

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

DENALI OVERFLIGHTS COUNCIL

October 28, 2011
Residence Inn Anchorage Midtown
Anchorage, Alaska

9:20 a.m. to 4:50 p.m.

- Advisory Council Attendees:
Sally Gibert, State of Alaska
Charlie Sassara, Mountaineering Community
Erika Bennett, Commercial Aviation
Joan Frankevich, State and National Environmental
Community
Suzanne Rust, Authorized Air Taxis
Tom George, General Aviation Users
Nancy Bale, Local Environmental Community
Mike Yorke, FAA
Tim Cudney, Scenic Air Tour Operators
Amanda Smith, Backcountry Users
Brian Okonek, Local Landowners
Miriam Valentine, Designated Federal Officer
Paul Anderson, Superintendent Denali National Park
and Preserve
Lt. Col. Scott Babos, USAF

- Audience Members:
Claire Leclair, State of Alaska
Eric Denkwalter, Talkeetna Aero
Davyd Becthkal, Soundscape Scientist, Denali
National Park
Lois Wirtz, Alaska Travel Industry Association

Reported by: Kristin L. O'Reilly, RPR

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So
2 let's just take a quick roll call and we'll get
3 started.
4 Scott Babos.
5 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Here.
6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Nancy
7 Bale.
8 NANCY BALE: Here.
9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Erika
10 Bennett.
11 ERIKA BENNETT: Here.
12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tim Cudney.
13 TIM CUDNEY: Here.
14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Joan
15 Frankevich.
16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Here.
17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Tom
18 George.
19 TOM GEORGE: Here.
20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Sally Gibert.
21 SALLY GIBERT: Here.
22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Brian Okonek.
23 BRIAN OKONEK: Here.
24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Suzanne
25 Rust.

1 SUZANNE RUST: Here.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Charlie
3 Sassara.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: Here.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Amanda
6 Smith.

7 AMANDA SMITH: Here.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Mike
9 Yorke.

10 MIKE YORKE: Good morning.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Great. Okay.
12 So we've got full council.

13 Paul Anderson, superintendent
14 for Denali National Park, is with us today.
15 And I'll be designated federal officer.

16 Great. So we're ready to get
17 started.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Do you want to
19 start because you're the -- actually, do
20 introductions.

21 Davyd, you want to start with
22 the introductions in the back?

23 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Dave Becthkal.
24 I'm the soundscape scientist for Denali
25 National Park.

1 LOIS WIRTZ: I'm Lois Wirtz.
2 I'm with the Alaska Travel Industry
3 Association.

4 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I'm Eric
5 Denkewalter, Talkeetna Aero, Fly Denali.

6 CLAIRE LECLAIR: Claire Leclair,
7 Division of Parks and Natural Recreation,
8 Department of Natural Resources.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So did you
10 want to talk about kind of where we are on
11 appointments and what's happening with the --
12 how the charter authorization works?

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. How
14 about we -- first everybody has an agenda in
15 front of them. And for members of the public,
16 do you have an agenda? There's more at the end
17 of the table there by Kristin, the court
18 reporter.

19 You'll notice we kind of broke
20 up the issues, kind of the administrative
21 issues of the Council, the first piece
22 regarding membership that we'll discuss next.
23 And then towards the very end of our day today
24 the other issues that kind of -- the council
25 members had interest in discussing. So we kind

1 of broke it up. I was hopeful that the agenda
2 reflects everything everybody wanted to talk
3 about today.

4 The first question is are there
5 any additions or amendments?

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: If we could --
7 I don't know if anybody has any information on
8 what happened out on south side this summer,
9 how things went there.

10 SUZANNE RUST: As far as
11 feedback, I didn't get any from John. Is that
12 what you're looking for as far as --

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Just general.
14 How it went, what you heard on the ground, what
15 the operators did? How'd your season go, you
16 know, lots of flights, few flights?

17 SUZANNE RUST: It was funny,
18 just mentioned that I was thinking this morning
19 as I was preparing to come, didn't hear
20 anything from John. So I don't -- as far as
21 the feedback was I didn't -- there weren't any
22 discussions like last year getting information
23 forwarded that we needed to take care of. But
24 that's all I can speak to.

