations, sound
23 sampling locations document. I've got it in a
24 Word format. I'll show you just kind of briefly
25 what it shows, and I'm going to focus on

1 specifically where the sites are going to be
2 located this year in 2011 and then all the sites
3 we've sampled so far from 2006 to 2010. So in
4 this document it kind of gives a background on
5 why we sample, which you're pretty familiar with
6 at this point. Then it will give you a map of
7 where the different locations are going to be
8 for 2011. Give you -- it's sort of sideways
9 here -- but it will give you an idea of when
10 we're going to be sampling at each location.
11 And then specific geographic locations as well
12 as the coordinates, how they're going to be
13 accessed, et cetera. It has that for pretty
14 much all the different sets.

15 Then way at the bottom, then
16 there's a map of all the sites we've sampled so
17 far. I have that in a Word document and in pdf
18 format. It's pretty large. It's about 21
19 megabytes. I'm going to show you right now
20 specifically the graph or the map that will show
21 you -- I don't know if that's really very
22 visible, is it? Let's see if I can't get --
23 that's better. Okay.

24 I'm going to zoom in and scroll
25 up. So in green are our grade points. There

1 are randomly sampled. There are six of them.
2 One at Estock (ph) Mountain to the north, Fang
3 Mountain in the eastern part of the park.
4 There's one up at West Kantishna Hills, kind of
5 near Otter Creek, I think. There's one off the
6 McKinley Bar Trail near Wonder Lake. Then two
7 out west on the Herron Glacier on the north
8 side, and then one kind of right on the spine of
9 the western part of the park on the Upper Yentna
10 Glacier. These are all going to be for the
11 upcoming summer season.

12 And then in blue for the winter
13 sites -- and we're not going to sample all of
14 those. Probably one of them would be ideal for
15 the winter sites. Lower East Fork was sampled
16 in 2009, so that's probably unlikely. So
17 Tokositna Toe, Dunkle Hills, Boulder probably
18 will be likely candidates for winter sites.
19 There's one site at the Stampede air strip.

20 PAUL RODERICK: So where on the
21 Upper Yentna? Just in general.

22 DAVYD BECHKEL: It's on kind of
23 the main glacier itself as it branches up to the
24 east there. There's two forks and then it's on
25 the east again of that, and then there's a final

1 fork and it's on the west side.

2 And then, lastly and finally,
3 there are the -- in yellow you've got the
4 administrative sites. And they are this season
5 social science. There will be three social
6 science sites that are part of the sound survey,
7 and I think we'll talk a little bit more about
8 that. But there's one going to be at the north
9 end of the Triple Lakes Trail, right after the
10 crossing of Rabbit Creek. There's going to be
11 one at 7800 foot camp, just above base camp.
12 It's not shown in yellow, but it happens to be
13 that the third one they chose was at the
14 McKinley Bar Trail. I think it was a randomly
15 placed site and a social science site together.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Davyd, just to
17 make that connection. Visitor surveys that are
18 being done are these social science things. So
19 it's the correlation of visitor surveys being
20 conducted at the same time we're gathering some
21 monitoring data.

22 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yes. The
23 physical data that are going to accompany the
24 survey. I forgot to mention that. Then, I
25 guess we haven't quite figured it out yet, but

1 I've got a station up at 17,000 foot camp. So
2 that's the 2011 sites.

3 Do you have any questions about
4 those so far? Pretty straightforward, I guess.

5 PAUL RODERICK: And the Herron
6 Glacier one, that's going to be at the --

7 DAVYD BECHKEL: That's near the
8 toe.

9 TOM GEORGE: It's one of the grid
10 sites?

11 DAVYD BECHKEL: One of the grid
12 sites. You got it.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: In the past
14 the Council has been asked to provide its input
15 for the administrative site, which is outside of
16 the grid pattern but we can locate. Some
17 selection was made for these three social
18 science, the ones that -- and even on McKinley
19 Bar Trail it will come up in yellow. Davyd
20 presented the visitor surveys that the Council
21 has been so interested in and making the
22 correlation to the data that we gathered from
23 sound monitoring. In addition, there's a desire
24 by the Council to further understand what's
25 happening on our mountain routes, right?

1 Does this kind of satisfy the
2 information needs that the Council has?
3 Charlie.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: I think we have
5 a new Best Practice for this year on the Ruth;
6 is that right?

7 SUZANNE RUST: Yes.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: What if we made
9 a suggestion to monitor there? We have a Best
10 Practice going forward on the Ruth. Why don't
11 we put one of the monitoring positions there. I
12 mean, you guys have monitored it before, but now
13 we have a practice and -- so, throw that out
14 there.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The next
16 overlay, Davyd, is also the request from the
17 Council that had been for this meeting to look
18 at where the sites have been monitored so that
19 you could compare baseline data so that when you
20 are making a recommendation, there's something
21 to compare to. I know that we've done a lot on
22 the Ruth, but I don't know if it was part of the
23 sound sampling since 2006.

24 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yes. I'll show
25 you what we've sampled so far and what we're

1 able to make comparisons to. Some of the older
2 data sets that we have aren't in the same -- we
3 weren't collecting the same kind of data. When
4 Chad Holtz or Sam Bresam (ph) were here back in
5 2000 to 2005, some of that data doesn't really
6 line up quite as well. So what I've got on this
7 map is all the stuff from 2006 to 2010, so all
8 of the stuff that Jared did and some of the
9 stuff I've done. We sampled on the toe of the
10 Ruth in 2006. The thought occurs to me that if
11 you're implementing the measure this year, it
12 maybe makes more sense to wait a year until it's
13 been implemented and then maybe think about that
14 for 2012.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm not the
16 science guy, so you tell me.

17 ERIKA BENNETT: Since there's no
18 baseline right now.

19 DAVYD BECHKEL: You'd be kind of
20 in a transition.

21 BRIAN OKONEK: And then maybe
22 2012 put something in the gorge.

23 AMANDA SMITH: That would maybe
24 also go along with the social. Is that your
25 intention, Charlie?

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah.

2 AMANDA SMITH: Because it's a
3 popular place, so it would be the data along
4 with the social survey.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, bring
6 them together and looking at the future
7 monitoring there.

8 DAVYD BECHKEL: So one of the
9 reasons that this map is included in the 2011
10 site locations map is because if you chose that
11 same spot, it's easier for me to go back, do the
12 statistics and do the comparison, and be able to
13 make a useful and accurate comparison. You
14 know, there's a lot of aircraft flying around.
15 It's a complex environment out there. If you
16 measure in exactly the same spot, you can
17 minimize the amount of error that you have in
18 your comparison.

19 BRIAN OKONEK: Except measuring
20 at the toe does nothing for knowing what's
21 happening in the gorge.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's where
23 the practice is implemented.

24 BRIAN OKONEK: That's right.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: So we have to

1 move the monitoring to where the practice is.

2 TOM GEORGE: What this is showing
3 you is that there's no baseline in there --

4 BRIAN OKONEK: Right.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Are there any of
6 those existing sites that are near areas that
7 are specifically affected by Best Practices?

8 DAVYD BECHKEL: I imagine the
9 head of the toe. There's one at 14 camp.

10 NANCY BALE: 17.

11 DAVYD BECHKEL: 17 camp? We'll
12 see about that one.

13 TOM GEORGE: Is your Triple Lakes
14 one an exact repeat? You're going to go back to
15 the exact same location?

16 DAVYD BECHKEL: The way the
17 survey worked out they were going to try to get
18 people who are -- a good number of survey
19 participants, so they're trying to focus on
20 either one of the entrances.

21 TOM GEORGE: So the answer is no,
22 it's not, but it will be tied to a place where
23 there's a social survey. I mean, I think this
24 notion of tying some of these soundscape
25 monitoring sites to places where there's a

1 social survey so we can start to get that
2 comparison. It's one thing to have a set of
3 numbers. It's something else to have some
4 measure of feedback as to what people's
5 reactions were. So I think co-locating those is
6 very good for some of our interests to really
7 understand and to tie people's perceptions with
8 these absolute numbers that come out of
9 soundscape. So I think that's good. Where we
10 can do that, I think we should.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Somebody asked
12 the question if the interest is in having a
13 reduction of impact to the soundscape in the
14 Ruth Gorge and there's -- am I hearing that
15 correctly, which is why your best practice kind
16 of talks about -- so Charlie is saying yes.

17 TOM GEORGE: I don't understand
18 the question.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: One of the
20 problems I think we have here is that by the
21 time the Council provides us information, we
22 already have gone through the compliance to set
23 the sound stations up. I'm trying to get ahead
24 of the curve now. If you're interested in the
25 Ruth and if there's an opportunity -- and I'm

1 not -- poor Davyd is being put on the spot. But
2 there's an opportunity to put a sound monitoring
3 station in the Ruth this year and it won't be
4 that baseline because some of the Best Practices
5 will be taking place, right. Now, I will tell
6 you, to say that you're going to go next year
7 and compare how well are we doing, our
8 opportunity to get a visitor survey through the
9 system, like if that's something you really want
10 to work for is just understanding the Ruth
11 experience, we need to know like now.

12 BRIAN OKONEK: Yes.

13 TOM GEORGE: So we need to hear
14 then what the other people later are going to
15 say about your plans for social science and
16 visitor surveys and then come back to that
17 question. We can't answer it now. We've heard
18 one part but not the other part. The point I
19 think you're making, though, is at the moment
20 there is no baseline. The only place you could
21 make a comparison has to be where the Ruth is,
22 at the toe, which isn't really going to be
23 impacted as near as I can tell by the Best
24 Practice change that was made further up. So
25 monitoring the air, even though it is a case

1 where there's a repeat before and after, you
2 could tell if there's a change -- it's like
3 we're putting the volt meter in the wrong place.
4 So that's a questionable value.

5 So now the question is: Are
6 there any social science plans and, if so, can
7 we co-locate with those so that we make this tie
8 between visitor surveys and actual sound
9 measurements. To answer that question we've got
10 to wait for the other talk. So I'd say we can't
11 answer that question yet.

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: All I'm
13 prompting is to be thinking about it and
14 thinking about how long it will take the
15 National Park Service to get it in place.

16 ERIKA BENNETT: If we have
17 hypothetically a monitoring station in the Ruth
18 this year. We could possibly do another one
19 next year, co-locate it with the social science
20 and then we have two years back to back of
21 monitoring.

22 TOM GEORGE: Well, you've already
23 made your change, so it's not telling you before
24 and after the change. You can go back. To me,
25 it's questionable. Why do you want to throw one

1 out there now? You'd probably want to wait
2 until you do the social science because that's
3 going to be the best benefit of the sound
4 monitoring site there. Because we can't go back
5 in time.

6 AMANDA SMITH: But it would be
7 more data.

8 TOM GEORGE: More data isn't
9 always helpful if it isn't strategically
10 positioned. We need to go back to this
11 discussion after we've heard the rest of what
12 the Park Service --

13 BRIAN OKONEK: Let's do a sound
14 study three years ago.

15 TOM GEORGE: If we could go back
16 through the time machine and do a retrospective
17 sound study, we'd have all kinds of ideas.

18 RANDY KILBOURN: Are you taking
19 into consideration that military operations
20 area, kind of the lower left?

21 DAVYD BECHKEL: Absolutely.

22 RANDY KILBOURN: Because you can
23 hear military airplanes through quite a bit of
24 that area you've got. You have taken that into
25 consideration?

1 DAVYD BECHKEL: Definitely.

2 ERIKA BENNETT: They can actually
3 pull out exactly what kind of airplanes doing
4 soundscapes.

5 TOM GEORGE: They can?

6 SALLY GIBERT: There are
7 different signatures.

8 DAVYD BECHKEL: There's a limited
9 amount of ability to distinguish. We can
10 distinguish between jets, props and helicopters
11 for the most part. Sometimes even between -- I
12 mean, not with any sort of certainty, but
13 between different kinds of turbo props. We can
14 see a different kind of signature than a regular
15 typical jet.

16 Then the last thing I wanted to
17 show you was a bit of a graph I worked up that
18 shows -- what it shows here is all the sites
19 we've sampled from 2006 to 2010. It shows you a
20 breakdown of traffic by aircraft types. In blue
21 you've got prop aircraft; yellow, you've got
22 jets; orange, helicopters. Each pie chart is
23 scaled by the average number of overflights per
24 day at that site.

25 TOM GEORGE: Tim, you should be

1 happy.

2 DAVYD BECHKEL: Of all the
3 overflights we've measured in the park --

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Davyd's
5 sharing information.

6 BRIAN OKONEK: Davyd, on the
7 number at the bottom, that's the average number
8 of flights per day?

9 DAVYD BECHKEL: It's the number
10 of days we analyzed each site. Some numbers
11 will be pretty small. Like this one, there's
12 eight days analyzed. Some of them are pretty
13 huge. Here's 71 days. So this is the average
14 number per day; this is the number of days.

15 TIM CUDNEY: It's interesting
16 that you see in the center of the bottom there,
17 the largest graph, that there is a little bit of
18 orange in there. There's no two aircraft in
19 there whatsoever. That's all agency.

20 DAVYD BECHKEL: The main areas
21 for helicopters, there's helicopter traffic up
22 here. There's helicopter traffic here as well
23 as --

24 TOM GEORGE: This is very good.
25 Would you say what you just said a little

1 louder, please? What did you just say about
2 high altitude or jets?

3 DAVYD BECHKEL: We were just
4 talking about how there's a high altitude IFR
5 route that runs here.

6 ERIKA BENNETT: As well as over
7 Cantwell.

8 DAVYD BECHKEL: 436 and 438.

9 TOM GEORGE: So are you saying
10 this is not all the data, or is it?

11 DAVYD BECHKEL: No, that's all
12 the data. Yep.

13 TOM GEORGE: So this does include
14 any high-altitude traffic?

15 MIKE YORKE: What it doesn't show
16 is sound level; it only shows sound detection.

17 DAVYD BECHKEL: It's the number
18 of events.

19 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, so the number
20 of flights, not magnitude of the sound.

21 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yep. It doesn't
22 have anything to do with pressure here, sound
23 pressure level.

24 TOM GEORGE: You should add the
25 route that goes to Prudhoe Bay or --

1 ERIKA BENNETT: They're there.

2 TOM GEORGE: No, no. Isn't
3 there -- there's a T route that goes right
4 across the top of the park.

5 ERIC DENKEWALTER: The T route is
6 not active yet; is that correct?

7 MIKE YORKE: That's correct.

8 BRIAN OKONEK: So there is going
9 to be a new route?

10 ERIC DENKEWALTER: There was a T
11 route that originated off the Talkeetna DOR and
12 went direct to Barrow.

13 BRIAN OKONEK: Okay. And that is
14 going to be activated again?

15 DAVID DENKEWALTER: No.

16 TOM GEORGE: There's a Q route
17 there, isn't there?

18 ERIC DENKEWALTER: We have Q
19 routes here.

20 TOM GEORGE: T routes below
21 18,000; Q routes above 18,000.

22 ERIC DENKEWALTER: There might be
23 a Q route --

24 TOM GEORGE: Well, we need to
25 look at that obviously.

1 BRIAN OKONEK: Davyd, you can see
2 how much more jet activity has picked up over
3 the southwestern part of the Park --

4 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yes.

5 BRIAN OKONEK: -- from the
6 military stuff.

7 DAVYD BECHKEL: Military or right
8 off the map there's another high IFR route
9 running. This is complicated, to be honest with
10 you. Anyway, I thought I'd share this with you.
11 It's an interesting kind of picture. I'm
12 continuing to sample. I'm sure that the
13 resolution of this map is going to continue to
14 improve. We'll be able to get an idea of
15 different traffic types and the relative
16 occurrences of events over the Park.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So, Davyd, how
18 do we find this? It would be good for us to
19 each have a hard copy of this. How do we find
20 this?

21 DAVYD BECHKEL: Right now this
22 graphic hasn't been published. It's something
23 we just recently worked up. Jared and I had a
24 draft copy of it and this is an update for 2010.

25 SALLY GIBERT: If you want to

1 e-mail it to me, I can send that out to
2 everybody.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's a nice
4 summary for us all to have.

5 DAVYD BECHKEL: Okay. Well,
6 that's what I've got.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm sure that's
8 an incredible amount of work putting all that
9 together. Thank you.

10 DAVYD BECHKEL: You're welcome.
11 That's what I've got for you today.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: The one piece,
13 though, that came out of the question is whether
14 or not we want to ask for a monitoring on the
15 Ruth, right? Is that the take-away on this
16 piece?

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think Tom
18 has asked that before the group makes a decision
19 on that they listen to Andrew and Peter's
20 presentation.

21 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, we'll hear
22 what their social study things are and then
23 factor all those things into any great and
24 profound recommendations I'm sure we'll have.

25 NANCY BALE: I think we need to

1 keep in mind that the Ruth Amphitheater and the
2 landing place have the highest soundscape levels
3 in the plan. We do respect that. I'd be happy
4 to try to fix the highest areas, but I'm
5 actually kind of interested in fixing some of
6 the areas that have quieter standards. I think
7 we do need to keep in mind that there's -- this
8 may be well within the specs of the plan and
9 might need fixing. I throw that out. I don't
10 know if it is or not. That's what these people
11 are going to tell us. This map is really
12 interesting because if you look at the Park
13 Service plan, it's pretty right on, south of the
14 border. It gave to aviation the area that is
15 most used because interpreting the mountain is
16 the Park's purpose. That's cool. The problem
17 is there's this hot border right down the middle
18 of it, so there's overflow and there's some
19 damage in the quietest areas. So I think those
20 would be areas I'd want.

21 SALLY GIBERT: So the
22 relationship to 2011 visitor surveys, have we
23 had that discussion or is that what we're doing
24 now?

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: After Davyd

1 commented on that by showing where they would be
2 located on the map, maybe Andrew could speak to
3 that further in Item 15, 16, specifically what
4 would be happening. Is that okay, Andrew?

5 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yes.

6 SALLY GIBERT: That might be good
7 Andrew. Before lunch.

8 TOM GEORGE: Then we break for
9 lunch and that gives us something to chew on.

10 ANDREW ACKERMAN: My name is
11 Andrew Ackerman. I'm a social scientist with
12 the Park. I work out of the Center for
13 Resources, Science and Learning.

14 I didn't bring any nice visual
15 aids today, but I did want to give you kind of
16 an overview of our plans for the summer with the
17 sound/social norms study and give you an
18 opportunity to ask questions and give us some
19 feedback on where we are right now. I also
20 should say that I was hoping to get Peter
21 Newman, who is the project investigator on this
22 on the phone here today. We don't have a good
23 hookup for a phone, but I was thinking that if
24 we could get him on a little after lunch, you
25 could ask him some questions as well. That

1 might be a good thing to try and do. So we'll
2 work with it and see. I'm not promising
3 anything.

4 So starting in May they're going
5 to be up here. There's going to be two
6 Ph.D. students actually who are going to be
7 doing a lot of the field work. They will be
8 scoping out the intercept locations that we
9 selected for this study. There's three
10 locations and Davyd alluded to them. There's
11 one on the Kahiltna Glacier at 7800 feet;
12 there's one on the McKinley Bar Trail, probably
13 about a mile or two down the trail; and then
14 there's one on the Triple Lakes Trail about a
15 mile or two up from headquarters.

16 One thing I want to point out is
17 that we designed this study to understand
18 backcountry users specifically. We knew that we
19 were going to be challenged in being able to
20 generalize to all backcountry users. We had to
21 select intercept locations for the survey based
22 on where we knew there was fairly high
23 concentrations of visitors, because we have to
24 get a certain sample size in order to make it
25 robust when you're making generalizations off

1 your sample about the population. So we were
2 able to find locations where we knew there was
3 concentrations of people.

4 The flip side of that is that
5 we're not sampling all locations in the Park.
6 We understand that. We won't be comfortable
7 generalizing to all subgroups of users in the
8 Park. We're probably going to be picking up
9 more day users on the north side than
10 backpackers. On the south side we're going to
11 be picking up mostly west buttress exclusively,
12 unless someone is doing a small ridge of
13 McKinley or something, so west buttress users on
14 the south side. But that's where we're getting
15 the most bang for our buck, so that's where
16 we're focusing our efforts.

17 As far as the design of the
18 study, I can tell you that we're doing it in two
19 phases. The reason why we selected Colorado
20 State University and this particular researcher
21 and the particular design that was selected has
22 to do with the fact that they have over ten
23 years of experience doing these types of surveys
24 in national parks. So the method that we chose
25 that we're working with, we've adapted them a

1 little bit, but they are time-tested, true
2 methods that other parks have utilized. These
3 researchers are very familiar with them and they
4 give you a really strong indication of what's
5 going on.

6 So the first phase of the study
7 is a Phase I this summer, 2011, is an inventory
8 and it's basically an exploratory phase trying
9 to understand what are visitors hearing as far
10 as the soundscape. So we've approached this
11 from the perspective that we as Park Service --
12 even though we've established backcountry
13 indicators and standards, we as Park Service
14 personnel are not going to determine for the
15 visitor what it is that they find either
16 pleasing or annoying in the Park. Tom likes
17 this part.

18 So we are going to ask them to
19 tell us, what are they hearing? They're going
20 to do listening sessions for approximately three
21 to five minutes -- probably about five minutes
22 at a time. They will tell us what -- there's a
23 survey form. They will mark down what sounds
24 they heard, both natural and human-caused
25 sounds, and then they will assess on a Likert

1 scale, which is kind of like a zero to seven,
2 how they either found these sounds pleasing or
3 displeasing. They will also make comments about
4 the sounds. There's some qualitative assessment
5 of the soundscape. So we get this by sampling
6 hundreds of hikers in the backcountry. We get
7 this assessment of a soundscape. Then we plot
8 everything out on what's kind of considered a
9 salience chart where you can see -- so if
10 something is way up on the right-hand side of
11 the chart, it has a high salience. If it's way
12 down low, it has a low salience, either positive
13 or negative. I don't know if this is making
14 sense.

15 If a lot of people are saying
16 they're hearing it a lot and they have a strong
17 assessment, like really annoying, then it's
18 going to end up up here. If they're saying that
19 it's really pleasing and they're hearing it a
20 lot, it's going to end up down here. This is a
21 process that we utilize to come up with
22 appropriate indicators when you're thinking
23 about social indicators and then setting
24 standards. Because if there's a high salience
25 and it's being heard in the soundscape

1 frequently, then you know you can monitor it.
2 You know it's something not only that is
3 occurring on a frequent basis, but that people
4 have told you is something that they either have
5 some kind of attachment to in one way or
6 another. So then from that we have an
7 understanding of the types of sound that are
8 occurring in the environment and we have some
9 indication of what are good indicators of
10 sounds.

11 Then we're going to select in
12 Phase 2 a variety of indicators based on Phase
13 1. In Phase 2 we then generate sound clips
14 using the types of sounds that we're told are
15 good indicators. They do a mix of sounds.
16 Actually the concurrent recordings at these
17 locations that are happening at the same time as
18 the surveys are going on are going to inform us,
19 allow us to get a real clear picture of what the
20 soundscape is like. I mean, people are going to
21 tell us. They're going to document that on
22 their surveys, but we're also going to be
23 recording it. We'll be able to know, you know,
24 decibel levels and exactly how many -- how
25 frequent the certain types of sounds are at that

1 location.

2 We will then in Phase 2 develop
3 clips, so short recordings of what would be a
4 true to form realistic environment, but we'll do
5 a range of clips. So people would hear
6 something that starts out with maybe a mix of
7 natural sounds and maybe low-level human sounds,
8 and then it will move to a higher level maybe of
9 human sounds and then higher and higher and
10 higher. So they will listen to this range of
11 clips. They will tell us on another Likert
12 scale of acceptability at what point during that
13 range do they find it no longer acceptable, it's
14 a negative impact to their experience. Then we
15 plot that out and we get what's called a norm
16 curve, an understanding of where the entire
17 sample would -- at what point the entire
18 sample -- it becomes a mean or an average of the
19 experience for the entire sample. We will be
20 able to get an indication of at what point
21 people find the soundscape being no longer
22 acceptable. So is it between clip 1 and 2? Is
23 it between clip 3 and 4, et cetera?

24 SALLY GIBERT: Where are these
25 people when you're doing Phase I? Are they like

1 in a classroom setting? Are they in the field?

2 ANDREW ACKERMAN: This is all in
3 the field.

4 SALLY GIBERT: They'll put
5 headsets on them and --

6 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yes. In Phase
7 2 you mean? So Phase 2 they will be in the
8 field, but we likely will set up some kind of
9 booth to keep -- it's going to have to be some
10 kind of an experimentally-controlled situation.
11 In Mirror Woods they did it in like a back area
12 behind the ranger station that was partially
13 enclosed. I think in Sequoia they did it out in
14 the backcountry quite a ways, so they had a
15 quiet area that they set aside where the people
16 were listening.

17 NANCY BALE: And these weren't
18 necessarily -- they could be completely
19 different people from the people who
20 participated in Phase 1?

21 ANDREW ACKERMAN: They will have
22 to be, but they will be in the same location.
23 We'll be sampling from the same areas, so it
24 should be some other type of experience that
25 people are having.

1 NANCY BALE: Is there going to be
2 any kind of question about their hearing? Would
3 their hearing be pretested to be sure that they
4 have hearing within normal norms? It's a nurse
5 question.

6 ANDREW ACKERMAN: You stumped me
7 on that one.

8 NANCY BALE: It would be easy to
9 do, quick.

10 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I'm sure you
11 can ask people if they have any issues.

12 RANDY KILBOURN: On Phase I
13 wouldn't it be important also instead of just
14 going from both extremes to find out if they're
15 not affected? Offer a third choice? Because
16 you're talking about either they're very pleased
17 or they're very upset. What if they don't
18 really care?

19 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Well, no, it's
20 a range.

21 RANDY KILBOURN: Oh, there will
22 be a range.

23 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah, there's a
24 range. When you plot it out, that's when you
25 start to find out if it's clustering in certain

1 areas. They tell you where they fall on the
2 scale of pleasing to annoying, and then you do a
3 cluster analysis and find out where people are.

4 TOM GEORGE: But you are actually
5 asking people to sit quietly and do nothing but
6 this. You're not saying, gee, in the last five
7 minutes as you walked up to the station, what
8 did you hear?

9 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Exactly.

10 TOM GEORGE: See, those are two
11 very different -- one is, I'm only focused on
12 listening very carefully. The other is,
13 whatever I experienced in the environment in the
14 last five minutes. Those are two entirely
15 different questions and I would expect to get
16 two entirely different sets of data out of it.
17 I want to know what people in the environment
18 engaged in whatever activity they're engaged
19 in --

20 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Well, we will
21 find out if there's a different spot because
22 we're going to be doing sound recordings, so we
23 will know exactly what they're experiencing and
24 we will also know how they assess that
25 experience.

1 TOM GEORGE: Well, not --
2 because, again, you're telling them to stop
3 whatever activity they came here to do and only
4 do this. I am now highly aware of everything I
5 hear; whereas hiking up the trail, I may have a
6 very different awareness of that. That's the
7 thing we really want to measure the most -- I
8 want to measure the most. So those are two
9 different questions. I'm not sure this quite
10 gets to the real question of what was your
11 experience, and that's where correlating that,
12 that observation of what did you hear in the
13 last five minutes, but the soundscape data is
14 collected to say, well, in that time period
15 there were this number of events at this level
16 of threshold. There's the connection, to me, we
17 really need to understand very well.

18 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. It's
19 hard to get information from people without
20 asking them.

21 TOM GEORGE: I know, but you're
22 preconditioning them.

23 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Pete Fix is
24 here. He's going to actually present some data
25 on the whole thing of presurvey versus post

1 survey, so whether or not we condition them by
2 asking them. It's a good point. It's something
3 that we need to be aware of and it will
4 definitely be documented how the methods are
5 done and very clearly how we ask people to sit
6 and listen. And whether or not they are
7 conscious of the environment more so by doing a
8 listening session, you know, we can do studies
9 to see the differences. But what we want is we
10 want them to tell us what are the things that
11 they're hearing and to really get more
12 information about how they perceive those
13 sounds, and their level of attention to
14 listening likely goes up when they're told to
15 sit and listen and in some ways that is our
16 objective, to understand what it is that the
17 human is hearing in the natural environment.
18 Whether that changes significantly from when
19 they're just hiking down the trail talking to
20 friends, we won't know unless we study that
21 specific question.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: There's a
23 significant difference between your
24 receptiveness to the aircraft sounds at the
25 beginning of the trip as opposed to when you're

1 trying to get the guy -- will him to come pick
2 you up.

3 AMANDA SMITH: Best sound in the
4 world.

5 TOM GEORGE: Yeah. There's
6 annoyance and then there's rescue.

7 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Let me get
8 through the entire study methods and then you
9 can ask any question you want.

10 The other component of the Phase
11 2 is there's a stated choice analysis that we
12 thought was an important piece to try and get in
13 there. Think of it as you're doing a trade-off
14 analysis. We're acknowledging that there are
15 trade-offs. A lot of studies you just ask
16 people, give us your perspective in this
17 environment. It's almost like a vacuum. We're
18 saying, give us your perspective on this
19 scenario. So given that there's a choice of
20 having -- I'm just going to give a totally
21 random example. Say, there's going to be --
22 you're hiking the Triple Lakes Trail. There's
23 going to be on average eight overflights a day
24 in this area of the Park. Would you rather have
25 on average eight overflights or less and know

1 that you can get on a scenic air tour any time
2 during your trip to the Denali National Park, or
3 would you like to have on average four flights a
4 day or less and know that you're going to have
5 to wait six to eight hours to get a scenic air
6 tour flight. Something along those lines. It's
7 understanding that there's trade-offs between
8 having scenic air tours and having a certain
9 type of sound environment in the Park. So those
10 economists come up with these tricky analysis.

11 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, that's a
12 loaded question. Triple Lakes is the worst
13 place you could do that. That's a main
14 thoroughfare.

15 ANDREW ACKERMAN: That was a
16 hypothetical.

17 TOM GEORGE: He said it was
18 totally random.

19 ANDREW ACKERMAN: That's totally
20 random. I don't know exactly the types of
21 questions. Maybe we can get some feedback from
22 you on how to design these. I'm sure you'd be
23 interested in giving us lots of feedback.

24 ERIC DENKEWALTER: We've seen
25 some of these questionnaires before, so we're

1 spring-loaded to the -- spring-loaded to the
2 Leopold -- the Leopold Institute had kind of,
3 did this ruin your whole day or your whole life?
4 I'm sorry. It's a sensitive issue here and
5 you're bringing up a real sensitive spot.

6 TOM GEORGE: But he's bringing it
7 up now with the opportunity for input, so don't
8 roast him.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think it's
10 important to emphasize, though, that the Park
11 management is interested in knowing so, yeah,
12 everybody wants the perfect park experience and
13 that might be a little bit different for
14 everybody. But you know what, it comes at a
15 cost to that visitor personally, so you don't
16 get to fly then when you want to or you might --
17 it's kind of like saying, well, I don't like
18 overflights. Well, the trade-off might be,
19 well, then, you don't get to get into the
20 backcountry. It's along the spectrum. We want
21 to know that. However it's worded, we need to
22 know because truthfully there are so many
23 competing interests for Park resources that to
24 think everybody is going to have a perfect park
25 experience is not realistic.

1 On this continuum where do people
2 feel that, okay, it's still acceptable here.
3 You're still allowing for the diversity of uses
4 and I still get what I want and they get what
5 they want. Okay. Where is that?

6 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Where your
7 expertise is really going to become invaluable
8 is making this realistic. It's knowing kind of
9 like what the parameters are around these
10 questions that are realistic. Is it even
11 realistic to say we can have less than four
12 overflights over Triple Lakes. I don't know.

13 SALLY GIBERT: That may impact
14 not only the visitor's choices, but the
15 existence of whether there's even a business
16 there that wouldn't be able to operate under
17 that constraint. One way to phrase it would be:
18 Do you mind this or if you do mind this, that
19 means you might have less overflights, but that
20 means nobody's going to get to fly anywhere
21 because nobody can afford to do that. It's an
22 amplified -- it gets amplified.

23 TOM GEORGE: Another question I
24 think we need to somehow get at is we know
25 roughly it's what, 400,000 plus Park visitors

1 that are the folks that go in and out of the
2 Park. There's what, 1200 people that try and
3 climb the mountain each year. What percentage
4 of Park visitors actually do take a flightseeing
5 tour of some sort? And actually a couple
6 questions. What people only see the Park with a
7 flightseeing tour and don't engage in any other
8 ground activities? What people do it by ground
9 and not air? What's the overlap between the
10 two? My guess is that -- I mean, a person who
11 only went in on the ground and didn't really get
12 any exposure to the things you can get to by air
13 and walk away with one understanding of what
14 Denali National Park is and vice versa. So
15 that's another thing.

16 ANDREW ACKERMAN: That's another
17 study. There's approximately 17,000 -- 17,000
18 passengers on flights into the Park. That's
19 combining scenic air tour and air taxi. So
20 about 14,000 of those are scenic air tour. And
21 you probably have better data than I do on this.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: A few years
23 they came up with 60,000. That was individuals
24 versus flights.

25 TOM GEORGE: Did you say flights

1 or people? This is visitors, right?

2 ANDREW ACKERMAN: This is
3 visitors. This is just landings, scenic air
4 tour -- I'm referring specifically to landings,
5 not to scenic flightseeing.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: Because the
7 number of overflights was closer to about
8 60,000?

9 ANDREW ACKERMAN: So 3,000 are on
10 air taxi. Anyway, we are going to study
11 comprehensively how many people are both
12 coming -- we're going to know based on another
13 study how many people are taking flights into
14 the Park and also going to the north side.
15 That's a totally different study. But from that
16 study we have a piece of information that we can
17 use to parse out what you're after, which is
18 possibly finding out exactly how many people
19 took a scenic air tour and also went into the
20 backcountry on the north side.

21 TOM GEORGE: And the perceptions
22 of those different people.

23 ANDREW ACKERMAN: That's a whole
24 other thing.

25 TOM GEORGE: Well, but that's

1 what we need to get to.

2 AMANDA SMITH: I'd agree. When I
3 was just a backcountry user, I hated every plane
4 that flew over my head. Then I went onto the
5 Ruth and I feel totally differently now. It was
6 on a flightseeing tour. Those are the
7 questions -- I agree, it would be helpful to
8 know when and if you're asking these users how
9 do they use the Park and if they've been on a
10 flightseeing tour it's going to impact their --

11 ANDREW ACKERMAN: We have a study
12 from 2000, which I know a lot of people are
13 really sensitive about, but it has multiple
14 pieces of information. Read the whole study.
15 It has a lot of information on people's
16 perspective after having taken a flight into
17 either the Ruth -- I'm sorry, 2005. They
18 surveyed people in a lot of the glaciated area
19 of the range. So they have people who just did
20 a scenic air tour. People who were on air taxi.
21 People who do flightseeing and how their
22 perspectives vary based on the type of trip they
23 were taking. It doesn't specifically get at
24 what you're trying to get at.

25 SHAWN PETERSON: One thing. I

1 know you're just starting with this and you're
2 going to start in a certain area, but I would
3 love to be involved in some of the surveying
4 process in the future. I have a few businesses
5 in Denali National Park that doesn't have
6 anything to do with air traffic or people out in
7 the wilderness. Set up some stations. I got a
8 gas station, a couple different places there.
9 It's right in the middle of Denali -- or they
10 call it Glitter Gulch. It's where most of the
11 tourists congregate and you can get an unbiased
12 opinion.

13 TIM CUDNEY: Have you solicited
14 any operators to see if they'll participate in
15 this?

16 ANDREW ACKERMAN: No. I should
17 back up and just say -- I think I tried to say
18 this at the beginning. We had very specific
19 objectives when we designed this study. We were
20 hoping we would be able to accommodate all of
21 your needs, but our primary objective is that we
22 have a Backcountry Management Plan that we know
23 needs to be looked at again as far as how the
24 indicators and standards were developed and that
25 when we look at things like soundscapes, natural

1 sounds, protecting those, that we have to have
2 indicators that are very robust that are built
3 from the ground up. In case of -- you know,
4 Davyd has his study design that was designed in
5 a very specific way to be able to generalize at
6 least samples parkwide. We have social science
7 objectives that we hope to have these indicators
8 help us develop the best indicators possible in
9 the Backcountry Management Plan. It may be
10 adding another indicator that's specific to
11 people's experience. But it may be helping to
12 inform what the current physical science
13 indicators are in the Backcountry Management
14 Plan. But that was our primary objective with
15 this study, is to learn more about what people
16 are telling us would be good indicators of the
17 natural soundscape in Denali National Park. We
18 can't unfortunately generalize to all areas of
19 the Park. We're specifically targeting these
20 areas of the backcountry. But that is our
21 objective and we can't necessarily take on
22 everybody's little study. So I wish we could do
23 more, but --

24 JOHN LEONARD: There's a lot of
25 different types of noise and a lot of different

1 people that create that noise. Are you focusing
2 like I am -- a lot of people, the military comes
3 up and buzzes the mountain. And it might be the
4 most intense noise, but it's the sound of
5 freedom so it doesn't bother them. Is there a
6 way to capture that in the questions as opposed
7 to air taxi versus backcountry hiker? You know,
8 the Park helicopter creates noise and people
9 seem to be fine with that because we're
10 performing a mission.

11 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I understand
12 that. They have tested that specific question
13 in places like Grand Canyon and I think in
14 Hawaii a psychologist researcher looked at those
15 types of questions. We are not going to
16 specifically ask that question. When they
17 document what sounds they heard, there's a list
18 of kind of 20 what we think are the most
19 commonly-heard types of sounds. One is
20 aircraft. I think it has subsets of aircraft,
21 jets and props. If they choose to, they can
22 document exactly -- in fact, we're encouraging
23 them to document more information about that
24 sound. So if they could tell you the type of
25 aircraft, then they could write that in. We

1 would have more information about it. But we're
2 not going to really set as an objective, tell us
3 how did you feel about seeing this
4 administrative flight versus seeing a scenic air
5 tour flight? We're not studying that particular
6 issue. But the studies I have read say that in
7 general, especially at a certain threshold,
8 people don't care whether or not you're saving a
9 life or not. They don't care whether or not
10 Bambi is being studied. This is really what the
11 study found. At a certain threshold it's just
12 all noise. It's an annoyance. That probably
13 has something to do with physiology and some
14 other things.

15 Other questions?

16 NANCY BALE: The Park has from a
17 policy standpoint divided this area up into
18 management zones, so quieter sounds are to be
19 advocated and worked toward in some areas. I'm
20 not quite sure how your study can capture the
21 idea of management zones. It's just capturing
22 the idea of what people can tolerate. Those are
23 really sort of two different things that, you
24 know, what people can tolerate may be above what
25 we would ideally like to have in a wilderness

1 management zone. So is that kind of where park
2 management comes in? You're doing your part,
3 but you don't expect to be dictating to the Park
4 everything about the way it decides?

5 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Exactly. Yeah,
6 that's a good point. Thanks, Nancy. The study
7 does not pinpoint exactly at what point -- it
8 informs us where most people are saying it's no
9 longer acceptable. Some other studies, social
10 norm studies, have in addition to finding out
11 where the unacceptability point is in people's
12 experience, they also ask the question: Ideally
13 where would you like the soundscape to be or the
14 crowding issue to be. So you get at what's the
15 ideal.

16 But, again, getting back to the
17 stated choice analysis, I have mixed feelings
18 about asking people what their ideal environment
19 is because they're not necessarily evaluating
20 the trade-offs. They don't understand the
21 entire scenario of what's realistic in a park
22 setting. So by asking them to make a stated
23 choice, make their own assessment of trade-offs,
24 then they are taking into account a larger
25 picture of what's going on in the Park.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: A simplified
2 version: Is it possible that you're measuring
3 pain threshold? Not what's acceptable, but when
4 it becomes so painful that we can't deal with it
5 anymore?

6 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. One of
7 the researchers seriously asked me if we
8 could -- there's someone else at Colorado State
9 that does the physiological side of things and
10 wanted to see if we could poke some more
11 mountaineers -- I know they get poked all the
12 time -- to draw blood samples, but wanted to
13 assess the physiological reactions of climbers
14 to see if their stress levels went up.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Going off Tom's
16 comments about people are experiencing things
17 without having to try. Is there any way either
18 this year or for 2012 -- 2012 would be fine
19 too -- to set it up so that you have kind of a
20 constant sound monitoring going on and then when
21 someone walks up and you have your first
22 encounter, that the first thing you do is give
23 them the listening sheet that they're about to
24 do studiously and to say, if you're willing to
25 take the survey, we'd like to you to listen to

1 the sounds, but before you do that, why don't
2 you just grab this piece of paper and quickly go
3 through it and note the notable sounds that you
4 recall or that you paid attention to in the last
5 five or ten minutes, whatever the time is. Just
6 sort of mark the ones that made an impression on
7 you one way or the other, and then they can note
8 those and mark their little positive/negative.

9 ANDREW ACKERMAN: What you're
10 saying is, give us an indication what you heard
11 before we met you here in the last five or ten
12 minutes.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Right.

14 ANDREW ACKERMAN: That's
15 interesting and that's a good question for Peter
16 Newman when he gets on the phone. There might
17 be a reason for why they don't do that, but I
18 don't know. It sounds logical.

19 SALLY GIBERT: I think it would
20 be really interesting to see that. And then
21 have the sounds. Of course you can't tell
22 exactly what they heard five minutes ago because
23 they were five minutes away, but certainly for
24 aircraft sounds you would be able to correlate
25 that in general, how much of that aircraft sound

1 did they notice or notice in a negative way
2 versus how much they noticed it when they're
3 trying. It would also familiarize themselves
4 with the form and everything.

5 BRIAN OKONEK: Miriam, you asked
6 us to e-mail you questions for this. Did those
7 questions get passed on?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You were the
9 only person who provided them and they went to
10 Andrew.

11 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I did read
12 through them. We'll make photocopies and hand
13 them out after lunch, if there's time. A lot of
14 those questions, I think, were addressing just
15 the way we designed the study.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: Good.

17 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Some of them
18 are like their own little studies.

19 Any other questions? If there's
20 a desire to learn more about exactly the methods
21 that we're using or if you want to know about
22 the process -- oh, one other thing I didn't say.
23 In May they're coming out to scope and find the
24 intercept locations. In June they will be back
25 out to do the actual sampling. They will be

1 sampling out of Talkeetna up on the Kahiltna
2 Glacier the last week, ten days actually, so
3 from the 20th until the end of June on the
4 Kahiltna. Then the same two guys will go up to
5 the north side and they'll sample for another
6 ten days in July, beginning of July, at Wonder
7 Lake and Triple Lakes.

8 NANCY BALE: So the length of the
9 sampling period will be a couple weeks?

10 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Ten days.

11 AMANDA SMITH: You said in the
12 beginning that this is a very specific set of
13 users and you're not claiming in any way that
14 it's comprehensive. Do you have anywhere on the
15 radar to do more sampling of backcountry users
16 who are kind of away from these more
17 concentrated areas like in the next couple
18 years?

19 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Pete can talk
20 to you about a comprehensive sample we did of
21 day hikers in the backcountry, backcountry
22 overnights, but it wasn't the same focus. It
23 wasn't just on sound. It was on essentially all
24 impacts to their experience. These are impacts
25 that we are measuring specific to our

1 Backcountry Management Plan, one of which is
2 mechanized noise or disturbance of the natural
3 soundscape. Yeah, it's hard. It's just hard
4 when you're trying to design something that
5 captures everything. I know I said we're not
6 able to generalize to everyone, but we are
7 trying to get the largest amount of people that
8 are experiencing a component of the backcountry.
9 So in that sense we can generalize, but we're
10 not going to say that the results of this will
11 generalize to all overnights or all people who
12 take a scenic flight into the range or something
13 like that.

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's probably a
15 funding issue. At some point there's not enough
16 money to do everything.

17 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. I just
18 wanted to address your point you were saying
19 earlier about monitoring B&Ps, best management
20 practices. We'll establish a baseline for the
21 backcountry user population that gives us an
22 idea of in 2011 this is what people are hearing;
23 this is how they're evaluating their situation.
24 Whether or not that's useful in what you're
25 attempting to achieve with monitoring best

1 management practices -- if it is, then I think
2 we could collaborate and work on something for
3 the future, but if it's not exactly what you're
4 trying to monitor, then it might not be of any
5 use.

6 BRIAN OKONEK: Well, let's just
7 take the backpackers that are hiking south of
8 the Park Road, you know, between the Savage and
9 the Muldrow. How do we know what they're
10 experiencing as far as flights are concerned?

11 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Well, I mean,
12 Davyd's data is a good indication of what the
13 soundscape is like out there from a recording
14 standpoint.

15 BRIAN OKONEK: Right, but that
16 doesn't really necessarily totally correlate
17 over to what it is --

18 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Exactly.

19 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah.

20 NANCY BALE: And their
21 expectations of their experience.

22 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Well, here's
23 something we're also going to learn from the
24 study, is that we will compare the recorded
25 data. This may be one of the first times -- I

1 don't know if Davyd has heard of other times in
2 national park settings where they've done this
3 kind of concurrent or co-locating of collecting
4 of data. We will have an understanding of how
5 people are assessing different locations within
6 the Park and the precise sound recording
7 measurements, so we can compare that data. If
8 we get sound recording data at other locations
9 in the Park, we may be able to generalize. So
10 if there's this type of sound environment, how
11 would people likely respond to that type of
12 sound environment. Of course conditions are
13 highly variable and you have to be careful with
14 generalizing like that. I mean, at least we'll
15 understand a little more.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: It's got to be
17 really difficult to set up these studies. For
18 example, you could have a five-minute spell when
19 you're listening to nothing but the wind, water
20 and birds. And the next person would have the
21 five-minute sound when there's a helicopter
22 doing some research study down at the mouth of
23 the Muddy River. So a lot of times in the
24 backcountry it's kind of on a day-by-day issue,
25 not a five-minute snapshot issue. If you're on

1 a river trip and one plane flies over you, you
2 don't think anything about it. When the
3 eightieth plane flies over you, it's a bigger
4 deal.

5 ANDREW ACKERMAN: The way I think
6 we're trying to account for that is through
7 samplings throughout the day, so effectively
8 everyone's listening becomes kind of one group
9 consciousness of, you know, we've got all these
10 samples from 8:00 in the morning to 8:00 at
11 night and we're combining them all. But as far
12 as understanding what the typical visitor's
13 duration, that duration issue is a hard one to
14 get at. Pete might talk a little bit about it,
15 but understanding just how long they're exposed
16 to sounds; we've asked them to estimate,
17 approximate how long they are. But most people
18 aren't out there using their watch to give us
19 precise measurements and how many minutes they
20 were exposed to sounds, so --

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's sort of
22 interesting that we're going to get this kind of
23 level of insight from professional assessments
24 of absolute sound and social science, and at the
25 same time we're here because none of this had

1 happened. It was too loud. I mean, basically
2 we're here because it was too loud. There
3 wasn't any qualification of it. That's just too
4 loud. Now we're going to do an assessment of
5 what that meant, but I don't want us to get
6 distracted from the fact that there was a
7 problem that we came together to try to solve,
8 right, which was -- and now you've got the Best
9 Practices that are sort of mitigating that. But
10 just keep that in mind.

11 SUZANNE RUST: I guess one thing
12 I see is really understanding the differences
13 and how different visitors experience things.
14 Like if you've worked really hard to get way far
15 away from the road; you've spent two or three
16 days committing to getting back away from the
17 road and from sound, that your tolerance is
18 going to be different. I think that just a
19 really good understanding of varying levels,
20 different people's perceptions then helps guide
21 us. Because Nancy is saying, well, maybe these
22 quieter areas where people are backpacking -- I
23 mean, we're moving traffic around and trying to
24 make areas quieter. For a while the park
25 corridor, let's stay away from there.

1 Where do we need to go and where
2 can we have the best impact on people? I guess
3 that's what I'm hoping that somehow out of this
4 series of studies or studies in the future we
5 can understand the big picture and, okay, what
6 can we do? We can take these measures, but what
7 else can we do? If we move here, are we
8 creating another problem? We tend to think that
9 we're helping, but sometimes we're not helping.

10 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. Where
11 can you get your best bang for your buck.

12 SUZANNE RUST: That's right. I
13 think that is one strategic tool for this group,
14 to really truly understand it and then to say,
15 okay, what actions can we take.

16 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I really was
17 hoping as a component of this study over the
18 next two, three years we could start to get some
19 of the spacial understanding you're talking
20 about of, does it vary as people move away from
21 the road. One of the reasons why I made sure we
22 selected something near the entrance and way out
23 at Wonder Lake and on the mountain -- I was
24 adamant that we actually get them -- because I
25 understand that those are fairly different

1 experiences to be way out at Wonder Lake versus
2 in the entrance area on Triple Lakes Trail and
3 up on the mountain. Not just up on the mountain
4 at base camp; up on the mountain away from base
5 camp. But the Peter Newman might talk to us
6 later if we get him, talk about the ability
7 to -- if we can get some of the route data. I
8 know we've got all of our administrative flight
9 path data, but if they could get their hands on
10 some of the commercial flight path data that
11 they could start to map where the sound
12 footprint is relative to where the people are.
13 Pete Fix and I started to get some data on where
14 densities of people are hiking off of the Park
15 Road this last summer, and we could combine that
16 data with the flight path footprint data to get
17 at where are people and airplanes really
18 intersecting most often. That may be something
19 that we can do at a later time, but I don't
20 think that's going to be the focus of this
21 effort right here. It's important.

22 TOM GEORGE: Is there time yet to
23 hear Peter Fix's presentation?

24 SALLY GIBERT: There's time
25 today, but I think we probably should take a

1 lunch break before we start a new presentation.

2 Thank you.

3 Should we take a break now?

4 (Lunch break taken from 12:25
5 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.)

6 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. This is
7 Peter Fix and he's going to do a presentation.

8 PETER FIX: I'm Peter Fix. I'm
9 an associate professor with School of Natural
10 Resources and Native Cultural Sciences. I'm
11 going to tell you a little bit about the study
12 that we did last summer to monitor the
13 indicators in Denali National Park.

14 ERIKA BENNETT: Where is the
15 school?

16 PETER FIX: The School of Natural
17 Resources and it's at the University of Alaska
18 Fairbanks. Feel free to stop me with any
19 questions.

20 So this study was initiated to
21 monitor the indicators in the Backcountry
22 Management Plan. So in the Backcountry
23 Management Plan they list several indicators,
24 ten indicators; five indicators of social
25 conditions and five indicators of resource

1 conditions. It states in the Plan that they'll
2 monitor it by visitor survey once every five
3 years. So this survey was an effort to see what
4 the level of those indicators were.

5 We started planning the study in
6 2007. We ran into some issues getting approval
7 for the study and budget, but we finally got
8 that approval and we were able to gather the
9 data in 2010. So here's some of the social
10 indicators that we have. Motorized sound, I
11 think in the Plan it actually says natural sound
12 disturbance, but the study was designed to
13 gather all of these data on all these different
14 indicators. So keep in mind that it wasn't
15 specifically focused on the motorized sound; it
16 was focused on everything.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: For the
18 wilderness areas?

19 PETER FIX: Yes. So it would be
20 starting basically a hundred feet from the road
21 corridor. One other thing that's probably
22 important to note given the questions we had
23 about where people might have heard the sounds
24 and can planes be rerouted to minimize the
25 impacts. When we put this together, the

1 standards are written for some pretty large
2 areas and we gathered data by unit. We know
3 which units people were in and then a level of
4 the indicators by unit. We did gather some
5 pretty crude information of where people were
6 hiking, but unfortunately we don't have real
7 fine data on if someone reported they saw modern
8 equipment or heard a motorized sound. We can't
9 pinpoint exactly where that was. So we know
10 what unit it was, but it's a pretty large area.
11 So that's the resolution that we have with it.

12 So we were just concerned with,
13 what are the level of these indicators? There
14 was one section which I'll briefly mention where
15 we were trying to get at the importance of the
16 different indicators, but we had some issues
17 with that. What I do, normally we put
18 limitations at the end of a study, but I'm going
19 to talk about some of these limitations first so
20 we can kind of say, you know, what can we tell
21 from this data, what can we not know from this
22 data. Probably going to raise more questions
23 than it answers perhaps.

24 This is one study for one summer.
25 One study certainly cannot claim to have all the

1 answers. So we gather this information. This
2 is the summer of 2010. What we need to do is
3 plug this into -- okay, we gather information
4 from different sources. We either plug this
5 into an overall body of knowledge to start to
6 understand what's happening out there. So we
7 can look at what happened, maybe learn some from
8 things that we did and build on it for future
9 studies as well.

10 Again, we need to keep in mind
11 that I was just tasked with monitoring the level
12 of the indicators. With that, it had this
13 natural sound disturbance or motorized sound
14 category. So I didn't break it out by whether
15 it was a bus or another visitor shouting or if
16 it was an airplane. So when I present results
17 that say this is how many times people say
18 they're reporting motorized sound, we don't know
19 for sure exactly what that was. So keep that in
20 mind as I present this data.

21 SUZANNE RUST: On questions.
22 Motorized sound could be which things? It could
23 be a bus?

24 PETER FIX: Could be a bus. It
25 could be -- well, it could be a bus or an

1 airplane.

2 SUZANNE RUST: Just those two?

3 PETER FIX: Yeah. We also
4 included the road corridor in our study, so when
5 we designed it, the person I was working with,
6 they said, yes, the road corridor is included in
7 this. We want to measure impacts that are
8 occurring from the road corridor. I've had some
9 more recent discussions with Phillip and he
10 said, no, we wanted to exclude the road
11 corridor. But this survey does measure things
12 that were occurring on the road corridor. So we
13 do have buses in there.

14 Then of course with any study you
15 have to look at the methods that they use. So
16 we sampled at the Wilderness Access Center for
17 the day hikers and the Backcountry Information
18 Center for the backpackers. So basically it's
19 people accessing the Park off the road corridor.
20 That's what our sample will generalize back to.
21 We have pretty comprehensive sampling of those
22 visitors, but we didn't get people going to the
23 glaciers and things like that. So we have to
24 keep in mind who our study population was.

25 Then we have -- we didn't

1 exclusively measure the tolerances for any of
2 the indicators, so we have levels but not what
3 people would find acceptable. Then as we
4 discussed before lunch, there's this issue of do
5 you sample people before or after their hike,
6 and what's the best method to measure these
7 different things. If you sample them after the
8 hike, there might be an issue of recall for the
9 backpacking trips. You're trying to ask someone
10 what they encountered maybe three or four days
11 before versus a concern of, well, are you
12 confident if you ask them beforehand. That's
13 definitely a concern and I'll tell you how we
14 addressed that here in a bit.

15 So here's the methods that we
16 used. We wanted to have a sample of day hikers
17 and then a sample of the overnight backpackers.
18 For the day hikers we decided a two-page survey,
19 front and back of an eight-and-a-half-by-11
20 sheet of paper. We surveyed the day hikers at
21 the Wilderness Access Center when they were
22 returning from their trip. We did a pretest in
23 the summer of 2008 where we separated out a
24 bunch of surveys before the hike, a bunch of
25 surveys after the hike. We didn't see any

1 differences in the mean levels of the indicators
2 that were reported between before and after.
3 The pretest from the day hikers -- the pretest
4 was just on the day hikers. That pretest showed
5 that it was much more feasible for the day
6 hikers to survey them after their hike. When we
7 tried to survey them before the hike, a lot of
8 people said that, yeah, they were going to hike,
9 but either they didn't hike or they lost the
10 survey for whatever reason. So we surveyed the
11 day hikers after they returned.

12 We broke the summer up into time
13 blocks. One in the late afternoon and one later
14 in the afternoon; kind of late afternoon, late
15 evening. So starting in June and going through
16 the end of August we had this little matrix of
17 all these time blocks that we could select. We
18 randomly selected 66 of those time blocks so we
19 could have a random sample of visitors. We also
20 randomly selected three days to be at Savage
21 River and then three days to be at the Triple
22 Lakes trailhead. In addition to those blocks
23 that we sampled, we also interviewed 12 people.

24 For the backpackers we had an
25 eight-page survey, which had six days for

1 possible -- six days of overnight hikes. So
2 with the backpackers what we determined would be
3 the best way to reach them is if they have to
4 get their permit and the backcountry rangers
5 that are issuing the permit, they have their
6 attention for a while. So we decided to sample
7 them at that time. So it would be a good time
8 to reach them, and then we also felt that it
9 would be -- they'd keep a diary and it would be
10 easier for them to keep track of things by day
11 rather than have them recall if it was, say, a
12 four- or five-day trip, starting to think about
13 things that happened in the past. We also
14 conducted interviews with four backpackers.

15 One thing that's a concern with
16 doing studies like this are the people who don't
17 respond, so we ask people if they want to
18 complete the survey. Some people say yes; some
19 people are going to say no. What's so
20 concerning was people who say no, maybe they
21 somehow had a horrible experience or maybe they
22 had a really great experience. But if they're
23 systematically different than the people who
24 responded, then the information is going to be
25 biased. So that's what's called nonresponse

1 bias. You obviously want to minimize that by
2 having a high response rate. What you can do to
3 see if it's a problem is try to gather some
4 information on people that are going to respond
5 to the survey.

6 As I mentioned, we were sampling
7 the day hikers on their return from their hike.
8 So if people didn't want to take the survey, we
9 said, well, would you answer two questions?
10 Then we asked them how often they heard
11 motorized sound and how often they encountered
12 other park visitors. Then we could compare
13 those people to the people who filled out the
14 whole survey and see if there were differences.
15 Also, for everybody that either completed a
16 survey or didn't complete a survey, we asked
17 their age and their residency and then we
18 recorded the group size and their gender.

19 For the backpackers we didn't
20 have that luxury of being able to ask them
21 questions after their trip, but we did have
22 group size, length of the trip, gender and their
23 residency. So, for example, we found that the
24 backpackers were more likely to be from the
25 local area. What we can do with the nonresponse

1 test is see if there's differences. Like if
2 people are from the local area, are they more
3 likely to not respond. We can test things and
4 see if our sample is representative.

5 So here's how we asked some of
6 these questions. This is a page of the survey.
7 This is from the day hiker surveys. From the
8 day hikers, we asked people if they hiked
9 farther than half a mile from the road, and if
10 they did hike farther than half a mile from the
11 road, we asked them to record only those
12 indicators -- the level of the indicators
13 farther than half a mile from the road. So now
14 we have some information from people who did not
15 hike farther than half a mile from the road and
16 some information from people who did hike
17 farther than half a mile from the road.

18 So we got the number related to
19 the indicator. We also asked how often they
20 experienced the indicator when they were in the
21 backcountry. We wanted to ask how often they
22 experienced things, things like modern equipment
23 or landscape modifications. So, for example, we
24 have the Park Road included in landscape
25 modifications. Let's say you're hiking back

1 towards the road and you see it -- it's there in
2 front of you for a few hours. They call this
3 one occurrence of that indicator. But if it's
4 there 74 percent of the time on that day, that
5 might have some indication of what we should be
6 monitoring for that. So that's why we have the
7 percent of time question there.

8 We also wanted to get at the
9 importance of the indicators especially with --
10 the Park had some concerns about landscape
11 modification questioning. They wanted to know
12 about the evidence of modern human use in the
13 backcountry. We had a different version of this
14 question that said, rate the importance of
15 encountering a low level of the following.
16 Through some reviews people thought that was
17 confusing. We ended up changing the wording to
18 how we have it on the screen here, to say, how
19 did these different things impact your
20 experience. So if you see the survey, it has a
21 set of questions in here. Unfortunately we had
22 some problems with this set of questions. What
23 ended up happening is we started noticing that
24 people were writing in, well, I didn't see
25 any -- I didn't hear any motorized sound. I

1 didn't see any modern equipment; therefore, it
2 didn't have any impact on my experience. So
3 people didn't catch that we were saying, if you
4 did see it or hear it, would it have an impact
5 on your experience? So we started telling
6 people, if you would see it or hear it and we
7 still had some issues with it. Unfortunately a
8 lot of people wrote in, I didn't see it, I
9 didn't hear it. So I can't do much with those
10 others questions unfortunately.

11 NANCY BALE: Can I clarify that
12 with you? You're only asking them to evaluate
13 if it impacted them if they heard or saw it?

14 PETER FIX: No.

15 SALLY GIBERT: If they were to
16 hear it.

17 NANCY BALE: So they were asked
18 to speculate.

19 PETER FIX: Yeah. So did these
20 things impact their experience. People took it
21 to mean, oh, did it impact my experience when I
22 was out there. So it was pretty clear that
23 people misunderstood what we were asking for
24 that.

25 TIM CUDNEY: Why didn't you ask

1 them if they had a positive experience?

2 PETER FIX: Some people -- well,
3 it didn't impact it. For some people it
4 couldn't even impact their experience.

5 TIM CUDNEY: Everything is
6 negative. Why don't you have a positive
7 response on there?

8 TOM GEORGE: I was glad to see
9 that road coming at me.

10 PETER FIX: I mean, when I put
11 that together, I was wondering, okay, did we
12 have a positive experience or not. I suppose
13 for some people having the -- there could be
14 some positive aspect of modern equipment or
15 something. But what the Park was concerned
16 about was, do these things negatively impact
17 people.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's an
19 interesting question, though. It pushes the
20 perspective over to a negative response and
21 really -- this is going to the nature of the
22 science. What if you asked for a positive
23 response? And so it's the nature of the
24 question.

25 RANDY KILBOURN: Because a lot of

1 people won't -- no matter what their experience
2 is, won't fill out the extreme edge, the 1 or
3 the 4.

4 PETER FIX: Maybe.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: You brought out
6 that -- he's asking what a negative response is.
7 What is a positive response to the same
8 question?

9 PETER FIX: So if someone has --
10 so if it's no negative impact --

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: Whatever the
12 metric is is what you get in a lot of these
13 things, so you have to be careful with what
14 you're measuring because it ends up being a
15 push-pull.

16 PETER FIX: If it was positive,
17 they'd respond that there's no negative impact.
18 So there's no issue there. So we don't know
19 that it was positive, but it's no negative
20 impact and that's what we wanted to know. Does
21 this impact your experience? No, it doesn't.

22 SUZANNE RUST: To me, perhaps
23 what you guys are getting at is it's a way of
24 framing a perception even though, you know,
25 words -- it obviously was a confusing question.

1 But the way we frame things for people,
2 sometimes they don't read it as well, it being
3 really clear when we -- no negative impact,
4 slight negative impact. It's all negative
5 impact where you could have maybe put it more
6 neutrally.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: They're forced
8 to do this to elicit some response, but it's --
9 if they're all asking it in one flavor, it tends
10 to -- well, I don't have the science behind it,
11 but the nature of the question changes the
12 answers and the perspective.

13 NANCY BALE: Actually, though, if
14 I can come in on this. I think the Park Service
15 had already set these things up to be negative
16 indicators in the Backcountry Plan. If you were
17 more than half-mile away from the road, you
18 shouldn't have to expect it in a wilderness
19 area. So I think the Park Service had set it up
20 this way; I don't think it was Mr. Fix. I think
21 he was just taking these -- the way I read the
22 Backcountry Plan anyway -- that all these were
23 set up to be negative indicators if they
24 happened too often.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's

1 reasonable.

2 PETER FIX: We're not saying we
3 want to know the impact of these following
4 things: Is it no negative impact, a slight
5 negative impact or a significant negative
6 impact? We're saying, we want to know if these
7 negatively impacted your experience. So it's
8 not like we said, oh, is this positive or
9 negative? We only said, is it slightly
10 negative, moderately negative or significantly
11 negative? We're saying, did it negatively
12 influence your experience. Because that's what
13 the Park --

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's basically,
15 I think, did it impact? Then it's negative
16 impact, yes or no, and then you happen to have a
17 degree of yes. So I don't know that that's
18 terribly biased.

19 PETER FIX: No, it's not biased.

20 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I'll give you
21 an example of a positive impact. I dropped off
22 some guys at Kantishna and they didn't see
23 anybody for days. I flew by and they were up on
24 the Harper. They were thrilled that they saw me
25 and I saw them. They hadn't seen or heard

1 anybody. They never met anybody until they got
2 to base camp three weeks later. They saw me
3 twice. There are people that like to say, oh,
4 good, here's the road.

5 PETER FIX: So that would be no
6 impact.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: No impact and
8 they would have the answer then.

9 PAUL RODERICK: But you don't
10 know if it was a positive impact. It could be
11 worded the complete other way with the same
12 result. But if the mandate of the question to
13 begin with was looking for negative impacts,
14 then that's what you have to do.

15 PETER FIX: We had some issues
16 with this, but it would have come back to say
17 that, okay, 80 percent of the people said
18 there's no negative impact. Then the Park
19 Service should rethink why they think that's a
20 negative impact.

21 PAUL RODERICK: But it would nice
22 to know in general the positive impacts of the
23 sound, whether natural or unnatural. But the
24 fourth question could be positive. I mean, not
25 taking away from this question because it's

1 important, but I think there could be another
2 question. We hear that feedback more because
3 we're making the sound up there. Then we hear
4 the negative too. But it would be nice for the
5 study end of it to have both perspectives.

6 PETER FIX: It kind of comes off
7 that --

8 PAUL RODERICK: Some people just
9 love the sound of a Beaver. It brings joy to
10 their heart.

11 BRIAN OKONEK: Peter, could you
12 go back one picture?

13 PETER FIX: To this?

14 BRIAN OKONEK: Yes. Why in this
15 one, the second one down, that modern equipment
16 did not include aircraft?

17 PETER FIX: Because that's how
18 the Park Service defined it in their indicator.
19 We took what they had written in the Plan and
20 they said that modern equipment doesn't include
21 aircraft.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's true,
23 though. It's like 1940s technology.

24 PETER FIX: So those italicized
25 things in there, that's from the Backcountry

1 Management Plan, so we want to be consistent
2 with how they define their indicators.

3 NANCY BALE: They had another
4 indicator brought in for camp sites, so that's
5 why they didn't include stoves, tents. And GPS
6 units and cell phones, I wouldn't want to see
7 some of those lying around, so I'm not sure why
8 those were excluded. You should have included
9 soundscape stations.

10 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Did you see an
11 airplane? Not hear one, did you see one?

12 PETER FIX: It would be necessary
13 to clarify some of these things. Some of these
14 were a little difficult to explain to visitors,
15 especially landscape modifications and modern
16 equipment. We had discussions about, well, what
17 did it include and what didn't it include.
18 There probably could be some clarifications to
19 some of the indicators probably.

20 Any other questions?

21 Here's some of the results for
22 that. We were able to contact 581 of the day
23 hikers; 452 completed the survey, which is a
24 response rate of almost 78 percent and we were
25 pleased with that. The backpackers, we didn't

1 have quite as high of a response rate from them.

2 PAUL RODERICK: Is that because
3 you can't get to them when they're done with
4 their trip?

5 PETER FIX: I think there was
6 probably a couple reasons for that. One was
7 that we handed them the survey before it
8 happened. I think some people forgot about it,
9 lost it or didn't feel like doing it while they
10 were filling it out. The local people, for the
11 backpackers, backpackers had more local people
12 than the day hikers and even looking within the
13 backpackers, the local people were less likely
14 to respond to it. Talking to the people who
15 were working at the Backcountry Information
16 Center, they thought that people figured they
17 could mail it in or fill it out later and then
18 they never did. So that might be one factor as
19 well.

20 TOM GEORGE: So this is just
21 people that failed to return it; this isn't
22 people that said, no, I don't wish to do it. Is
23 that correct?

24 PETER FIX: It was -- let me see
25 if I get this number correct. I believe there

1 was 24 people who said, no, I don't want to do
2 it and then 186 who said they took it and didn't
3 do it. So the people who just flat out refused
4 were pretty low.

5 We had two boxes where people
6 were supposed to deposit the surveys afterwards
7 and then we also had some envelopes available
8 for people to mail them back. We had the people
9 that were standing at the WAC, and so the people
10 on the camper buses were getting off at the WAC.
11 We also wanted to sample some people there as
12 well because of that question of, well, before
13 or after, we wanted to get some information on
14 surveying people after the hikes.

15 TOM GEORGE: So some percentage
16 of this was post --

17 PETER FIX: The 38 were completed
18 post hike. That response rate is based on that
19 365. We didn't have a real vigorous sampling
20 plan set in place for the post-hike backpackers,
21 but we were just kind of -- if we'd see some
22 backpackers, we'd ask them if they wanted to
23 fill that out. We analyzed the unit for the
24 backpackers and what we're analyzing are days
25 that they're hiking. So they filled out data

1 for each day they were out there or if they
2 switched units, we had them do a new page for
3 the survey for the unit. So the end for the
4 backpackers then becomes the separate pages of
5 the survey that was filled out.

6 For the day hikers, for the
7 people who didn't respond, the group size was a
8 little bit larger than the people who responded.
9 For the backpackers, again, it was the local
10 people who didn't seem to respond at a higher
11 rate than the nonlocal people. We weighted the
12 data, looked at all sorts of analyses to adjust
13 for those differences and it didn't matter in
14 the results. So we're pretty confident that
15 that's representative of the total population,
16 so we didn't make any adjustments for that
17 potential bias.

18 We had a variety of units in the
19 sample, a little over 30 for the backpackers and
20 a little over 20 for the day hikers. This is
21 the units that were concentrated with more than
22 5 percent of both the day hikers and
23 backpackers. So the darker reddish color,
24 that's where we had more than 5 percent of our
25 units that people hiked in for the backpackers.

1 The yellow, that was 5 percent for the day
2 hikers. And then that orange color, that was 5
3 percent of both the backpackers and day hikers.
4 You can kind of see where our data is
5 distributed in terms of where people were
6 hiking.

7 As compared to some other maps
8 that the Park Service has in term of what they
9 think the distribution is, it seems to match
10 fairly well. So I think we got a pretty good
11 sample of people there. In the Backcountry
12 Management Plan it wasn't real explicit in terms
13 of how they compared the indicators to the
14 standards so we could look at the mean level.
15 We could take a stricter approach and say, if
16 one person violated the standard then the
17 standard is violated, we can look at days
18 violated. So I have some charts that show a
19 level of the indicators by means, whether or not
20 just one person violates the standard and then
21 how many days are violated.

22 This table shows the mean level
23 of the indicators for -- except for litter and
24 human waste and camping out of sight or sound.
25 For motorized sound their standard was one per

1 day. What we were measuring is that for day
2 hikers, on average they were hearing 3.18
3 motorized sounds per day and the backpackers
4 were hearing 3.21 sounds per day. Again,
5 remember, that could be buses in there as well.

6 RANDY KILBOURN: So the second
7 one, modern equipment, does not have airplanes
8 in it?

9 PETER FIX: Right, right.

10 TOM GEORGE: Visitors was a high
11 one for day hikers, but less than 1 for
12 backpackers, which makes sense.

13 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Modern
14 equipment is a visibility question. Did you see
15 that stuff, not did you hear it?

16 PETER FIX: Right, right.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Look at the
18 motorized sound versus the other.

19 NANCY BALE: Communications com
20 facilities, research equipment.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Which is people
22 are further afield, but they're hearing more
23 sound.

24 NANCY BALE: And if they're
25 looking at the peaks, they might be seeing those

1 little com stations, I suppose. What do you
2 think they were seeing? Did they actually tell
3 you what they were seeing or you didn't really
4 ask them?

5 PETER FIX: We didn't really ask
6 them. People would write in like the
7 construction. So, remember, it does include the
8 Park Road within the indicators.

9 NANCY BALE: And if they were
10 hiking at Triple Lakes, they might have seen
11 trail crew with chainsaws?

12 PETER FIX: Yeah. The
13 construction equipment, I remember one comment
14 about the infrastructure at Toklat that they
15 would see that from quite a ways away.

16 NANCY BALE: Oh, okay. As long
17 as they could see it, they could mark it.

18 PETER FIX: Yeah, yeah.

19 CHARLIE SASSARA: Does anyone
20 really have a sense of the distance the day
21 hikers and the backpackers would be from the
22 road? Because they're hearing almost the same,
23 having the same experience in terms of motorized
24 sound, but you would think that the backpacker
25 is further away, so --

1 PETER FIX: Well, there's a
2 corridor -- I mean, we were discussing this on
3 the way down and we thought about this. So we
4 have a day hiker and backpacker. They're
5 leaving from the road. There's sounds from the
6 road. Then once they get back there, sounds
7 from the road might become less and then are
8 there aircraft that people might be hearing.
9 But if everyone has to leave from that road --

10 CHARLIE SASSARA: You have the
11 same experience up to a certain point and then
12 it's different.

13 PETER FIX: Yeah. But the day
14 hikers will be coming back through that corridor
15 that same day.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: But not the
17 backpackers. The day hiker would come back. He
18 would have the same. But there's no difference
19 from the backpacker being away.

20 PETER FIX: Right. So that mean,
21 then, could be made up of some the first day of
22 leaving.

23 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. If
24 you're not having aircraft in there, what is it?

25 RANDY KILBOURN: The sound has

1 aircraft in it, but the modern equipment does
2 not. We don't know if that's aircraft sound.

3 PETER FIX: Right, we can't tell
4 that with this. Since you asked the question,
5 I'll jump to -- from the day hikers, we did ask
6 about the people that were within a half a mile
7 from the road versus farther than half a mile.
8 So people that didn't go farther than half a
9 mile, they just recorded them for their hike.
10 People that did go half a mile, then we asked
11 them to record only what they experienced on the
12 half a mile. There's only 25 people that said
13 they stayed within half a mile of the road. But
14 we didn't see that great of a difference. It's
15 2.4 versus 3.3 with more sound actually when
16 they were farther from the road. But we have
17 the length of hike that would influence that.
18 So we have all these compounding factors.

19 When I looked at the length of
20 hike, there was a positive correlation but it's
21 pretty small. It was .13. So as people hike
22 longer, then they reported more motorized
23 sounds. They're out there for a longer period
24 of time, so they have a greater chance of
25 hearing things.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: Or their
2 sensitivity changes to it.

3 PETER FIX: Right. Someone
4 mentioned the first one may not be that bad and
5 then you see more.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: Or you're in a
7 quieter space or you're away from noise and
8 you're more attuned so sensitivity to the sound
9 goes up.

10 PETER FIX: Sure. That could be.
11 We saw the same thing for backpackers with
12 length of hike. The positive was not that
13 strong, but it was significant and positive. I
14 broke it down to the backpackers by their first
15 day of the hike versus sort of the middle of the
16 hike. I didn't find any differences there
17 either. With the first day and the last day,
18 they might be closer to the road.

19 I looked at weather as well. We
20 looked -- and it's kind of crude because of
21 where you gather the weather from. We had some
22 observations from the day hikers at the entrance
23 area. We took the weather reports for Eielson
24 for the backpackers, but that's pretty
25 localized. So the analysis is there, but I

1 think there's probably some issues with how you
2 accurately look at things such as weather on
3 something. But we did see that the day hikers
4 and backpackers were less likely to report
5 motorized sound on rainy days. And here's the
6 one -- if the backpackers were near the road or
7 not, and we didn't see any difference in the
8 motorized sound if they were closer to the road.

9 So there's all sorts of things we
10 could look at. Maybe new ideas keep popping up
11 in terms of, did you look at this or that? It's
12 kind of continuous. So I'll jump back up to
13 here.

14 One thing that I think needs to
15 be mentioned is there were some outliers in the
16 data. So we looked at the mean values earlier.
17 We had motorized sound at 3.18 and 3.21. There
18 were some people recording some pretty high
19 occurrences of motorized sound. So we had --
20 the median's low, so most of the data is grouped
21 in that lower end, but we did have some people
22 reporting some extreme events. So depending on
23 what it is, that could be possible. If someone
24 is camped near a road or something, you know,
25 that combined with some flights or something, it

1 wouldn't be unreasonable to think that someone
2 could encounter that. But what I did is I also
3 looked -- took greater than three standard
4 deviations from the mean and said, okay, let's
5 define that as an outlier and then see what
6 would happen to those means. Here we can see
7 the mean is dropping if we took out the outliers
8 that were greater than three standard deviations
9 from the mean. So for day hikers put at a value
10 of 27, 42 times and 52 times which got dropped.
11 Then sort of backpackers 14 four times, 15 four
12 time, 20 four times; 21, 22, 25, 30 and 40 got
13 dropped. We see the means dropping without
14 those values. So which one's more accurate?
15 You know, it's a judgment call dealing with
16 outliers.

17 NANCY BALE: Would that be
18 something that you would typically do before you
19 publish, would be to take out outliers?

20 PETER FIX: Well, it's a judgment
21 call. I think I would just note what they were
22 and I'd probably go with the data that had --
23 obviously of concern is that pre versus post
24 issue. Here's what we have for the pre hike
25 versus the post hike. When we look at the

1 overall means, the prehike was a little bit
2 higher than the post hike, but the number of
3 observations is pretty different. We had about
4 four times as many prehike observations as post
5 hike, so that could be influencing things.

6 Then we have different time
7 periods -- well, we had 82 different time
8 periods for prehike and 52 for the post hike.
9 In looking at how much overlap there is between
10 the prehike and the post hike, we had 36 time
11 periods that were only completed for someone who
12 got the survey prehike and we had six time
13 periods that were only completed by someone who
14 had the survey post hike. The prehikes went
15 across a few more units than the post hikes.
16 The prehikes had 32 units that were sent in; the
17 post hike had 21 units. So comparison here
18 becomes a little bit difficult because we don't
19 have these matched up to identical time periods
20 and identical units. When it was possible, I
21 did attempt to match these up for units. But
22 then it becomes difficult because if we start
23 throwing in units and then time, we would have
24 very few people to look at. So this is by unit,
25 but it's not the same day. We just kind of have

1 to make some assumptions. Is there something
2 about these units that would be the same across
3 time? So looking at it this way, we see a
4 difference. Some of these -- some of these the
5 post hike was higher. We looked at the outliers
6 and some of these are due to outliers.

7 NANCY BALE: What is the N?

8 PETER FIX: That's the number of
9 observations we have for that. The first one, 3
10 for unit 4 in the upper left; 3 would be the
11 number of observations we have in the post hike
12 for unit 4, and we have 10 observations for
13 prehike in unit 4. It becomes problematic
14 because three observations, what do you do with
15 that? When we start trying to go across these
16 units, it's spread out and it gets pretty thin.
17 But just so we can see essentially what's
18 happening.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: This is for day
20 hikers or backpackers or combined?

21 PETER FIX: This is for
22 backpackers. This is just for backpackers. The
23 day hikers were all post hike. Some of these
24 were pretty close, though.

25 RANDY KILBOURN: So most of the

1 post hikes are smaller numbers than the
2 prehikes. What do you draw from that?

3 PETER FIX: I think it's probably
4 due to the low -- could be due to the low ends.

5 RANDY KILBOURN: The low what?

6 PETER FIX: The low number of
7 observations we have from that. It's very
8 difficult to make some statements when here you
9 have 3 observations versus 10 observations.

10 RANDY KILBOURN: Do you think it
11 could be from -- if the guy's got a survey with
12 him and he goes, there's something and he checks
13 the box. But the post hike he's drawing on his
14 memory. So do you think that could be part of
15 it?

16 PETER FIX: It could be part of
17 it. Here's the analysis when we looked at --

18 RANDY KILBOURN: Because he's
19 only going to remember the significant issues,
20 right?

21 PETER FIX: Right. When I look
22 at the outliers -- so we had 97 observations
23 that were from the post hike and then like 450
24 that were from the prehike. There were 14
25 outliers and 2 of those were from the post hike,

1 but the same proportion of it. So some of the
2 largest outliers were from post-hike data, so it
3 was 40 and 30. So were they not recalling and
4 guessing? I don't know. Or did they remember
5 those extreme events?

6 RANDY KILBOURN: Well, it seems
7 to me that --

8 TOM GEORGE: Looks like the post
9 hike is always lower with one exception and
10 that's in the 42.

11 RANDY KILBOURN: That was my
12 point. Prehike, they've got the form with them,
13 so they complete the survey on every occurrence.
14 They make a note. But post hike they are
15 drawing upon their memory when they're not going
16 to remember insignificant memories, generally.

17 PETER FIX: This is by unit, not
18 necessarily on the same day, though. That's a
19 concern. That's what we're trying to find out.
20 Well, does it change things?

21 RANDY KILBOURN: I think it
22 changes the impact, positive or negative. I
23 think it changes it.

24 PETER FIX: This is by day and so
25 here we see an equal number of post hikes that

1 are higher and then prehikes that are higher.

2 TOM GEORGE: That's really
3 interesting. In one sort of the day it's all
4 pretty much one way and here it's kind of mixed.

5 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Right. These
6 are the days where you knew you had overlap
7 between pre and post.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm struggling
9 a little bit here, which is to step back a
10 little bit and say, what was the -- I want you
11 to come to a summary level of what you learned.
12 This is not the data. This is sort of middle
13 level analysis that is -- but you're going to
14 make some sort of assessment, a synthesis of
15 this and say, this is what I learned. Come back
16 to that, if you would, and say this was the
17 question we were after and this is their
18 conclusion or our assessment of what we learned.
19 Because going through it this piecemeal seems to
20 be --

21 TOM GEORGE: Let him get to the
22 end.

23 PETER FIX: Well, this is kind of
24 an aside. I don't think we can make too many
25 conclusions about this pre/post issue with the

1 ends that we have. So given the fact that we
2 had -- this one analysis looks at the same unit
3 on different days; another analysis looked at
4 the same day across different units. We see
5 some different results. One thing that we could
6 look at, though, the day hikers were all
7 post-hike surveys and the backpackers had a
8 little bit of mix, but the means for that was
9 very similar. We could look at something more
10 -- break those out by unit or something as well.
11 So on this little aside that's kind of this
12 mid-level data now, so you're talking about --
13 if we want to investigate this issue, we would
14 have had to have a larger end of those post
15 backpackers to see what effect that had. With
16 the data that we had, I don't think we can
17 conclude that one is different than the other.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: What was the
19 question that you were trying to answer?

20 PETER FIX: Well, for this it
21 comes down to that issue of did we prompt people
22 to record more for the backpackers? We
23 administered that survey beforehand.

24 TOM GEORGE: Were they biased
25 because they were given the questions before

1 they went to the field rather than only seeing
2 the questions when they came back.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Got you.

4 PETER FIX: Yeah, yeah. So
5 that's what this is addressing, well, we have
6 this data, we had a certain method that we used.
7 The majority of the surveys were handed out
8 before people hiked, for the backpackers. Did
9 we bias them with that method?

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So I got lost
11 in all the numbers. What's your answer to that?
12 Is there a bias if you give it to them ahead of
13 time?

14 PETER FIX: I don't believe so.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So the
16 data is mixed and similar in some respects, so
17 it didn't seem to matter so much whether it was
18 pre or post.

19 PETER FIX: That's my conclusion.
20 Now, other people might look at the numbers and
21 have a different conclusion, but I'm not
22 convinced that there was some systematic bias
23 associated with that. It's just, you know, when
24 you're looking at it with that small event, it's
25 hard to tell. Was it five times higher

1 consistently or something? No, it wasn't. So
2 that takes care of that question.

3 Another way that we can look at
4 the data -- we look at the mean level. That
5 means this issue of, okay, to set these
6 standards what if they take a stance where it's
7 if one person is above that standard, then it's
8 violated for the unit. I'm showing summaries
9 across all these units in these slides. I do
10 have it broken down by unit so we can see how
11 that can vary. I have an example of that later.

12 This shows how many respondents
13 were above the standards for the indicators and
14 then the units that were above the standards for
15 the indicators. So for the day hikers, 27 of
16 the 28 units, at least one person had
17 encountered more than one motorized sound during
18 their hike.

19 NANCY BALE: So those aren't unit
20 numbers but they're --

21 PETER FIX: No, no, those are
22 numbers of units. We had 28 units that were
23 represented by the day hikers and 32 units that
24 were represented by the backpackers. So it's 27
25 of 28.

1 NANCY BALE: Could you break that
2 down into the unit numbers?

3 PETER FIX: Yeah. I actually
4 have that if you want to see it, but I do have
5 all the unit numbers and so forth.

6 NANCY BALE: Is your survey
7 available in pdf form on line?

8 PETER FIX: I can send you the
9 survey pretty quickly. The report we are
10 working on. It should be out, I'm hoping,
11 sometime in April. Then we have sort of table
12 upon table upon table of here's the mean for
13 unit X. Again, we looked at everything by unit,
14 but that's as small or as fine as we can get.
15 We don't know exactly where in those units it
16 occurred. Some of those units are very large,
17 so --

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: If you did, how
19 about a sense if it's south of the road, north
20 of the road. That would be a nice breakdown,
21 perhaps.

22 PETER FIX: I should have a map
23 that shows that, yeah.

24 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Do you want me,
25 after you're done, to show the map that shows

1 the density of where the day hikers --

2 PETER FIX: Yeah, we could do
3 that. Since this question is being raised, I'm
4 going to skip around here. We were expanding
5 this map for the report to include units of 10
6 or larger. So we will be analyzing, okay, this
7 is where those means occurred. So that darker
8 red color there, that's where the highest means
9 were reported.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So south
11 of the road and units -- I can't read the
12 numbers.

13 PETER FIX: -- 5 and 7 are
14 showing up with the higher means. Basically 13,
15 12, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5 were south of the road and
16 had a mean above 3 and then 26 also had a mean
17 above 3. The lower means were here; 34, 33, 39,
18 32, 31, 11, 18. And we also have -- in the maps
19 we're making for the report, they also show
20 when -- I don't think there's any unit that will
21 be showing for the motorized sound, but we'll be
22 showing when the standard -- making it clear
23 where the standard is being met as well. This
24 one had no data.

25 So this is for backpackers, the

1 backpacker data. This is for the day hikers and
2 so we don't have as great of coverage for the
3 units with more than 15 people. Five shows up,
4 6 shows up again in terms of being a heavily
5 impacted unit. And 12, 11 and 31 were also
6 means above 3.

7 NANCY BALE: But you didn't get
8 information on details of each hike?

9 PETER FIX: Yes and no. For each
10 group of people we had them draw and map their
11 route. The day hikers, we gave them a map when
12 they filled out the survey. We asked them what
13 unit they hiked in and then we gave them an
14 eight-and-a-half-by-11 map of that unit and had
15 them draw their route in that unit.
16 Backpackers, there were multiple units. I mean,
17 we didn't have as much time with them ahead of
18 time. We just had them fill out a map that's on
19 the cover of the survey. So we didn't have that
20 great of resolution on the -- it was a smaller
21 map and so we have their routes. How useful it
22 is, I'm not sure. It was useful for something
23 to kind of verify what they said in terms of how
24 long they hiked and so forth. We scanned and
25 tried to digitize the backpackers. It might not

1 be fine enough of a resolution. For the day
2 hikers that seemed to work out well because we
3 had the sort of large map. Andrew digitized
4 those and he has a map that he can show us with
5 that as well.

6 One other thing I can show here.
7 This is the days above the standard, so it's
8 different than the units above the standard.
9 It's just looking at the different days that we
10 have information for, how many of those days
11 were above the standard.

12 RANDY KILBOURN: So it's almost
13 every day the park is open?

14 PETER FIX: Yeah. For day hikers
15 91 percent of it for the motorized sound.

16 NANCY BALE: Do the dates on your
17 survey go from mid-June through mid-August or
18 what was your range of dates?

19 PETER FIX: It was early June.
20 So the backpackers started right away, June 1st,
21 and then the day hikers June 3rd or 4th. We
22 went through the end of August obviously.

23 NANCY BALE: So you covered the
24 three busiest months pretty much.

25 PETER FIX: Yes. So there's

1 another way that we can look at the indicators
2 and whether or not they meet the standards.
3 Again, that can be broken down by unit, which
4 the report will do. We already talked about
5 this slide.

6 One other thing on the surveys
7 that we had. On the back we just asked if they
8 had any other comments and so forth and then we
9 can look at what's in there. So with the
10 comments regarding motorized sound, of the
11 surveys, there's 12 people who made comments
12 that airplanes negatively impacted their
13 experience.

14 TOM GEORGE: Could you show us
15 those comments?

16 PETER FIX: Yeah, I could. Let
17 me make that larger so you can see that.

18 NANCY BALE: Are these just --
19 you typed up what they wrote by hand?

20 PETER FIX: Yes. This is just
21 written as they put it on there.

22 RANDY KILBOURN: So airplanes are
23 annoying but buses aren't.

24 PETER FIX: That's what that
25 person said.

1 NANCY BALE: Person No. 4 didn't
2 read your survey parameters.

3 PETER FIX: Right.

4 NANCY BALE: That's okay, though.
5 They don't. Don't you have to weigh for people
6 who don't read?

7 PETER FIX: Yeah. There's going
8 to be some measurement of that in there.

9 RANDY KILBOURN: Buses are
10 stalking wildlife. What does that mean?

11 PETER FIX: If there's a moose on
12 the side of the road and there's buses driving
13 there.

14 NANCY BALE: This was all from
15 2010?

16 PETER FIX: Yes.

17 NANCY BALE: And it would be
18 possible if someone came to your office and
19 looked at the comment to relate it to a map of
20 the route drawn and the survey taken?

21 PETER FIX: Yes, that would be
22 possible.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Those comments
24 don't seem to correlate with the number of only
25 three flights per day. I think more telling is

1 the number of people who saw 30 or 50.

2 PETER FIX: Right. So we could
3 go back and look at some of these where someone
4 says they were annoying whether the person
5 saw --

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: There must have
7 been a lot of people who didn't see any?

8 PETER FIX: Yeah. The median of
9 that was 2. People were really grouped on the
10 low end of the scale.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Some people
12 didn't see any.

13 PETER FIX: I mean, 50 percent
14 were above 2 and 50 percent below 2. In terms
15 of people who saw zero, it's about 24 percent of
16 the people saw zero.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Look at the
18 energy in this room around -- this is where the
19 action is, you guys. These public comments is
20 where the action is. Notice the conversation in
21 here and the energy, like, what do you mean so
22 and so does that? Now, what does that tell us
23 about our experience in analyzing this issue?
24 It's about that interaction. So how do we get
25 more or be careful with or be conscious of these

1 comments because look at how the conversation
2 here changed. As soon as someone made it --
3 well, put something up there. Everybody is
4 engaged. How do we bring that forward
5 generally? You wanted to see -- you're looking
6 for helicopter if it's there or not there.
7 You're selecting helicopter, right? This is
8 where the action is for us and --

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: But, Charlie,
10 I look at this and this to me is extremely
11 subjective. It's one person's opinion.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: Absolutely
13 subjective.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So why it
15 resonates with all of us is we're like, well,
16 yeah, we can relate to that.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: This is a
18 subjective conversation. This is a subjective
19 engagement about quality of this experience.
20 We're saying this is too loud or it's too
21 little. It's not about -- we're trying to
22 quantify something which is a subjective
23 experience right now, and we're getting closer
24 with these kinds of comments. I don't have an
25 answer to this, but like the whole conversation

1 in the whole room changed when we put that up
2 there.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, yeah.
4 I've been through this presentation three times
5 now, what Peter is presenting today. Every time
6 I learn something. Because I don't have Peter's
7 level of understanding about how you really take
8 this very subjective piece and make it as
9 objective as you can in terms of, okay, we had a
10 random sample. I mean, like the desire is to
11 take out -- if I have this right, Peter, please
12 correct me if I'm wrong -- take out that
13 subjectivity so that you can like, is there
14 really a problem? Do people really think it's
15 loud? If so, is it going to keep them from
16 coming to the Park?

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: People's
18 behaviors have already changed and the rules and
19 ideas we have here, they're good for a little
20 bit of time and then the behaviors change, the
21 weather changes, the market changes. It's
22 happening faster than this group can get its
23 hands around. It's much more dynamic than that.

24 PETER FIX: There's one more
25 piece of information that might be of interest

1 too. We had this interview. People could write
2 down or not. From the day hikers, there were
3 two comments that they heard planes, not
4 negative or positive, just neutral. Two
5 comments that it was a big impact. With the
6 interviews we talked about a wide range of
7 indicators, so it wasn't just the motorized
8 sounds, but I pulled up the motorized sound
9 comments here. Some of these were sort of
10 categorized. These were in general negatives,
11 what people were saying. These we don't know
12 what the source of that sound was. Some of
13 these were talking about modern equipment and
14 things.

15 So these were all from day
16 hikers. I have some more slides and there's
17 some interesting things in light of some of the
18 other comments I heard earlier today. There's
19 only four on that that specifically pointed to
20 airplanes as being negative impact from those
21 interviews of backpackers. The others were
22 either vague or they weren't saying it was
23 negative. Here are some comments that, again,
24 it's not specific to any one thing. These were
25 neutral comments about the motorized sound. I

1 think it was the person to the left of Miriam
2 who made a comment about, well, if you'd taken
3 an aircraft in, then you were more tolerant
4 toward that. Some of these people are saying
5 things like, well, I took a bus in, so I guess
6 it's okay for me to hear a bus. Yeah, the
7 middle one. The last person was kind of
8 realizing that's the nature of it. For him it
9 wasn't a big deal.

10 NANCY BALE: Was this dictation?

11 PETER FIX: Yeah, and I didn't
12 clean it up so much.

13 TOM GEORGE: So you actually
14 recorded these; is that how you captured them?

15 PETER FIX: Yeah. Here's some
16 points I find interesting. You know, the first
17 person talking about it's necessary. So some
18 people were expressing their tolerance for the
19 overflights. One other thing of interest here.
20 There was a group of comments that were
21 associating motorized sound to the Park Road.
22 We were talking about this on the way down. At
23 what point does sound diminish and so forth?
24 These groups of comments were linking the sound
25 to the road. Again, we can't make the

1 assumption that it was one thing or another, but
2 they were definitely pointing towards the road.

3 I guess in summary the
4 backpackers and day hikers did report a number
5 of sound events that were above the current
6 standard, but I guess putting in perspective the
7 number of other visitors per day hikers was well
8 over the standard. It's supposed to be an
9 adaptive management process. One occurrence per
10 day, I don't know if that's -- well, anyway.
11 With our data we can't distinguish the airplanes
12 from road noise and I think that becomes
13 problematic. In talking with Phillip recently
14 he was saying, oh, we only intended to include
15 things that were outside the road corridor in
16 that standard.

17 So in looking at the open-ended
18 comments that were in the survey I think it's
19 fair to say that airplanes were identified as a
20 negative impact by some of the people. It
21 clearly does bother some people. But looking at
22 the interviews, they associated some sound at
23 the road corridor. We don't know exactly what
24 they were referring to. We kind of need to
25 factor in the length of the hike for those

1 people to see how far from the road corridor
2 they were going. A few of the interviews
3 expressed tolerance for the airplane sounds but
4 also felt we should keep monitoring it. There
5 was some concern of what if it increased. It
6 might be an issue.

7 A few considerations that are
8 involved here. We didn't really design this
9 study to address issues related to motorized
10 sound. We wanted to know how often people were
11 hearing it. So there's a lot of questions that
12 we can't answer either related to what it was
13 and did everyone find it equally annoying or
14 were other people fine with it. We don't
15 necessarily have a real solid handle on that.
16 Should there be something different for these
17 other motorized sounds and airplanes, I mean,
18 you have other things out there that people are
19 hearing. It does make sense to separate those
20 or at least get a handle on which is which using
21 studies such as this. It seems like people can
22 differentiate before making comments.

23 I don't know if you have any
24 other questions or concerns or comments.

25 TOM GEORGE: You also asked in

1 your questions about percentages of time. What
2 kind of response did you get out of that? I'd
3 happy to focus on the sound elements here in the
4 interest of time.

5 PETER FIX: Yeah, I've got the
6 sound elements here. When we put this question
7 in there, we wanted to get a sense for whether
8 it was a little bit of time or was it a lot of
9 time. We had the reading zero to 24 percent. I
10 took out the 2 people who said they didn't hear
11 motorized sound and I put that in zero. So
12 22 percent for the backpackers didn't hear
13 motorized sound; 27 percent of the day hikers
14 didn't hear motorized sound. I think the
15 problem is that 1 to 24 percent category is
16 large. A lot of people who are in that category
17 thought, was it 2 percent? Was it 20 percent?
18 Again, we're just trying to get the sense of
19 whether it was a lot or whether it was a little,
20 thinking about things like if you were looking
21 at the Park Road for four hours and hiking back
22 towards it. So obviously we'd want to refine
23 this if we wanted to get at this issue because
24 we're talking about the lower end being broken
25 out.

1 TOM GEORGE: That's helpful. The
2 other question is: On the outliers could you
3 then look at the responses in those sound
4 outliers to see did the other responses that
5 they made to the other questions, were they
6 similarly extraordinary.

7 PETER FIX: I could look. I
8 didn't do that, but it would be pretty easy to
9 look.

10 TOM GEORGE: It seems like it
11 would be interesting to see if you can get any
12 kind of further information from those outliers
13 since there was such a big split between the two
14 to get a handle on what was going on with that.
15 Was sound for some reason more noticeable than
16 the other things or were all their responses
17 extreme or just what the case might be.

18 PETER FIX: Right, it would be
19 easy to do that.

20 TOM GEORGE: Thank you.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: This is
22 context. You're at University of Alaska
23 Fairbanks. I can't remember, are you under
24 contract for this to do this work or is this
25 your own research?

1 PETER FIX: I was under contract.
2 Park Service funded it.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Okay. They
4 said, this is what we want. Are you done? Is
5 there going to be a publishing?

6 PETER FIX: We're working on a
7 report that will be available to anyone who
8 wants to see it. Then, I'll do more -- things
9 are coming up. We'll look into that and get
10 back to you. I guess there's a limit to how
11 much time is available, but certainly I'm
12 willing to --

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: There's not
14 another season.

15 PETER FIX: There's no funding
16 for another season. If there was funding
17 available, I'd be more than happy to continue on
18 with it. I think it would be good to do it.
19 Especially going over multiple seasons I think
20 we have more confidence in the data than just
21 one season.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. In the
23 framing of your scope of work, is there --
24 exactly what was the scope? Did we want to
25 answer this particular question?

1 PETER FIX: Yeah. They said,
2 okay, we have the Backcountry Management Plan.
3 We said we're going to monitor these indicators
4 once every five years.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: So that's the
6 piece to bring it back?

7 PETER FIX: Yes. So I gave a
8 couple presentations to the leadership team at
9 the Park and this and that and they'll be
10 getting the report for it.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Thank you,
12 Peter.

13 PETER FIX: I can get the report
14 to Miriam and she can get it to everyone.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Peter Newman,
16 who Andrew mentioned is going to be responsible
17 for the 2011/2012 study, has about ten minutes
18 to offer us before he needs to go. We can
19 connect him. We're going to Skype him in. Is
20 there any specific questions for Peter Newman
21 regarding the 2011 and 2012?

22 NANCY BALE: That's the Phase 1
23 and Phase 2 studies?

24 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Right, exactly.
25 He did want to respond to your question, Sally,

1 about why they can't ask questions about
2 experiences prior to Phase 1. Let me see if I
3 can get him.

4 (Telephone conversation with
5 Peter Newman.)

6 ANDREW ACKERMAN: There's a
7 couple questions that some of the Council
8 members have. There's about 12 of them sitting
9 around the table here and then four or five of
10 us in the audience.

11 So one of the questions I
12 mentioned to you earlier, Peter, was about the
13 way we designed Phase 1 with the respondents
14 being asked to sit and listen for three minutes
15 or three to five minutes, and why we can't get
16 their experience from kind of a more natural,
17 you know, what did you hear in the last five to
18 ten minutes of your hike?

19 PETER NEWMAN: All right. So let
20 me take one step back first. When we do a lot
21 of these studies, they kind of tend to -- we
22 tend to look at things from two different sides.
23 One is a side that's descriptive and the other
24 is a value. The descriptive part tends to be
25 more of an inventory. It's objective data and

1 it really describes the flow of people across
2 the landscape. It could be the number of cars
3 on the road. It could be the number of people
4 on the trail. Pure description of what's out
5 there. It's a lot about flow and condition of
6 things out there.

7 The second piece is this piece
8 that we tend to call value. It's more of those
9 value questions. It's asking people about how
10 much is too much. So now that we know what's
11 out there and what has been raised as potential
12 issues or things that we're trying to get a
13 sense or a better understanding of, we ask them
14 about them from a value standpoint and we tend
15 to measure that with things like acceptability.
16 In sound, often it's annoyance, using some
17 annoyance scales. That allows us to get a sense
18 of that how much is too much question.

19 So we've done this in a lot of
20 different parks at this point. What we've been
21 trying to create is this instrument that allows
22 us to do an inventory of sounds of what people
23 are hearing. We've done this out in Mirror
24 Woods, in Rocky Mountain National Park, in
25 Yosemite. We've done it in Hawaii, Sequoia,

1 Great Smokies and Rainier we did last year.
2 That enabled us to really get a sense of what
3 are people hearing.

4 The question you just asked in
5 terms of, why are we asking people to stop and
6 listen? A lot of that is just about the control
7 of a survey. No approach is absolutely perfect
8 in these things. We tend to try to get
9 questions related to behavior and oftentimes we
10 get it. In this case we're trying to get at
11 what are people hearing. And one of the ways
12 we've been doing that and improving on it is
13 using things -- Davyd, I think, spoke with you
14 about some of the ways they've been doing
15 recordings of the acoustic environment that's
16 out there. In asking these questions, we have
17 people sitting next to these recording devices
18 so we can actually hear what are people hearing
19 and then what was actually recorded, and we can
20 begin to develop those relationships between at
21 what point are people actually picking up or
22 hearing these different things.

23 Part of it too is controlling
24 time and understanding the exact time of when
25 people are talking about. If you ask them what

1 they heard in the last five minutes, are we
2 getting what they heard in the last 15 minutes,
3 in the last hour, in the last two minutes. It's
4 hard to tell. So part of it is really that
5 piece of control and really understanding and
6 developing that relationship of we know what
7 we're recording and we know what they're
8 hearing.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Can you hear me?
10 This is Sally Gibert.

11 PETER NEWMAN: Yes.

12 SALLY GIBERT: My question
13 earlier was -- I totally get that. And what I
14 was wondering is if this is possible or if
15 you've had any experience with in addition to
16 doing what you just said, which I understand
17 that, but before you did that to ask people to
18 spend a minute or two to record what they heard
19 in the previous five or 15 or whatever time
20 period of minutes, what stood out for them when
21 they weren't paying attention so precisely.
22 That way you would get a sense of like if they
23 were particularly jazzed by hearing bird sounds
24 or they particularly noticed airplane sounds,
25 that kind of thing. So it wouldn't be a

1 comprehensive detailed thing, but what stood out
2 for them one way or another just to see how that
3 compared with what happens when they're actually
4 actively listening. That was my question.

5 PETER NEWMAN: We don't have
6 that. There are many questions with some of the
7 recall data in terms of the validity of recall
8 data, the validity of trying to understand and
9 compare what is one person's five minutes to
10 another person's five minutes. It's a good
11 question. I'd have to think about that a little
12 bit more. One thing we have done is we've asked
13 this -- we've asked it in an open-ended way.
14 We've tried it where people actually check off
15 on a list of things they have heard and then
16 we've asked things in an open-ended way, just
17 list all the things you remember hearing in the
18 last five minutes.

19 We've also had questions related
20 to their expectations. So what did you expect
21 to hear versus the amount they actually heard.
22 That gets a little bit in terms of those
23 expectations that I think you're talking about,
24 which what they're jazzed to hear or what
25 they're expecting to hear overall. I'd have to

1 think about that.

2 SALLY GIBERT: I think the value
3 of that would be the kinds of things that they
4 noticed in a normal -- in a normal park
5 experience, and it would just be interesting to
6 compare that with the active listening where
7 they're specifically paying attention to what
8 they're hearing.

9 PETER NEWMAN: So your question
10 is about a normal park experience?

11 SALLY GIBERT: When someone is
12 having what I'm thinking of as a normal park
13 experience, they're not sitting there with
14 microphones -- they're not listening or they're
15 not doing an active listening exercise. That's
16 not a normal park experience. And like I say, I
17 totally understand the value of that active
18 listening exercise. But to compare that with a
19 nonactive park experience where you're just
20 hiking or looking around or talking to friends.
21 You're not particularly paying attention, but
22 there will be things that you'll notice that
23 will come to your consciousness automatically
24 and to get a handle on what those things are by,
25 like I say, just sort of checking off everything

1 you heard in the previous X number of minutes
2 and how that compared with the expectations,
3 that would be great.

4 PETER NEWMAN: So, yeah. I think
5 in this Phase I part of what we're doing is
6 trying to understand -- define what it is you're
7 talking about. So one of the things we're
8 trying to figure out is, one, what are people
9 actually exposed to. In the second one we
10 actually do try to -- using a lot of the
11 response work that's been done with recording
12 actually is about trying to re-create what
13 you're saying is the normal park experience.
14 And in a sense that's almost like the value, the
15 second piece. In this first piece we're just
16 trying to figure out what it is that people are
17 hearing. I think I understand what you're
18 saying which is that, is it normal? I think it
19 is quite normal, whether mountaineering or
20 hiking, that people stop and listen. I think
21 it's a huge part of the park experience and we
22 do know that sounds are important. You know, 91
23 percent of park visitors say they go to parks
24 for quiet and lot of them are going and stopping
25 and listening, and that is -- there's data that

1 show that people do, especially when they're
2 stopping for breaks on trails and just entering
3 a park in general, that they are going there to
4 sit and listen. It can go either way.

5 For example, someone who can hear
6 certain sounds, it's very possible that those
7 most important sounds -- let's say it's birds or
8 it's a plane, that's all going to be in the
9 report. So I think it's important to remember
10 that what we're trying to do is get the full
11 array. Our study question is about doing a full
12 inventory of sounds that they're exposed to.
13 That's almost a separate question than what
14 we're looking at, I think, in this Phase 1 which
15 is a little bit more descriptive.

16 SALLY GIBERT: I hear you too.
17 It's definitely two sets of data. They don't
18 substitute for each other.

19 PETER NEWMAN: Right. So I think
20 we may get at that stage, I guess is what I'm
21 getting at. I think we definitely would get a
22 better sense.

23 TOM GEORGE: Could he describe
24 briefly in that Phase 2 how the sounds are
25 presented to visitors, in what context and what

1 location.

2 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. There's
3 another question having to do with methodology
4 in Phase 2. I described earlier a little bit
5 about how they'll be listening to sound clips, a
6 range of sound clips that will be mixed and
7 they'll be basically true to the soundscapes in
8 Denali. Can you describe a little bit more in
9 detail about how we envision doing that in the
10 field. They're going to be wearing headphones,
11 et cetera, and the locations and kind of how we
12 envision the exposure to those sounds.

13 PETER NEWMAN: Sure. Part of
14 Phase 1 is answering some of those questions
15 with Andrew and others, like what we've done in
16 other places. I don't know exactly how we're
17 going to do it in that park yet, but I think
18 we're going to try to figure that out. The
19 equipment, we often use things like i-Pods or
20 small CD players or MP3 players or anything like
21 that. We use Bose noise-canceling headsets that
22 allow -- do the noise cancellation as much as
23 possible. In your woods we went as far as
24 reclaiming a bathroom at a visitor's center and
25 turning that into a little sound booth. There

1 were no flushing toilets in there. We actually
2 re-created those kinds of things in those
3 different places. Part of this Phase 1 is
4 figuring out where we could do that in Phase 2.

5 As far as mixing the sound, we do
6 a few things. One is we tend to look at the
7 data that are described from that Phase 1. So
8 what are the sounds heard, look at frequency.
9 We work with the Park on trying to figure out
10 what is the study question, and we try to create
11 these different tracks of typical sounds heard
12 in a different area. For example, in your woods
13 what we did is we found in your woods that one
14 of the major issues was trying to figure out
15 noise from visitors and that came out -- that
16 was a big issue. So we really focused on
17 different levels of noise generated by visitors
18 and, in fact, that was the major issue that they
19 pointed to was wanting to reduce. So we ended
20 up trying to figure out in Phase 2 different
21 ways of reducing that noise. So, one, we found
22 a level that was appropriate using the sound
23 tracks and then, 2, we actually tried an
24 experimental design in order to reduce the sound
25 that visitors made.

1 So I think a lot of the questions
2 we're going to answer with these guys. Another
3 thing that's happening right now is we're
4 working with the Volte (ph) Center and the
5 Natural Sounds Program -- due to the size and
6 cost we're going to do it here -- and the FAA to
7 come up with methodology that get at all these
8 questions. One of the issues that the Park
9 Service has been working very closely with FAA
10 and Volte Center is to really get a better
11 understanding of different standardized ways to
12 make these measurements. We've been working on
13 it this year. We're actually sending our post
14 doc to Grand Canyon all of April to begin to
15 look at some of these surveys and to work with
16 folks on these issues.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you.

18 PETER NEWMAN: You're welcome.

19 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I'm sure there
20 was something else. The stated choice
21 component.

22 PETER NEWMAN: Yeah. You know
23 what, I may give a quick -- I'm going to be able
24 to go through this quickly and then I have to
25 run. I'm sorry.

1 Stated choice. So choice
2 modeling is a really -- Pete can answer some of
3 these questions. He can actually answer a lot
4 of these questions as well. His research has
5 used some of these new techniques. Choice model
6 is pretty cool. It's a neat way of putting
7 visitors -- making them make choices between two
8 alternatives or more. And the scenarios are
9 often made up -- they all have different
10 attributes. This approach came out of actually
11 car salesmen. You look at different models of
12 cars. You can imagine two people that are
13 making a choice between the same model car.
14 There may be different attributes of that car.
15 Could be leather seats; it could be a standard;
16 could be a moon roof; sun roof; air conditioning
17 and in those different areas someone might
18 choose a car and so maybe it's the stick shift
19 you want.

20 So it's a stick shift, but it's
21 going to be a nasty green color and it's not
22 going to have a sun roof or it will have air
23 conditioning. I don't know. Whatever it is.
24 Or it's all wheel drive. What you're trying to
25 do is you play with these different alternatives

1 to figure out what are the trade-offs that
2 people make between these different attributes
3 in order to find the thing that has the best
4 value for them. What you can then do with those
5 data is figure out what it is people would trade
6 off in order to get something. For example, if
7 stick shift is your thing, would you take that
8 really nasty green color in order to get it, or
9 the leather seats? What is the thing you're
10 trading off?

11 In park management it's been
12 really useful because we can create these
13 different scenarios and these different
14 scenarios tend to provide things like, for
15 example, in Yosemite one of the things we looked
16 at was this idea of solitude and freedom. And
17 this idea that in the ultimate wilderness
18 experience people say that they want to go
19 anywhere they want, whenever they want. They
20 don't want to see any people. They want perfect
21 trails with very little impact. They want the
22 camp sites to be nice and small, but groomed.
23 What we're saying is, you know, Yosemite where
24 there's 4 million people a year, you can't have
25 it all.

1 ANDREW ACKERMAN: You still
2 there?

3 PETER NEWMAN: Yeah. You can't
4 have it all, right? So what I was saying was
5 that we actually forced people to make these
6 decisions between these competing types of
7 scenarios, and in this case it was solitude and
8 freedom is what I'm getting at. So the same
9 thing, I think, this is a common question in
10 parks. What are people willing to give up in
11 order to get a certain type of experience
12 desired? And what it allowed us to do is build
13 models and figure out what it is that people are
14 really making that decision from. What is the
15 driving factor and what will they actually, in a
16 sense, buy or sell in order to get that value
17 that's most important to them.

18 So we would set up these
19 different scenarios that would be in line with
20 the management objectives of the area that would
21 allow us to get at what are the most important
22 indicators. What are the different types of
23 alternatives that the park wants to measure.
24 Then it would allow us to get a sense of, in
25 some kind of public vote, in a sense, we can

1 build a model that would say what percentage of
2 the people would choose this over this.

3 That's kind of a quick version of
4 it. Did that make some sense?

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

6 PETER NEWMAN: I am sorry. I
7 have to go pick up a kid.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you.

9 PETER NEWMAN: You're welcome. I
10 would be happy to send articles on any of the
11 things that we've done. We just had a nice set
12 of articles published on sound. We've done some
13 work on park science. Have you guys seen some
14 of the data on park science on sound? I think
15 that's nice -- or some work we've done on
16 soundscapes. We've also done some work on
17 trade-off modeling. I would be happy to send
18 you any of the papers we've done that would
19 allow you to kind of look more into some of
20 these procedures that we use.

21 TOM GEORGE: Please do.

22 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Thanks, Peter.

23 PETER NEWMAN: I'll work with
24 Andrew on that. Andrew, just let me know how I
25 can help.

1 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Okay. Thank
2 you so much.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Let's take
4 a five- or ten-minute break.

5 (Break taken.)

6 SALLY GIBERT: It's 3:30. We
7 always manage to end up here. I have on my list
8 of things still yet to do, if we do everything,
9 is giving both Mike and Amanda -- it was like
10 three to five minutes and now it's like one to
11 two -- brief introductions about their
12 background and where they're coming from, who
13 they're working for, that kind of thing.

14 Miriam, you've got a couple of
15 reports here, actions taken on Triple Lakes
16 Council recommendation and visitor comment
17 cards.

18 Do you want to go into that?

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Actually
20 during our break, we had a discussion with
21 Charlie that I think supersedes the need for --
22 I mean, I can do it in a nanosecond, yeah.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Any
24 representations that we have as a group relative
25 to the data-gathering activities that have

1 occurred to date, either recommendations we can
2 make RIGHT now or if we want to send something
3 to committee to do some more thinking about.
4 Fact sheet, brainstorming list, talk about the
5 listening session on May 21st, volunteering
6 monitoring on the north side and JPARC. Better
7 get talking.

8 Why don't we do the Miriam report
9 slash Charlie first.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Here we
11 go. The recommendation was that we share with
12 the public objectively the aircraft use over the
13 Triple Lakes area so that users of that trail
14 could have a realistic expectation of the
15 experience. So in talking with folks at the
16 Park about how we would do that or try that out
17 this summer -- because we don't have our
18 backcountry, those two positions not on staff
19 yet -- our chief of interp said a great way to
20 get information out to people is to have
21 something in the Alpenglow, which kind of lists
22 our trail system. This is like well read by the
23 visitor as well as it goes on line and it's used
24 quite a bit.

25 The other piece that they'll do

1 is that as for the Denali Visitors Center -- so
2 if you can think about Triple Lakes Trail is, a
3 lot of people come in and just day hike that. I
4 mean, like they'll ask at the DVC as well as at
5 the Wilderness Access Center to train staff to
6 just give a sound bite. Not giving the whole
7 Overflights Council, blah, blah, blah, blah,
8 because these are probably our lowest-graded
9 employees unfortunately at the park. Kind of
10 like, you know, if you're going to be going on
11 the Triple Lakes Trail, you can expect that
12 there may be some aircraft overhead, and just
13 leave it like this is the condition, not this is
14 how we feel about it. Just like, there might be
15 aircraft and leave it at that. Very simple.

16 So those were two things that the
17 chief of interp felt that we could do this
18 summer to see if that was in any way effective
19 to reducing people's -- the Alpenglow, it's like
20 a summer newspaper. There's one for summer, one
21 for winter.

22 Is that enough information on
23 that? Okay. Then the second piece was, I did
24 not get all of our visitor comment cards
25 compiled for '09 and '10. But that's something

1 if people are interested, we'll do it like we
2 did before and I'll scan them into a pdf and we
3 can load them and have it as part of the web
4 site so everybody has access to them. I'm done.

5 SUZANNE RUST: Quick comment. In
6 training for that sound bite, I think how that
7 sound bite is said is important. For instance,
8 saying on this trail it has higher aircraft --
9 there's a higher frequency of airplanes versus
10 other trails, so that they know there's a choice
11 versus when we just put it out there that this
12 trail has aircraft noise. Then it puts that --
13 rather than giving -- making it more neutral.

14 SALLY GIBERT: What about, this
15 trail parallels an area that is under an
16 aircraft traffic corridor until about 8:30 at
17 night.

18 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, that would be
19 good. It's under an aircraft's traffic
20 corridor.

21 ERIC DENKEWALTER: If there are
22 people that doing any hikes, go out there about
23 8:30, it's nice and quiet.

24 NANCY BALE: In June it's great.

25 KRIS FISTER: I hike that trail

1 all the time because it's pretty close to the
2 mountain. You expect aircraft around there
3 because there's a Park air strip, there's
4 another air strip.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: What Kris is
6 describing is exactly what we would want to
7 train staff on. Here's a map. Look at where
8 all of these -- there's a heliport, there's a
9 private strip, there's a McKinley strip, there's
10 this traffic. So people could -- yeah, there
11 might be aircraft above them for these reasons,
12 but the message to the public is we want
13 people -- staff to be successful. Just simple.
14 But we do want to give them the background of,
15 like, we're not condoning impairment of the
16 wilderness recreation values. Let's be
17 realistic about the experience in the Park.

18 NANCY BALE: The Alpenglow piece,
19 is that something that we could have a
20 subcommittee develop or what?

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Probably not,
22 only because I can't get stuff to you guys on a
23 timely enough basis. It's going to fit in terms
24 of the space that's available for the wording
25 regarding the trail system on it. That's really

1 going to be dictated by the chief of interp,
2 Ingrid. Okay.

3 So I put Charlie on the spot.
4 He's got a suggestion for a future vision for
5 our next meeting.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: Thanks. Bear
7 with me, guys and girls and friends. I have a
8 general sense that we're sort of drifting off
9 our mission and that there's little pieces of it
10 coming up and expressed in different ways here.
11 I'm revisiting our charter here, because our
12 charter, the guts of it says: The Council
13 develops voluntary measures for assuring safety
14 of passengers, pilots and mountaineers for
15 achieving desired future resource conditions at
16 Denali National Park and Preserve.

17 It's about the future. And one
18 of the things that's really been missing in our
19 conversations here is we haven't had any
20 visioning in future conversations about what we
21 want this place to look like 50 or 100 years
22 from now. The commercial interests are very,
23 very short term. We've got cash flow. We've
24 got to make the project happen this year. But
25 at the same time our charter is about 50 years

1 from now. You're not going to be flying
2 hundred-year-old aircraft. You're already
3 flying 50-year-old aircraft, right?

4 And the other thing is that the
5 conversation around -- we were originally sort
6 of brought here because there was a perception
7 that there's too much noise, and there's
8 disagreement whether or not there was but that's
9 why we were here, right? And now we're going
10 down analytical paths to prove that there's
11 noise sort of after the fact, and I don't know
12 the utility of that. The big thing is I think
13 that the need to make sure that we are looking
14 at the future conditions not just what's
15 happening today, and I don't see us doing that.

16 What do you guys think? I mean,
17 am I off track here or not making sense or what?

18 SALLY GIBERT: I think that my
19 perspective was that sort of the first bite of
20 the apple was to take care of things that could
21 be taken care of immediately.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: With voluntary
23 measures. And those are ongoing, right?

24 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, and I think
25 we're still doing that. I think there's some

1 ideas that are going to come up in brainstorming
2 that maybe start to get to that. But, yeah, we
3 haven't spent very much time on that, but I
4 don't think that means that we aren't going to.
5 I mean, it's a helpful reminder to not just
6 think about today.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah. Well,
8 okay.

9 PAUL RODERICK: Aren't we just
10 laying out like a framework and a foundation
11 first. We're looking at the data and saying,
12 well, we've had the complaints, but we're trying
13 to gather the analyses and -- I mean, we're in
14 agreement that there are areas that have present
15 conflict that are probably going to have
16 conflict.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Does this group
18 need to objectify or quantify an objective? Do
19 we have to do that in order to have
20 recommendations? I mean, the Park has to do it
21 for their management. They have to have
22 something that's defensible, but do we need
23 that?

24 SUZANNE RUST: We were visiting
25 at lunch and one of the things is really

1 understanding. I think having a really good
2 understanding helps us make good decisions for
3 the future, and I think that these studies
4 aren't necessarily -- I guess maybe I'm seeing
5 them differently as trying as much to say, oh,
6 is there a problem or is there not? I think
7 there's been a recognition, but we're trying to
8 decide or at least I would hope to understand
9 more of how we can better try to fix things or
10 try to -- if we do this, how does it affect
11 these visitors? Really understanding the
12 visitor. You know, somebody who hikes farther
13 in the Park, their perceptions are different.
14 And where we move when we try to shift or try to
15 make changes that are better, even those ones
16 that are in the near future, are we really
17 making it worse in other areas? I think that
18 some of that is stuff that we have to know and
19 then there's other stuff -- we talked about it
20 at lunch -- I would really like to understand
21 sound more, because sometimes I'm not sure if
22 we're always approaching things the best way we
23 could. What things can we do? What tools do we
24 have right now? And then what you're talking
25 about also is perhaps eventually new

1 technologies. There are all kinds of different
2 things for the future. So I don't think it's --
3 I wasn't seeing it just as, is there a problem
4 or is there not. I think it's a deeper
5 understanding.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right.
7 Everyone comes to different levels of
8 understanding and perspectives. We can agree to
9 that. I think that we need to have some -- it
10 just seems like we're getting into -- I can feel
11 us going down rabbit holes and not being
12 necessarily in alignment with what the charter
13 was and -- you know, so that's my perspective.
14 It doesn't mean that's where we are. That's
15 all.

16 AMANDA SMITH: Or is another
17 question, now that we've got somewhat of a
18 foundation or we're building a stronger and
19 stronger foundation as the years go on, is now
20 or soon, this year, time to start talking about
21 those questions? You know, it's another -- can
22 we do them concurrently? We've started and is
23 now the time?

24 Is that the question you're
25 asking, Charlie?

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. It's
2 like you have some framework that we know we're
3 going down this road. Are we still going down
4 this road? Is this what we're doing? How do we
5 know we're being successful? Maybe that goes
6 back to having quantifiable data to point to.
7 Maybe that's an approach. But one of the --

8 This is a side note. One of the
9 problems with that is that this is a continuum
10 of experiences and that it's not static. When
11 we get these little digital limits of what we
12 think reality is and this thing has already
13 moved along, the original premise changes.
14 People move. People have already moved their
15 climbing behaviors. So the original idea has
16 changed of why you need to be here and not
17 there. So in some respects I don't see us being
18 dynamic enough.

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: The first
20 couple of meetings I went to people and said,
21 where's the biggest problem here? I'll give you
22 one example. They said Glacier Creek. I said,
23 gee, I didn't even know people went there. So
24 we modified our behavior, where we went, because
25 we heard that's where it was. I think we've

1 gotten away from that. Now we're talking about,
2 like you say, huge generalities. If someone
3 said today, here's the areas we're having the
4 most complaints. It's not hard for me to change
5 routes. We did. You said, I don't want people
6 over the summit during climbing season. Okay,
7 we stayed away, but that's the end of it. We
8 haven't done any more on the north side. We've
9 done all the south side stuff. We haven't got
10 any feedback.

11 Two-and-a-half years ago we said,
12 why don't you put the sound monitors where these
13 sensitive issues are. There seems to be a
14 complete disconnect with those people and what
15 we're trying to do. We've got all sorts of
16 reasons why it's over here and over there.
17 That's got nothing to do with this Council. The
18 Council needs to be looking at it and saying,
19 okay, if there's a probably at Glacier Creek,
20 put a sound monitor there. We talked about this
21 a year and a half ago. Put another one where we
22 think on the Upper Teklanika. Do those things.
23 Nope, there's some other agenda that they're
24 doing.

25 We need to go back to what I

1 think is solving some of the most egregious
2 problems here. Saying, tell me, talk to me,
3 what have you heard? What have you got from
4 those comment sheets? And say, okay, we can
5 make a pretty quick adjustment to that. One of
6 the things that's kind of backwards is they
7 said, stay away from 17 camp and 14 camp. The
8 next year they put a sound monitor at Bear
9 Basin. What the hell? What was that about?
10 Wasn't that exactly the opposite? So there's
11 something that's not coordinated on what we're
12 doing.

13 I can only do so much. I've
14 talked to you and said, hey, where is it? I'll
15 stay the hell away from there. That's what we
16 need is kind of an immediate can we come up with
17 something where we're all marching forward? I
18 agree with you. I don't know where we are here.
19 I'm hearing things about surveys of people on an
20 unrepresentative trail, which is the Triple
21 Lakes Trail. That's got nothing to do with the
22 rest of the park country. Where's all this
23 stuff going? What's this have to do with
24 anything? I'm with you. I don't know where we
25 are here.

1 SALLY GIBERT: I think a lot of
2 the research we're hearing about is not set up
3 to serve the Council. It's set up for another
4 purpose.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right.

6 SALLY GIBERT: And that's part of
7 the problem.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: It gets kind of
9 confused. What's the purpose of this? What's
10 the relationship with us? And these
11 professionals, they get into the detail and --

12 BRIAN OKONEK: In defense of the
13 professionals, we have identified some places
14 where there have been some conflicts and then
15 people want, you know, unequivocal data that
16 shows there is some kind of conflict, and so
17 people try to produce the data to see what's
18 really going on.

19 CHARLIE SASSARA: Got you.

20 BRIAN OKONEK: There's a lot of
21 people on the ground that know that there's some
22 conflicts out there and that, for sure, there's
23 some conflicts with the master plan. We are
24 trying to -- we've come a long ways. All of us
25 have learned a lot. People have gotten more

1 used to the idea that, yeah, there are people on
2 the ground, that sound matters. And people on
3 the ground have gotten used to the idea that,
4 yeah, there are businesses in the air, that
5 flying matters. We're trying to compromise and
6 everything.

7 But I'm with Charlie's camp here
8 on this, that we can go round and round in
9 circles on this data stuff forever and not make
10 anything better in the Park for the users on the
11 ground and for the master plan because it will
12 just -- it could go on endlessly.

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: We're not set
14 up to really administer that, I don't think.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: My thought
16 would be, I think I can kind of see all sides of
17 this. I agree with Charlie absolutely and I
18 also don't mind having -- if the studies are out
19 there, I might as well benefit from the
20 information.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Exactly.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think the
23 process is lengthy and the process is messy, but
24 I feel like we're going in the right direction.
25 Unfortunately you feel like maybe we're not, so

1 I'm not quite sure how to correct that. Maybe
2 we need to talk more future visioning and move
3 on to a different level. But I also feel like
4 it's messy and maybe we start going and we go
5 like this, but we're still -- I feel like we're
6 making progress. It's just not a straight line
7 and that's frustrating. I think it's just the
8 name of the game.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: Vision and then
10 concrete things that Eric can address this next
11 year, you know, is an alignment, both of those
12 places. I can see us providing the guidance and
13 the vision and doing the concrete for this
14 particular year. I can't see us really
15 administering analytical work or being
16 meaningful drivers of that because it's -- we
17 don't have the attention span for it.

18 TOM GEORGE: Speak for yourself.
19 I want to reinforce Joan's
20 comment. I think the thing we've got to bear in
21 mind is there are a lot of moving parts in this.
22 There are airplane parts. There are climbing
23 parts. There are technical data collection
24 parts. As we get to different portions of this,
25 we all have to take some time to learn about

1 some of those other parts. At the same time
2 we're trying to get the scientific community to
3 understand a little bit about some of the
4 questions we have and whether we can get those
5 questions addressed in their -- some of the
6 complicated studies. We're kind of going in
7 fits and starts, but that's the nature of the
8 beast and we kind of have to take the time to go
9 in some of those areas.

10 Now, if we're too far off track
11 in some direction, yeah, then occasionally we
12 have to do a course correction. Again, we're
13 not being asked to administer anything. If
14 anybody is giving you the impression this
15 Council is administering studies, you know, that
16 was a miscommunication. On the other hand for
17 this Council to, first of all, have awareness of
18 what's going on out there in the studies, which
19 definitely will impact us, it's time we need to
20 invest to understand that and, conversely, if in
21 fact we think some of -- I mean, we've had them
22 define a number of the questions they're trying
23 to answer. If in fact there are still some
24 questions that we need answers to be able to
25 make progress in these areas, then we as a

1 Council need to package that up in some way and
2 see if we can communicate it to them to get to
3 where we all need to go. So, yeah, there are a
4 lot of moving parts. It's messy and it takes
5 time to delve into these other areas of
6 expertise and understand them well enough we can
7 have a discussion. That's what we're doing. We
8 just need to keep moving it along.

9 SALLY GIBERT: I also think that
10 we did lose some momentum this winter. I think
11 everybody -- for whatever individual reasons --
12 everybody including me got very busy and we
13 didn't do very much between December and now.
14 And I think that's part of it. So I think we
15 can hopefully learn from that and try not to
16 slip into that between now and December.

17 NANCY BALE: Very slow to evolve
18 the Best Practices because of the situations
19 that developed with the working group. So a
20 Best Practice for a summer season has to be
21 promulgated by now or even before now so it can
22 be vetted through the committee, through the
23 subcommittee working group. We've never really
24 put that into writing that that's how we want to
25 work. It seems to be that the whole Council is

1 comfortable with the whole Council promulgating
2 an idea, but they would have to run it through
3 the working group. Anyway, so I'm disappointed
4 that we haven't put something into effect about
5 the north side. I'm disappointed about that.
6 But we do have something for the Ruth Gorge
7 that's relatively new this year.

8 You all know that Joan and I are
9 particularly devoted to trying to see that those
10 harder to achieve standards are somehow
11 addressed, the ones within the wilderness core,
12 the Park. So that's our wider vision.

13 I also agree with Charlie that
14 having a wider vision is good, always keeping in
15 mind that there may be seasons where it's
16 bluebird days from June to August and the
17 economy completely recovers and the market could
18 double and what would Denali look like? You
19 have to envision that. I mean, right now we're
20 constrained by weather. We're constrained by
21 the economy. There's constraints on us that
22 this Council didn't place. What if those
23 constraints disappeared? What would be our
24 recommendation?

25 I appreciate, Charlie, that you

1 had that kind of idea because I do think there
2 are future -- there are problems for all of our
3 children and that we need to come up with,
4 before we disband, some probably big ideas that
5 we haven't even touched on yet about what that
6 looks like in a scale and scope sort of way for
7 our businesses and for our lifestyles.

8 TIM CUDNEY: I agree 100 percent
9 with what you're saying because we've all
10 suffered in our own way for the last couple
11 years with the economy. We change our business
12 models to deal with it, however we conduct our
13 respective businesses. I heard -- what's the
14 cap on the mountain? 1500? There haven't been
15 1500 climbers on the mountain in how many years.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: There's never
17 been.

18 TIM CUDNEY: I mean, road
19 traffic, vehicle traffic. Even right now every
20 day we turn around there's a new gas hike.
21 That's going to affect us. It's going to affect
22 the aviation operators for sure. As everybody
23 knows, our prices were set close to a year ago
24 and now we're dealing with another increase
25 again. How do you forecast that? And the

1 uncertainty in Japan, the uncertainty in Libya,
2 it affects us all. For 2011, sure, I would love
3 to have it be a banner bluebird year. I'd love
4 to be able to say, hey, I need another aircraft
5 versus shipping another aircraft out on a fire
6 job or something. I would love to say that
7 we're going to have a great, great year but I
8 don't see it.

9 So once again we're going to have
10 skewed numbers. We're going to have skewed
11 numbers as far as how we operate, as far as the
12 number of flights, number of people, but then
13 all of a sudden maybe in 2012 it turns right
14 around and it does rebound and then we have a
15 whole different -- we start adding again and
16 then all of a sudden the picture changes. Like
17 we've done these Best Practices under this
18 scenario and all of a sudden it changes to this
19 scenario, you know, maybe the way it was five or
20 six or seven years ago.

21 There's so much uncertainty out
22 there, I would like to be prepared for it by
23 exploring all avenues of how we address this.
24 These Best Practices obviously can't be narrowed
25 to just one location. It's just like anything

1 else; when you put congestion in one area, you
2 make mitigation for that area, move to another
3 area. Whether it's our soundscape or whether
4 it's the congestion at Triple Lakes -- you know,
5 they put a tremendous amount of work on the
6 Triple Lakes Trail last year. Triple Lakes
7 Trail last year received one of the highest --
8 it was like one of the busiest trails in the
9 whole park system.

10 Well, what happens where you've
11 hiked the trail numerous times, and the old
12 trail where it wasn't as, I call it paved, you
13 know, more wilderness, and now all of a sudden
14 you've got everybody on the trail to where at
15 one time you might have seen three or four or
16 five hikers a day, now you see 10 or 12. It
17 changes the whole experience. So what's going
18 to happen? Those people are going to go
19 someplace else.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So in light
21 of this long-term vision, what do people want to
22 do about that? We could talk about that until
23 5:00. Do we want to put this on the agenda for
24 the September meeting and just be thinking about
25 it, or do we want to have an aviation working

1 group or another group working on it or just
2 people talking to each other before the
3 September meeting?

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'll volunteer
5 to frame something for -- and not in terms of
6 what the vision is or anything, but just what
7 the process might be to hold this. I think that
8 we need the concrete now of this season and the
9 guidance. So maybe it's as simple as it's an
10 agenda item that we address every year or, like
11 Nancy suggested, that there's a time frame for
12 suggestions to come forward for being vetted so
13 they can be used. Just that, okay, give us a
14 little bit of --

15 SALLY GIBERT: Certainly the
16 September meeting is an ideal time to do the
17 broad-scale brainstorming. People can be
18 talking about it before that and that gives you
19 all winter to say, okay, here's some general
20 ideas and what can we do with those specifically
21 to see if any of those translate into actions.
22 Okay. So you're the champion for keeping that
23 issue moving forward.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, I will.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Good.

1 Public comment period.

2 PAUL RODERICK: I was just going
3 to make a general assessment. Although this is
4 slow, I think everybody can agree with it. I
5 mean, it's not necessarily the nature of the
6 beast, but there's one thing that I can tell you
7 that's come out of this and it may have to do
8 with the slowness is that I think all of us --
9 instead of having gone to our particular
10 corners. Like, initially I think when this
11 group came together we felt like we better go to
12 the corners and be defensive, and basically I
13 don't think we're as open as we are with each
14 other now. But I think it's an opening now,
15 because it's gone slow. We see that the
16 factions aren't against each other. I think
17 there's a relationship here that's developed and
18 it's taken this long. It's been a couple of
19 years, I would say.

20 I would say, though, if you're
21 going to take a group of people just in general,
22 just watching the general group here, I'd say
23 it's kind of just getting into a certain stride
24 of being able to make some important decisions
25 and that would pertain to the future. I think

1 it has been slow, but I think a lot of this
2 stuff is coming out. It's like something coming
3 out of its shell. But I don't know. I feel
4 more comfortable talking about a lot of the
5 aspects and I know some of the other operators
6 are the same way about divulging information
7 they wouldn't have at the start of this. It's
8 kind of unfortunate it has to take this much
9 time, but everybody has these lives to live
10 that's outside of this particular group. But I
11 would say we're in a good situation in general.

12 I don't feel like it's gotten off
13 course dramatically. It's like going for a
14 Ph.D. You want it -- or any kind of degree or a
15 rating of some kind. You want it now, but in a
16 way there's like a certain movement that has to
17 take place where some of these insights occur.
18 It's a complex organism if you take this whole
19 body of people. I think it's impressive that
20 it's working as well as it is. That's just a
21 side comment. But I think it's going to happen.
22 Although I have to admit that the north side is
23 the weakest aspect of this whole thing. We
24 don't fly there on the south side as much and
25 we're not in tune with the situation with the

1 backcountry users and what they do and what they
2 don't do. But that's been coming out in the
3 meeting as we progress, even those it's pretty
4 darn slow. Some of the information given today
5 was hard to follow and maybe extraneous to what
6 we're trying to do here. I'd say somebody
7 should write down five things they would like to
8 see on the north side and we should all talk
9 through them in the next few months. The south
10 side, in my mind, they're the major ones that
11 have been established and we're implementing
12 over the last few seasons. But the north
13 side -- it might be weak. I kind of feel like
14 it's weak because I don't really know enough.
15 Some of the information is coming out.

16 SALLY GIBERT: I think part of
17 the reason that the north side is weak is
18 because it's still unclear what the actual
19 objectives are. That's okay. It takes time to
20 figure out what those are. Thank you.

21 Anybody else have anything,
22 public comment type things to say? Okay.
23 That's good. Thank you.

24 Fact sheet, brainstorming,
25 what's --

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Can I make a
2 suggestion?

3 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, please.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I would like to
5 go next to the listening session, the third one
6 under member reports. That's a key thing we
7 need to talk about.

8 TOM GEORGE: Before we do that,
9 there's an image on the screen. Is that
10 something someone can talk to us about just
11 briefly?

12 ANDREW ACKERMAN: I put that up
13 there because I'd mentioned it earlier. If you
14 want to wait until later, I can wait until
15 later. Do you want me to speak to it now or
16 later?

17 SALLY GIBERT: What was the
18 purpose of putting it up?

19 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Data that was
20 collected this past summer on day hiker routes.

21 SALLY GIBERT: This is new, in
22 other words?

23 ANDREW ACKERMAN: Yeah. I'll
24 give you a description of it if you want it.
25 Probably in person I can do it. It's not

1 important that I explain it to everybody.

2 SALLY GIBERT: It would be great
3 if you get that graphic to Miriam so she can
4 send it around to us. That's great. Thank you.

5 Did you want to talk about the
6 listening session?

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Tom, I have
8 things to say on that or did you want to start?

9 TOM GEORGE: No. Go for it.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It kind of
11 blends into what we were just talking about on
12 the north side. I find it frustrating too that
13 we haven't come up with anything concrete on the
14 north side. I do think it's a more complicated
15 problem and that's part of the difficulty.
16 People aren't in a concentrated place like
17 climbers up the mountain. What I have felt
18 after the last meeting, I thought that we were
19 talking about the bubble idea I presented. For
20 those who weren't there, there is an idea on the
21 table on the north side to take kind of the
22 high-use backpacking areas and day hiking areas,
23 which is basically from the spine of the range
24 to the road to five miles north of the road from
25 the park entrance to about the Muldrow Glacier.

1 So we took one of the high-use day hiking and
2 backpacking areas, put a bubble over that and
3 said, that's kind of our primary problem area on
4 the north side.

5 Then there was an idea presented
6 at our last meeting and that idea was try to
7 avoid that area when you can. Fly south of the
8 range or fly north of the Park Road or if you
9 can't or don't want to, then fly higher. The
10 FAA recommendation over the Park is to be 2,000
11 feet above ground level. So the suggestion was
12 made, you know, make that even greater. Make
13 that 4,000 feet. I thought Suzanne had a good
14 comment. My recollection is that her comment
15 was, before I ask my pilot to do something
16 that's going to take a fair bit of energy and
17 effort, I want to know how much I gain by going
18 from 2,000 feet to 4,000 feet. In my mind -- I
19 don't know that I really stated this publicly.
20 But in my mind, okay, set this north side
21 solution on the table for a bit. I'm content to
22 let it ride as we learn more information. So
23 what I would like to see happen -- what I would
24 like to get out of the May 21st listening
25 session is to be able to sit and listen.

1 There's been talk whether to have
2 kind of an active social situation like we did
3 at Petersville Road as we're listening to planes
4 fly overhead or just more quiet active
5 listening. My suggestion would be to eliminate
6 the variables and have a quiet listening session
7 because my goal -- there's been some information
8 and I don't know how I know this and if it's
9 accurate or not, but just because you go twice
10 as high doesn't mean it's twice as quiet. So I
11 would like to get a feel for what does a plane
12 sound like at a thousand feet, the same plane
13 directly overhead, keep all the variables the
14 same, what is the difference between 500 feet or
15 a thousand feet versus 2,000 feet versus 4,000
16 feet to kind of get a personal experience on,
17 you know, it's higher up and I hear it longer,
18 worse or better. At what point does it become
19 kind of background noise?

20 So I would suggest for this that
21 we don't do the social thing, because
22 Petersville Road was a great event and I loved
23 the grilled pizza. Thank you, Tom. But I found
24 what sounded louder or quieter to me had to do
25 whether I was in an animated conversation or I

1 had drifted off and was quiet by myself. So I
2 want to eliminate that variable. I would
3 suggest we have the same type of plane fly over
4 at various heights -- and we can discuss what
5 those various heights should be -- and then use
6 that information and maybe also do an offset as
7 well. And use the same plane. This is what it
8 sounds like at a thousand feet, 2,000, 4,000.
9 This is what it sounds like a quarter-mile away,
10 a half-mile away, a mile away. We can kind of
11 work on what those distances should be. Then
12 that can help us to frame what might help on the
13 north side and give us some more information.

14 The second piece of that too is
15 we're not the first people to ask this question,
16 and so is there somebody available or willing to
17 look in the literature and see what kind of
18 information studies there have been on what kind
19 of aircraft and different decibel levels at
20 different heights and different distances. I
21 would imagine that there's some information and
22 research already out there that we can benefit
23 from, and it would be helpful if it duplicates
24 our own personal experience. Be that as it may,
25 I think more information is good.

1 TIM CUDNEY: That information is
2 available.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I have not gone
4 looking for it. I have kind of piecemeal
5 gathered things as I find them, but they're
6 scattered in my notes.

7 TIM CUDNEY: As a matter of fact,
8 I have a lot of it.

9 MIKE YORKE: And from
10 manufacturer's standpoint, meaning current
11 manufacturer's standpoint, they advertise the DB
12 level for the various reasons. If you take a
13 single Otter, the geared engine is going to be
14 different than a Pratt unless -- zero degrees
15 opposed to 59 degrees, which way the wind's
16 blowing. A lot of variables.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Davyd, did you
18 have anything you want to add to that?

19 DAVYD BECHKEL: I did. In fact,
20 just to speak to the physical properties of
21 sound, if you change your flight level by -- if
22 you double the distance from the source, from
23 the observer, it should drop by about 6 decibels
24 the sound pressure level. The inverse square
25 law is what it's called. If you went up from

1 2,000 feet to 4,000, you should expect about a
2 6 decibel reduction theoretically.

3 SUZANNE RUST: Can you walk
4 through that with us? Because as you go from 2
5 to 4,000 feet, so if it was, let's say,
6 60 decibels at 2,000. So you go to 4,000, it's
7 going to be --

8 DAVYD BECHKEL: 54.

9 SUZANNE RUST: Now you have to
10 double it again to 8. And where will it go to?

11 DAVYD BECHKEL: Drop down to 48.
12 The reason is that is because each decibel --
13 it's logarithmic. So the pressure is dropping
14 dramatically, but the way we describe it, the
15 sound pressure level, it makes a huge range in
16 differences which our ears can detect a lot
17 smaller and easier to deal with. That's why we
18 use decibels instead of just talking about the
19 straight pressure.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So what's the
21 practical -- okay, 6 decibels. What will I hear
22 to my ear, though? It will be a little bit
23 softer, a lot softer?

24 DAVYD BECHKEL: Rule of thumb to
25 use for loudness is that every 10 decibels you

1 reduce in the sound level aptitude, you're
2 cutting the loudness in half approximately.
3 Noticeable difference is about 3 to 5 decibels.
4 Three decibels is the bottom floor of that, so
5 if you reduce the sound level by 3 decibels,
6 that's pretty noticeable.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So
8 30 decibels is -- 60 decibels is twice as loud
9 as 30 decibels?

10 DAVYD BECHKEL: No.

11 MIKE YORKE: No, it's not linear.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I said that
13 wrong. Every 10 decibels. Forty decibels is
14 twice as loud as 30 decibels?

15 DAVYD BECHKEL: It would sound to
16 your ear about twice as loud, yes. It's a rule
17 of thumb, so at the really loud sounds and
18 really quiet sounds that kind of breaks down.
19 It's a good rule of thumb.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That gives us
21 a --

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: Just for
23 reference. The propeller on a 185, where was
24 that at when you're taking off? It's like 95 or
25 100 or what?

1 DAVYD BECHKEL: Depends how close
2 you are to the propeller.

3 PAUL RODERICK: If you're pushing
4 on it?

5 DAVYD BECHKEL: So to answer your
6 question, Charlie. A lot of how loud something
7 is depends on how far away you are.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. If you
9 have to be 2,000 feet above, that's the
10 standard. Every aircraft is there. We'll say
11 that. So how loud is the --

12 DAVYD BECHKEL: I can't say for
13 sure how loud it is.

14 RANDY KILBOURN: We took those
15 measurements at Petersville.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: You could do
17 the math of it and say, well, at a thousand feet
18 this for that, you know, and if we have these
19 rules of thumb.

20 RANDY KILBOURN: You have
21 attenuating factors too.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: What's the
23 biggest factor?

24 DAVYD BECHKEL: The biggest
25 factor, I would say, is distance.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: And then?

2 DAVYD BECHKEL: Then probably air
3 attenuation. That all has to do with the
4 distance away from the observer. The air
5 absorbs a certain amount of energy over distance
6 and that will reduce the sound a little bit.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's still
8 distance. What's next?

9 DAVYD BECHKEL: Then I would say
10 the angle of the aircraft to the observer. So
11 if you're really close to the ground -- say, a
12 bus is a really good example. You've got a bus
13 and you've got a backpacker a couple miles down
14 the Toklat River from the road. They're really
15 close -- the bus is really close -- it's
16 almost -- this is a hard thing to describe. But
17 it's right along the ground, so the sound is
18 traveling to the observer along the ground.
19 There's friction with the sound wave and the
20 ground. It slows the bottom of the sound wave
21 down and it ends up curving into the ground.
22 That actually will tend to attenuate how far or
23 how loud.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: So that's
25 telling you the terrain affects it?

1 DAVYD BECHKEL: Yes.

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: So terrain is
3 next. So distance, terrain.

4 DAVYD BECHKEL: Environmental
5 conditions, barriers.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: So this is
7 interesting. He's saying that -- like the
8 mountains will attenuate as opposed to
9 magnifying. That's not as counter-intuitive.

10 SALLY GIBERT: I think we need
11 to --

12 TOM GEORGE: You're getting too
13 deep into this science for us.

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, the
15 notion that was starting to emerge was rules of
16 thumb and we were talking about going out and
17 hearing what the aircraft sounds like, which was
18 demonstrated a year or two ago, right? And
19 so -- but developing those rules of thumb,
20 they're interesting, and they might be useful
21 for us in terms of how far do we really need to
22 be or what's optimal of as a component of the
23 best practice. Maybe it's not meaningful --
24 after you get to a certain distance, it's not
25 meaningful anymore, so who cares. We accept the

1 aircraft, but here's -- that's all.

2 TOM GEORGE: So I think to follow
3 on that and what Joan said, I agree. I think
4 for what we want to do now to kind of -- as prep
5 work to working more on the north side issues is
6 you've got to set up a scenario where we have
7 either one or maybe two aircraft type -- we
8 don't need a whole bunch of aircraft types -- to
9 fly a flight track overhead at a couple
10 different altitudes and offset at a couple
11 different altitudes. I mean, we can predict
12 with the theory kind of what the decibel
13 difference might be. The idea is to actually be
14 there on the ground experiencing that to see,
15 okay, from a generic type of perspective,
16 realizing that environmental conditions vary.
17 Where you are on the landscape is going to cause
18 it to vary. So the only thing in this case is
19 by us being in a fixed location, we're going to
20 at least see the relative difference between
21 that.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: So the outcome
23 would be that we would agree what the rule of
24 thumb might be.

25 TOM GEORGE: We would never agree

1 to anything. That would be too easy. I think
2 we would gain some experience here that would
3 help us sit down and talk about, okay, does it
4 look like it makes more sense to try and go
5 higher in some cases over a sensitive area
6 versus offset. And my guess is the distances --
7 it's like overhead or a mile off, to deal in
8 increments less than that, my guess is we
9 wouldn't be able to discern the difference.

10 But I think we should try, again,
11 and if you can set up and run a station for that
12 period of time so we actually do have the actual
13 decibel numbers to compare and to map back to
14 the standards. Because, remember, in the
15 background there are always the standards that
16 we need to be mindful of where we fit into that.
17 I think that would be a good outing for us and a
18 good setup then to try and get the aviation
19 working group together and talk more about going
20 back to that north side area. At the north side
21 you've got 400,000-plus visitors. They're over
22 a larger area. It's a tougher challenge than
23 the south side.

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And the value
25 of the Stampede Road is it's tundra and

1 scattered spruce. It's more representative than
2 Petersville Road.

3 TOM GEORGE: And we can have
4 either pizza or barbecue afterward while we're
5 compiling that data. What I'd hope we'd try and
6 do is, again, be able to get some rough numbers
7 like we did and put those together, so before we
8 leave we have at least the first order results
9 in order to walk away with numbers as well as
10 whatever impressions we were bathed in that
11 wonderful sound from those airplanes going by.

12 SALLY GIBERT: I think we need to
13 get two or three people who want to be involved
14 in working on the details of that. I think
15 we've got enough of a framework from the whole
16 group.

17 NANCY BALE: I'll be glad to be
18 involved.

19 TOM GEORGE: I'm volunteering,
20 and Joan has to get involved.

21 SUZANNE RUST: We're doing that
22 on May 21st? I can't come on the 21st.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It doesn't have
24 to be that day. That was the first day we
25 picked. We had a secondary day the week before,

1 the 14th.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Tim, can we do
3 helicopters too? Do you have the resources
4 available to help with that?

5 TIM CUDNEY: Sure. Will that be
6 cash or credit?

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: See Miriam.

8 TIM CUDNEY: Yes.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Is that a good
10 date for you, then?

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'm going to
12 ask that you be really thoughtful based on what
13 Tim said about the price of gas. I think
14 there's money in the Overflights -- the last
15 time we chartered so that people didn't have to
16 incur that expense. But have it well thought
17 out. I don't think it needs to be the
18 multi-type of aircraft again. What do you
19 really want to learn? What's the outcome you're
20 trying to achieve? Then, let's be efficient
21 because we're all about sustainability too.

22 TOM GEORGE: I'll volunteer to
23 draft a plan and we can put this down. I don't
24 think we need a whole bunch of different
25 aircraft types for this. I think more the

1 altitudes is what we need to --

2 TIM CUDNEY: That's not that far
3 for us. What we would easily be willing to do
4 is I always have people willing to fly. At that
5 time of the year we're just starting to get to
6 the busy time. We could do one northbound --
7 northwest at a set altitude and then go out of
8 the footprint long enough and turn around and
9 come back at 2,000 elevated and back where you
10 have some instant results. I mean, that's not a
11 big deal. But if we start going back and forth,
12 I need to kind of do it around the work
13 schedule.

14 TOM GEORGE: We might want to mix
15 this up to where you don't necessarily know
16 which altitude is what. Again, you're recording
17 your observations based on what you heard with
18 that pass. Later we'll supply the information
19 about --

20 SALLY GIBERT: You can put that
21 in the work plan.

22 TOM GEORGE: Miriam, in the
23 interest of cost, I was going to see if maybe
24 Colin Malone or something, the Park could maybe
25 supply the airplane.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It's still
2 costing money. It's cheaper than Tim.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Is May 21st the
4 best day?

5 ERIKA BENNETT: May 21st is the
6 only one I can do.

7 TOM GEORGE: Let's try and go
8 with that date then.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Fact sheet.
10 My understanding is that we haven't done
11 anything with that. Everybody still wants to.
12 We need some way of collecting information for
13 the fact sheet or photographs that can be like
14 pdf'd and somehow shared and narrative --
15 possible bits of narrative. I know I've been
16 wanting to work on narrative. Maybe our next
17 goal should be by like August 1st have --

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That's almost
19 too far away.

20 TOM GEORGE: How about
21 April 30th?

22 SALLY GIBERT: April 30th maybe.

23 TOM GEORGE: I took an action
24 item at the last meeting to set up a web site to
25 perhaps use. Rather than pushing big piles

1 around and cluttering up. I did do that;
2 however, it's a free Google site and it appears
3 that you have to have a Google account to get on
4 it.

5 SALLY GIBERT: And you have to be
6 invited by the person.

7 TOM GEORGE: Well, that's easy.
8 I could do the inviting. I'm set up to do that.
9 I sent that out to Miriam and Suzanne as a test.
10 When I realized that people had to have a Google
11 account, I didn't know whether people were
12 willing to go through the hassle of that or not.
13 There is a site there. If you want to go that
14 way, I'm happy to send it out to the whole
15 Council. But if you don't have a Google
16 account, you would have to go sign up for one.

17 SALLY GIBERT: It's not hard. I
18 did it.

19 TOM GEORGE: It's not hard to do,
20 but it's an annoyance. This is temporary only
21 for purposes of getting that up so we can all
22 see what each of us put on there. After we're
23 done with that, it goes away. It's a work space
24 is what it is. It would not be open to the
25 public. It's only by invitation. So I do have

1 that in place. If you want to go that way, I'm
2 happy to send that out. But if there's an
3 easier, better way to do it, I'm happy to do
4 that too.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think it's
6 easier to -- whoever is to send the photos to
7 Miriam and you were going to work on the text.

8 SALLY GIBERT: The nice thing
9 about the central site is everybody can go at
10 any time and look at what's there as opposed to,
11 hey, Miriam, can you send me whatever so and so
12 has sent and then next week, hey, Miriam, would
13 you send me any new stuff. But that means
14 everybody has to get a Gmail account.

15 TOM GEORGE: If they don't have
16 one already.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You just sign
18 up for one for free.

19 TOM GEORGE: It's free. You can
20 delete it later if you don't want to use it.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: If that works
22 for you and Miriam then.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Did anybody
24 other than Suzanne come with photos today?

25 NANCY BALE: I have photos I can

1 put on my memory key and give to you.

2 SALLY GIBERT: I'm not hearing
3 any objections to Gmail accounts.

4 TOM GEORGE: So I'll do that?

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, go ahead.
6 You can send that around and that will be a
7 reminder to everybody to get their Gmail
8 account, but then they're going to have to let
9 Tom know what your address is.

10 ERIKA BENNETT: You can actually
11 send the invite to everybody's regular e-mail
12 account.

13 TOM GEORGE: Right. I will send
14 it out. If somebody has trouble getting onto
15 it, let me know and maybe I can help or maybe I
16 can't. Just know you need a Gmail account.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Deadline for
19 that? I like the April 30th myself.

20 SALLY GIBERT: April 30th, okay.

21 TOM GEORGE: April 30th sounds
22 great.

23 NANCY BALE: Now, you were
24 thinking you wanted pictures of backpackers,
25 pictures of airplanes and --

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think what
2 we're interested in is photos that reflect
3 aviation in the Park. So what had been
4 suggested at our earlier meeting is research
5 that occurs, rescue that occurs, the access that
6 occurs through aviation.

7 SALLY GIBERT: The issues that we
8 deal with.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Something that
10 reflects not only aviation, but the Council.
11 What is the Council kind of grappling with?

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought what
13 I suggested before is -- we need like the three
14 major user groups we're dealing with, visitors
15 who take a flightseeing trip, visitors who are
16 mountaineers and visitors who are day hikers or
17 backpackers and kind of how we balance all those
18 uses.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So the fact
20 sheet can be as photo rich as you want.

21 TOM GEORGE: Everybody can
22 contribute materials and then we can have a
23 discussion about it.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Yes. So if
25 you have a little verbiage you want to have to

1 describe it.

2 AMANDA SMITH: Submit those
3 things and then we decide as a group? Collect
4 it and then we decide as a group?

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Can you remind
7 me again what the goal was for this?

8 SALLY GIBERT: It's something we
9 wanted for -- it was a combination of something
10 that would explain what it is we do, why we
11 exist. Because there are other people that are
12 outside the process that are curious and it
13 helps them understand what it is that we're
14 doing. And it's something that can go on our
15 web site that helps describe what it is we do
16 short of just the charter. We can mention the
17 fact that we've got these Best Practices and
18 everything, get people to look at the link. So
19 it's kind of where it all comes together.

20 TOM GEORGE: Just to get a sense
21 that the last three years wasn't just in vein.

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Park Service
23 will use it as VIPs come to the Park. Kris
24 actually puts together packets of information.
25 What's new and the cool things that we do in the

1 Park usually goes in our packet. It's down to
2 one page, so it reads well in D.C. Pretty
3 simple and condensed.

4 SALLY GIBERT: It's two pages.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Can be two
6 sides or one side.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Recommendations
8 for additional research. Was this something we
9 want to bump to September?

10 NANCY BALE: For NPS
11 recommendations, if there was a way that a
12 request could be made of the Denver people for
13 data to show the influence of height above
14 ground if they could do a meta study or gather
15 together the data on that.

16 SALLY GIBERT: Tim was saying he
17 has information.

18 TIM CUDNEY: I have some. It's
19 reasonably current.

20 NANCY BALE: I would imagine that
21 the soundscape office in Denver probably has
22 even more than Tim has. I mean, Tim's would be
23 great. Denver would have a huge amount of that
24 type of stuff.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Tim could

1 circulate what he has and if there are
2 further -- maybe what he has is great and if
3 there's further questions, we could direct those
4 to Denver.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Is that going
6 to be on our action list?

7 SALLY GIBERT: I'm thinking that
8 Tim may have adequate information so we don't
9 need to make an official request.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Davyd, do you
11 know of information?

12 DAVYD BECHKEL: Not right off
13 hand.

14 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Voluntary
15 monitoring on the north side. This is basically
16 Amanda's idea of trying to develop a training
17 module for non-Park Service staff. Is that
18 something that we want to try and work on in a
19 working group format this season? Is that
20 taking on too much?

21 AMANDA SMITH: One reason to
22 advocate it is because it's all north side
23 stuff, and if we're starting to charge down the
24 north side tackling those problems -- I mean,
25 what questions do we want to ask? Maybe the

1 Stampede thing is going to answer a lot of our
2 questions; maybe it's not. It's just one other
3 possibility.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Whatever
5 information is provided to John, for example,
6 for the mountain rangers -- that's a different
7 context of course. Maybe just recording
8 observations. I don't know.

9 AMANDA SMITH: Maybe I'll take a
10 step back and explain it a little better. The
11 way I see it is there are three private guest
12 lodges at Wonder Lake. Those staff members live
13 there and they often are taking their days off
14 between, like I said, roughly Toklat or
15 Polychrome and Wonder Lake and they're spending
16 a night or two nights out in the park. Some of
17 them are guides at Camp Denali. They have the
18 only permit to be in the park doing naturalist
19 interpretations. So you have people with
20 masters degrees with trained eyes who are out
21 there. They're naturalists who are recording
22 data in that whole area. Granted they're
23 usually within five miles of the road, but
24 they're out there all day long. Not in the
25 p.m., not at 8:00 p.m. when a lot of

1 flightseeing is happening. But they're out
2 there. So the idea is if you have the cheat
3 sheet or just prep them a little bit and they
4 have contracts with Park Service people, so we
5 could go through Park Service avenues or
6 overflights avenues and say, hey, we just
7 want -- these are the questions we're asking.
8 How often do you see an aircraft and how loud
9 was it? Or maybe we make it more specific than
10 that. But that's kind of the vision for it.
11 You know, those are people who are out there if
12 that eliminates some of the big questions of how
13 we would accomplish this. That one initial stab
14 is my thoughts of a way to do that.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And do you have
16 a way to easily contact these people and
17 distribute this and follow through?

18 AMANDA SMITH: I do. I would
19 feel more comfortable if I was working in
20 conjunction with the chief of interpretation or
21 whoever is responsible for overseeing those
22 guest lodges. Yes, I could do it on my own one
23 way, but do we want to go through and get the
24 Park Service buy-in? Because the Park Service
25 goes to each of those lodges and those guides

1 every year and says, hey, this is what you need
2 to know for rules and regs for the road when
3 you're with guests and this is what you need to
4 know for this. And, hey, we're doing a study,
5 we'd like you to participate. Would you be
6 willing to ask your staff to do this? I think
7 it would be good if we did it in collaboration.
8 It wouldn't have to be separate. That's
9 something the working group would decide
10 together is how we go about this, who do we talk
11 with at the Park Service. At least that's what
12 I imagine the working group would decide, not
13 necessarily the whole group. It's just whether
14 or not we want to try this this summer if we
15 want information for the north side stuff.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: What about just
17 having a conversation with John Leonard and
18 having the same information, questions that
19 he's -- or information that he's giving his --

20 BRIAN OKONEK: Charlie, they've
21 got parameters. They've got Best Practices, you
22 know, so they're looking at planes or the summit
23 flights and stuff. This would be more just an
24 open book sort of thing. It's a little bit
25 different. I would think it would be nice to

1 have some ground observations, just what people
2 are experiencing in the park.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Especially if
4 we are effective on changing the sound --
5 especially if we do something like shift from
6 here to here and then we create a new problem
7 somewhere else where there wasn't any.

8 CHARLIE SASSARA: What would be
9 the three questions? What would they be?

10 SALLY GIBERT: The only thing I
11 can think would be numbers of flights -- numbers
12 of flights you hear. But in terms of getting at
13 their disruptive value or whatever, I don't know
14 how you'd ask that.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What I
16 envisioned -- I don't know if I can find it --
17 the scale that you had set up for us, Tom, on
18 the Petersville Road, it was like 1 to 5 and
19 your descriptions were actually quite clear. It
20 was pretty easy to tell. It was like barely
21 noticeable. You know, noticeable but -- or
22 something, you know, and interrupts conversation
23 or something like that. He had some clear --
24 whatever those were. If we could just make a
25 chart and each time you just make a little tick

1 mark. Airplane or helicopter, 1 to 5, barely
2 heard it 1, and comments.

3 SALLY GIBERT: And where you are.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And where you
5 are. Maybe time too and maybe weather too.

6 AMANDA SMITH: Some of these
7 things you can eliminate. But I agree, like,
8 five questions like that. You take some of the
9 subjectivity out of it by saying those
10 parameters and check them off and then we
11 collect them at the end of the year. They have
12 to turn in reports to the Park Service every
13 week or every two weeks on where they hiked, how
14 many guests they had, all that kind of
15 information. There are mechanisms for
16 collecting this kind of data.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Years ago we
18 got a letter from -- I can't recall their
19 name -- who worked at Denali Backcountry Lodge.
20 She would have been there toward the mid or late
21 '90s. She kept a detailed journal one summer
22 and gave it to the park and I have it. I
23 presented it at one of the meetings. That was
24 years ago. She did something similar to that.
25 She just had what unit she was in, how many

1 aircraft. She didn't have anything about the
2 scale. She did that on her own because she was
3 noticing a change.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Taking notes here.
5 I've got five questions: Where, weather,
6 when -- where, weather, when, the actual event,
7 which would be type of aircraft, X type of plane
8 relatively flew over, and the relative loudness
9 scale that you developed.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And maybe a
11 little place for comments because they might
12 know something. Like there's a search going on
13 or the Park Service is doing a caribou study or
14 whatever.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I hate to be a
16 little wet blanket here. Why it works on the
17 south side so well is the people who are
18 providing the information are staff, Park
19 Service staff. So we can pretty much tell them
20 to do whatever we want because they're getting
21 paid by us to do that. So I have a little bit
22 of -- I think you have a great idea and I think
23 it can work. I think it's going to need to be
24 well thought through because now you're speaking
25 about -- it would be like us asking Tim or

1 Suzanne, we want your staff to provide us with
2 this data that's helping the park. Okay. The
3 lodges are great partners with us. But it's not
4 up to us to ensure that their staff do something
5 that benefits the park, so --

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: Just going to
7 ask them if they would. It started out as a
8 voluntary thing.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I just wanted
10 sensitivity to that. I think it's great. I
11 think it takes some relationship building. I
12 mean, I think they would --

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's just a
14 question, yes or no.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. And I think
16 Amanda, because of her connections out there, I
17 think that would help. So if it's both
18 voluntary from the lodge standpoint as well as
19 voluntary from the individual, they have to be
20 willing to do it.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I would
22 suggest that it be well thought through so that
23 when you do present it to them that there's that
24 sensitivity. Like, we're not expecting
25 everybody to do it but, gosh, this would be so

1 great and that you had an outcome that you were
2 clear about. We're really hoping to get this
3 information for whatever it is you determine.

4 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I do want to
5 chip in a buck 30 to get a comment.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Maybe it would be
7 good to do just a quick why this idea came from
8 you and what your background is relative to
9 this.

10 AMANDA SMITH: Sure. Very
11 quickly. Amanda Smith. And got bit by the
12 Alaska bug and worked at Camp Denali for two
13 years, which is one of the private guest lodges
14 near Wonder Lake. Still have very close
15 relationships with them. I probably spent a
16 cumulative 30 weeks, 40 weeks in the backcountry
17 in Denali, week-long trips, weekend trips and
18 then living out sort of at that end. I moved to
19 Anchorage. I used to work for Alaska
20 Geographic, who is a partner of all the national
21 parks and public lands. I now work for SCA,
22 which is the Student Conservation Association,
23 also a partner of Denali National Park and most
24 of the public lands in the country.

25 What else would you like to know?

1 I'm outside all the time and I have been to the
2 Ruth Glacier and I loved it. I have been on
3 flightseeing trips and I loved it. I try to
4 spend as much time in the park, both the front
5 country and deep in as I can all year round,
6 although I need to ratchet up some time in the
7 winter. I'd like to ratchet up some time in the
8 winter.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you. That's
10 helpful. Does everybody think that's a good
11 idea to try and do this on a voluntary basis?

12 MIKE YORKE: I see no harm.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah,
14 especially if Amanda is willing to -- the timely
15 part is the connection with the lodges.

16 AMANDA SMITH: It would be nice
17 to get some of the backcountry rangers
18 volunteering or Wonder Lakers on board would be
19 nice because they patrol that area regularly.

20 NANCY BALE: But then we'd be
21 having official NPS staff doing it.

22 AMANDA SMITH: Then we shouldn't
23 do it -- then we shouldn't include them. We'll
24 stick with the original plan.

25 NANCY BALE: Would you agree,

1 Miriam?

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: To have Park
3 Service commit to doing that?

4 NANCY BALE: Well, you have to go
5 all the way to the top and ask Phillip, No. 1.
6 He wasn't supportive of it last time he was
7 asked.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Because nobody
9 on the north side is saying that they have the
10 capacity right now to do it. He's kind of being
11 a responsible manager.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It could be a
13 good prototype in that this was really easy or
14 we were lacking this information so that by the
15 time -- if and when we ask the Park Service, we
16 kind of know this is too unwieldy or this worked
17 well or this was missing.

18 AMANDA SMITH: What I would hope
19 is that one or two other people would work with
20 me on the questions and the format and what
21 we're really asking. I don't feel like I can
22 yet do that on my own. So that's a question for
23 the group.

24 NANCY BALE: I would be happy to
25 work with you and Tom has materials as well.

1 AMANDA SMITH: Thank you.

2 TOM GEORGE: Geographic location
3 obviously is important for something like this.
4 So how would that be recorded? Do people carry
5 GPS's with them?

6 AMANDA SMITH: Oh, they know
7 exactly where they are.

8 TOM GEORGE: But how does that
9 get captured?

10 AMANDA SMITH: We can do it by
11 unit. That would be one way -- is that what
12 you're asking, or where exactly they are?

13 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, where exactly.

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: By unit and
15 maybe distance from the road. Some of the units
16 are huge.

17 TOM GEORGE: How about exactly.

18 SALLY GIBERT: How about taking
19 maps.

20 TIM CUDNEY: I'm not downplaying
21 this, but unfortunately people have no real
22 direction sense of how far they've actually
23 gone. It gets very skewed. We've issued some
24 of our backcountry guides the spot units and we
25 tell them at certain times to send a notice and

1 we get the e-mail with the lat-long and all that
2 stuff. Those things are very inexpensive. I'm
3 not saying everybody run out and buy one, but
4 it's a great way to gather some very accurate
5 data.

6 AMANDA SMITH: When they work.

7 TIM CUDNEY: When they work.

8 AMANDA SMITH: I think that's an
9 excellent idea. If we wanted to buy ten spots
10 and send them with people, I think we could do
11 that. I have a relatively high level of
12 confidence only because these folks have to
13 record for the Park Service exactly where they
14 go with exactly how many people. It's highly
15 regulated anyway. They have lived out there
16 year after year after year. For most of it.
17 When they're on their weekend trips, I agree
18 that they might think they've gone 10 miles off
19 the road and they're two. I think they
20 generally have a better sense than that. But I
21 agree. It's absolutely an objective way if you
22 have a spot or if you have a GPS as opposed to a
23 map, which can still be pretty accurate but it's
24 another variable.

25 SALLY GIBERT: A lot of people

1 have personal GPS's on their phone, so that
2 could be like --

3 TIM CUDNEY: Well, the GPS's on
4 the phones don't work in the backcountry.

5 AMANDA SMITH: That's something
6 that the three of us can decide, however we do
7 that.

8 ERIC DENKEWALTER: If you just
9 put a spot on the map, I could figure it out.

10 SALLY GIBERT: We've got ten
11 minutes. Unfortunately this is the third
12 meeting in a row where we haven't gotten to the
13 brainstorming list. We keep putting it off.

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Maybe start
15 with that envisioning next time because it kind
16 of all flows.

17 TOM GEORGE: Well, I think
18 talking about the JPARC trumps the brainstorming
19 list.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Well, yeah. We
21 could talk about. Do you want to quickly try
22 and set a date for a December meeting?

23 BRIAN OKONEK: After we talk
24 about JPARC.

25 TOM GEORGE: She's right. Get

1 the December meeting first.

2 SALLY GIBERT: September 9th. We
3 try and plan one ahead. Anybody have a calendar
4 with December on it?

5 TOM GEORGE: Where would this be?

6 SALLY GIBERT: Like the 1st or
7 2nd? The 2nd of December is a Friday.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought we
9 decided we were going to kind of go between
10 Talkeetna and Anchorage.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Usually I think
12 the winter meeting is in Anchorage. So the 1st
13 or 2nd of December.

14 TOM GEORGE: How about the 2nd?

15 BRIAN OKONEK: December 2nd.

16 That's in Anchorage.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Anchorage.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What's the date
19 on our September meeting?

20 TOM GEORGE: The 9th.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. JPARC.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: JPARC, okay.

23 I'm not the authority on this, but Scott Babos
24 isn't here, so Sally asked me a couple of days
25 ago. I can't really speak to the JPARC plan in

1 general. But I did get very involved and write
2 comments for MPCA regarding an idea I have
3 regarding the Susitna MOA and where that
4 overlaps with the park and affects this
5 committee completely. So I sent my comments.
6 Most of you may or may not have seen them. But
7 my idea was ever since --

8 You might remember, I think it
9 was about two years ago, December of 2008, was
10 the first meeting we really talked about
11 military overflights and Scott was saying how
12 the Susitna MOA isn't used that much. About
13 three pilots piped up and said, I see one every
14 week and I see a military jet here and I see one
15 below me. To me it was a big red flag. It was
16 new information to me and it's always kind of
17 been on the back burner of my mind that having
18 these military flights overlap with the primary
19 flightseeing routes around the mountain is not a
20 good idea.

21 You know, the chance of moving
22 the military is kind of a heavy lift. Should
23 there be a chance, it's something that we should
24 at least address. So I saw this plan as an
25 opening because they were taking public comment.

1 The public comment doesn't have a lot to do with
2 the Susitna MOA. I think there's a couple small
3 changes.

4 SALLY GIBERT: By the way, the
5 public comment period is a result of scoping
6 that's going on now. It's a scoping period, so
7 there will be a draft EIS that will come out
8 later. So now is the time to raise issues.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: For everybody
10 who might not be aware, the JPARC plan is a
11 military plan to expand air space for military
12 training flights. It covers a pretty big area
13 pretty much from Anchorage to Fairbanks. I
14 don't know a whole lot about the plan in
15 general. It sounds like they're definitely
16 getting a little bit of pushback. So my
17 suggestion was as a mitigating measure for
18 planning elsewhere, here's a problem area in one
19 of your least used MOAs and a big safety
20 conflict that I see with the flightseeing
21 routes, so maybe shift that back a little. I
22 suggested a number of things that either they
23 completely eliminate where it overlaps in Denali
24 or just where it overlaps the primary routes or
25 a seasonal closure. I figure at the very

1 least -- the sense I get is the military maybe
2 doesn't have a good idea how much activity is
3 going on in this area and how often the military
4 flights do go there. At the very least it helps
5 highlight to the military that this is a
6 potential problem area.

7 So I sent him a letter suggesting
8 this particular thing. So the question in my
9 mind is: Is it appropriate and do we want --
10 even though scoping is officially over, we could
11 send something in as a Council as well to
12 bolster that idea. Say, yes, as a committee we
13 sense a safety problem here in this area. Could
14 you please consider changing military routes so
15 they don't overlap with the flightseeing routes.

16 SALLY GIBERT: Or just to say
17 minimize safety issues.

18 ERIC DENKEWALTER: The MOA itself
19 starts at 10,000 feet or 5,000 feet above the
20 ground, so the airplanes that we see in the
21 Gorge and around Moose's Tooth are not really in
22 the MOA.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: They're out of
24 compliance.

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: No, they're

1 not out of compliance. The MOA is the area
2 where they can do yanking and banking and
3 bending. They're done and they say, let's go
4 check out the Gorge. Then at that point they're
5 just like general aviation. They're not
6 restricted from doing that, but I'm sure there's
7 some cautions. So I think addressing it in the
8 MOA area, there's not that much conflict with us
9 in that area unless you happen to be just south
10 of Hunter at 11,000 feet. But then again they
11 should be 5,000 feet above the top there. As
12 far as the MOA goes, it's very hard to be in
13 conflict with them. That's just a technical
14 side of it. There are aircraft there, but
15 they're not in the MOA that we see.

16 NANCY BALE: It's my
17 understanding that Scott had told us that
18 generally they're not authorized to fly low
19 there.

20 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Right. That's
21 right, but I don't know how strict they are
22 about that.

23 SALLY GIBERT: He's been trying
24 to sort of push the message that they shouldn't
25 be in there, and he's been one of the people to

1 actively report activity that is of that nature
2 so they can do sort of gentle reminders.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think it's
4 hard because of the different crews coming in.

5 TOM GEORGE: If I can add. In
6 part because of the JPARC scoping meetings and
7 follow-up work that some of us have been doing
8 regarding that exercise, it's turned out that a
9 bunch of people are reporting sightings of
10 military aircraft in areas that they didn't
11 expect them. Eric's right. The MOA is shared
12 air space that does allow the military to do
13 some maneuvering and stuff that they couldn't do
14 outside those areas, but military aircraft are
15 allowed to fly outside of MOAs. So MOAs do not
16 contain military aircraft; they just allow them
17 to do certain kind of maneuvers they can't do in
18 other places.

19 What's become abundantly clear
20 is, yeah, there are military aircraft kind of
21 popping up in areas including the park, but also
22 over by the Canadian border as well and places
23 that pilots haven't expected it. So I think
24 what we'll hear from Scott when we catch up to
25 him again is that they are working right now on

1 kind of revising their phone numbers. A number
2 of these people I talked to said, we were
3 concerned enough about this that we called when
4 we got back from our mission. Who did you call?
5 Fort Wainwright. In other words, people don't
6 know who to call and as a result, their calls
7 were probably going left, right and center. So
8 I think Scott has a renewed mission to come up
9 with a phone number or a couple of phone numbers
10 that they can then track and make sure that
11 these things get reported and that will be going
12 into the brochures that go out every year with
13 all the dates of the exercises so the civilian
14 community in general will have a better way to
15 report these unexpected encounters.

16 Again, bear in mind that not
17 every unexpected encounter necessarily is
18 illegal or bad, but some of them are kind of
19 rude awakenings when the military learns where
20 their people really have been. So I think this
21 is actually something beneficial that's going to
22 come out of this JPARC stuff, is without even
23 waiting for the JPARC EIS to go anywhere, there
24 will be some actions to provide a better
25 feedback mechanism to the civil pilots in order

1 to get this stuff nailed down. There's a
2 meeting coming up of the Alaska Civil Military
3 Aviation Council early next month, I think,
4 where I expect this issue to be addressed.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So the
6 first question: Is it appropriate for us to
7 make a recommendation? And the second issue is
8 what that would be. I have a recommendation for
9 what to say if it's appropriate. Can we do
10 that?

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You can do
12 anything you want, Sally. Are you doing it as
13 the Council?

14 SALLY GIBERT: As the Council.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think it
16 would have weight in that you're so
17 representative of an incredibly diverse
18 constituency, so that in itself -- I don't think
19 you need Park Service's blessing to do that. If
20 you say -- if you're looking for the Park
21 Service to also, then you change the whole --

22 SALLY GIBERT: I realize we can't
23 make a recommendation to you to recommend to the
24 military. This is like us talking right to the
25 military.

1 TOM GEORGE: I think we just make
2 a recommendation to the Park Service and copy it
3 to the military. Job done. Again, our charter
4 is only to make recommendations to the Park
5 Service. We don't have a charter to make
6 recommendations.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Let me tell you
8 what my thought is, that we write a letter, like
9 a real letter, and I can sign it and say who we
10 are and we've been working on overflights issues
11 for a long time. We've become familiar with the
12 patterns of use. We've developed protocols or
13 Best Practices for where people go. We can
14 attach those. We can say that we're all about
15 safety and that we want the military to
16 understand that there is a high amount of use in
17 this area and some of the ways that we're
18 working to make it safer and to take that into
19 consideration in their planning process, period.

20 TOM GEORGE: Sounds good to me.

21 BRIAN OKONEK: That would be very
22 good.

23 TOM GEORGE: I do think we need
24 to recognize some of the values the military has
25 brought to this, such as moving the base camp

1 in, et cetera, just so you're being fair
2 recognizing you value things about what they're
3 doing at the same time that you want them to be
4 aware of other things.

5 NANCY BALE: It's my
6 understanding that Scott had also said the
7 Susitna MOA is barely used.

8 TOM GEORGE: If you really want
9 to tackle that, and I'm not suggesting that the
10 Council do that formally, the way to do it is to
11 query the FAA and ask them.

12 NANCY BALE: I'm not really even
13 interested in that. I totally support the
14 letter. I just feel that that's something Scott
15 said.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: He did say
17 that.

18 TOM GEORGE: Are you going to use
19 that against him now or what? He's not here to
20 defend himself.

21 NANCY BALE: No, it's just
22 something I'm bringing up. It's not because I'm
23 trying to change the letter. It's just
24 something I'm bringing up.

25 TOM GEORGE: I think relative to

1 other MOAs it doesn't get as much use. I think
2 that's a fair statement.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It might be
4 easier for them to change some patterns there if
5 it's not as important to them.

6 NANCY BALE: It might be
7 something they could do. It's not really even
8 part of JPARC, is it, the Susitna MOA?

9 TIM CUDNEY: No, I don't think it
10 is.

11 MIKE YORKE: So what real
12 objection do we have that the military is
13 increasing their areas of operation? Is that
14 the foundation?

15 TOM GEORGE: This is not
16 objecting to them increasing. This is just
17 saying to take these things into account. I
18 think that's totally fair because the proposal
19 the military put out on the table is a totally
20 unconstrained proposal. In other words, it's
21 all about what the military wants to do. So the
22 process we're going to go through is now bring
23 in all of those other things that happen in that
24 and surrounding air space. So I think a letter
25 such as you've outlined would be a good thing.

1 A good thing to drop in there would be, hey,
2 don't forget about these things that go on here
3 too.

4 SALLY GIBERT: So I will draft
5 something and send it out for review.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: This will have
7 Sally's signature as the chair representing
8 everybody. So you're going to list people which
9 would be inclusive of Scott or --

10 TOM GEORGE: No.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Just a
12 question.

13 SALLY GIBERT: I would want Scott
14 to approve the letter for sure. And the
15 question of letterhead?

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It won't be on
17 Park Service letterhead.

18 SALLY GIBERT: The recommendation
19 I put on my letterhead because it's me, but I
20 signed as chair. But this is a State
21 letterhead, which is a little dicey.

22 TOM GEORGE: We don't have a
23 letterhead.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Plain paper, not
25 letterhead.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah. From
2 Sally Gibert, Chair, Denali Overflights Working
3 Group. Whatever it is. Just clearly from us.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Anything else
5 before we adjourn?

6 BRIAN OKONEK: I've got just one
7 thing. As a Council member that represents
8 local landowners and stuff, I just want to
9 remind air taxi operators to remind all your
10 pilots about approaching and departing Talkeetna
11 and the transitioning out over the Talkeetna
12 River or Susitna River going south, avoiding
13 town and approaching. Watch where people live
14 up the river and stuff just to keep the flights
15 over their houses as low as possible. Do what
16 you can for the locals. Again, last year Beth
17 was just telling me it started off good, but
18 then kind of started -- everybody was kind of
19 fudging on the flight lines and stuff. So if
20 you can just remind pilots throughout the season
21 what you want them to do, that would be great.

22 AMANDA SMITH: This is a
23 different topic. If you could reply to the new
24 e-mail address that Miriam or Sally will send
25 out so I could be included just as a new person.

1 That would be helpful.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So this is a
3 new list. I had a couple holes. If everybody
4 can take a look at this list before you go, that
5 this is current. Then I'll send this out. This
6 is the list that gets posted on the web, on our
7 site for people if they want to contact who is
8 the person who is supposed to have my voice on
9 the Council. So don't put unlisted numbers or
10 anything on here. If there's a number that you
11 prefer that I contact you at, make a note of
12 that and say for internal use or something.

13 MIKE YORKE: Just some
14 information for the people here in Talkeetna.
15 The 150th weather cam goes on line tomorrow.
16 Actually it is on line. But it will be
17 dedicated here tomorrow in Talkeetna. So if
18 you've got time, that would be a good thing to
19 go to. There's a barbecue and RSIT, which is
20 runway safety issues, over at the Sheldon Hangar
21 here tomorrow 9:00 to 2:30. The barbecue is
22 1700 to 1900. Some entertainment for people in
23 Talkeetna tomorrow.

24 I'd like to personally thank
25 Miriam for the work to get me on the Council. I

1 appreciate that. Thank you.

2 SALLY GIBERT: And we didn't do
3 an intro.

4 Nancy.

5 NANCY BALE: This is a big thing,
6 but I'm just going to introduce it because I
7 don't know -- Tom and I haven't had the chance
8 to talk about it. I brought up with him in an
9 e-mail how we could in a way that would be
10 comfortable for the commercial operators gather
11 data on numbers. I'm personally interested in
12 numbers over the past maybe ten years as to
13 what's been happening with commercial aviation
14 over the park, expansion, leveling off,
15 declines, expansion, level off, declines. I
16 know we've discussed this in the past in terms
17 of because it could be deemed to give a
18 competitive edge, that businesses are a little
19 bit leery to talk about those numbers. So I
20 know that Tom was thinking of a possible way to
21 gather the data inside a black box but still be
22 able to gather meaningful data.

23 So I'm popping this up at the end
24 of the meeting because there are a lot of
25 operators here right now. So I wanted you to be

1 aware that I have an interest in that
2 information because I think it's germane. Like
3 we're trying to look and see how many
4 backpackers there are, how many tourists there
5 are busing on the road. So we do need to have
6 that number to utilize for sort of maybe our
7 thinking about the long-range vision. Maybe
8 that number really affects our long-range
9 thinking more than our tomorrow thinking or
10 next-year thinking.

11 SALLY GIBERT: I might suggest
12 that if numbers are problematic, another way to
13 deal with it -- you still have to use the black
14 box to get there -- is just a graph of relative
15 change over ten years with no numbers.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I was going to
17 say when I wrote to the military about the
18 JPARC, I had the sense that they might not
19 really know the areas that well and where the
20 flightseeing corridors are and how much use
21 there is. It would have been nice to put a
22 number -- but I didn't have time to follow up or
23 call anybody -- just to give them a sense of how
24 much this area is used. Are there 20 flights a
25 day? Are there 100? Are there 500? It would

1 just be good to have kind of a ball-park on a
2 general day, a typical day, this is how many
3 flights go up a day in the park.

4 NANCY BALE: Is the working group
5 thinking about meeting with respect to anything?
6 It could be discussed there. It's not something
7 we're deciding right now. I'm just bringing the
8 issue up before you because I see it as valid.

9 TOM GEORGE: The numbers you're
10 talking about are the number of people, the
11 number of park visitors?

12 NANCY BALE: Flights is more of
13 interest to me.

14 CHARLIE SASSARA: I was thinking
15 that I would with your sort of concurrence take
16 our Best Practices and the documents that lead
17 to them and put them -- make them available to
18 my constituency on line and such. In thinking
19 about that, I wanted to suggest that the
20 operators do something similar with their own
21 web site, some linkage that there's -- these are
22 some of the things that we're following or
23 practices to both push the information out to --
24 we talked about educating the customer and
25 that's one of the interfaces. Just to throw

1 that out there.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: On a different
3 topic, I just wanted to mention to people that
4 my office puts out a little informational
5 newsletter on what the office is doing twice a
6 year. So the recent one that came out, I had a
7 little article mostly on the work and the
8 progress we're making on this Overflight
9 Committee and our media person really liked it
10 and plans to submit it to a national blog on
11 national parks and national parks travelers. So
12 that might appear in the next couple of weeks.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Anything
14 else? Okay.

15 Meeting adjourned.

16 (Meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 I, LESLIE J. KNISLEY, Notary Public for
4 the State of Alaska, and Shorthand Reporter, do
5 hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
6 were taken before me at the time and place herein
7 set forth; that the proceedings were reported
8 stenographically by me and later transcribed by
9 computer transcription; that the foregoing is a
10 true record of the proceedings taken at that time;
11 and that I am not a party to, nor do I have any
12 interest in, the outcome of the action herein
13 contained.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
15 my hand and affixed my seal this 3rd day of May,
16 2011.

17

18

19

20 LESLIE J. KNISLEY
21 Notary Public, State of Alaska
22 My commission expires: 02/22/15

23

24

25