25 SALLY GIBERT: I'll put a call

1 in to John at the break.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

3 SALLY GIBERT: He was unsure if
4 he was going to be able to make it today.

5 NANCY BALE: Any time for
6 constituent feedback? It could turn into a
7 public comment, but I would be reading it
8 because that person isn't here.

9 SALLY GIBERT: I see that we
10 don't actually have scheduled a public comments
11 point. I guess that's something we kind of do
12 it if we need it. When would you like to do
13 that?

14 NANCY BALE: Maybe it would --
15 where it might fit would be either before,
16 after or during the north side discussion
17 because it is north side feedback.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Maybe
19 start that off. So we'll do a little
20 mini-public comment thing right before that.

21 Eric, is there anything that you
22 might want to contribute? Are there points in
23 the agenda where you think you may have some
24 things you'll want to toss in?

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Sure. Well,

1 I'm -- aren't too many north side users here.
2 There's two of us. So, I mean, when that comes
3 along I would like to throw in my two cents.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

5 ERIC DENKEWALTER: And the sound
6 perception activity, I was involved in that
7 also.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. We'll give
9 you some time on that too.

10 Anything else on the agenda?

11 The way I thought would be good
12 for you to do right now is just kind of do the
13 nuts and bolts about where we are on
14 appointments and how the charter requisition
15 works, but not have a discussion about that
16 until the end just so we'll all be thinking
17 about the future, you know, toward the end of
18 the meeting. There's probably going to be an
19 ongoing discussion because we're still two
20 years out from the end of the current charter.
21 We all know that time goes by fast with long
22 lead times for making decisions about the
23 future. So we'd kind of like to start that
24 discussion but we thought we'd be better off
25 doing that toward the end of the meeting rather

1 than the front. But let's start out with the
2 nuts and bolts from Miriam right now.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So what we'd
4 like you to be thinking about is the charter
5 for this Council sunsets in 2013, September of
6 2013. So we have about two years for the work
7 to continue. So be thinking about two years
8 left, we've been at it just about four years
9 now. Five years. Four years. Started in '07.
10 So what would you like to do in that remaining
11 time? What would you -- I don't know. I
12 always think it's nice to have something
13 tangible that the Council did in their time.

14 The other piece of this is
15 everybody's membership was renewed. So we're
16 in process because that takes forever. But
17 it's much easier for us to do renewal than new
18 appointments. So let's see. Sally's position,
19 Nancy's position. I'm winging this. About
20 half of you who were done are now in process
21 for renewal.

22 The other piece of this we're
23 going to discuss, the State of Alaska position.
24 Now that Sally has retired, it's going to
25 transition to Claire Leclair. So we're going

1 to start that in motion to have it official.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Is it official on
3 the State side yet? Okay. Great.

4 CLAIRE LECLAIR: I mean, not on
5 paper.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. Okay.

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So that's
8 another piece that's kind of moving. Is that
9 kind of what you wanted? Just a kind of
10 overview like that?

11 SALLY GIBERT: Uh-huh. And then
12 the Council has to kind of decide if we think
13 that it's a good idea to move forward. Or not
14 necessarily decide but recommend to you guys to
15 decide if we ought to keep going. Is that --

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, there's
17 a couple things. In 2013 when the charter
18 sunsets is it -- so it would be a time to
19 evaluate. And you should know that FACA
20 groups, which this is one, you know, there's a
21 lot of scrutiny right now in D.C. regarding
22 them.

23 First of all, their efficiency.
24 Are they providing what they were intended to
25 do? So how valuable are they to the government

1 to run these? Because it's a cost to run
2 these.

3 The second thing, you know,
4 we've heard a lot as the Council has been
5 operating, people have thought about maybe a
6 different make-up of stakeholder groups. You
7 know, there was a time where we need tourism at
8 the table, we need -- I mean, it's a time to
9 re-evaluate.

10 If we are going to have a
11 council continue, what does it look like? So
12 there's a specific scope of work for the
13 charter, is that still relevant to what's
14 needed by the park. Now you need to remember
15 the Council is chartered by the park to assist
16 us. And so while there might be a lot of other
17 ideas about how the public can engage with the
18 park, it may not be under an organized FACA
19 group. It might be that there's a different
20 mechanism for us to run -- have that two-way
21 communication with stakeholder groups.

22 So, I mean, that's all stuff to
23 consider as we move towards 2013.

24 SALLY GIBERT: So it sounds like
25 there are multiple ways we can move forward, I

1 mean, assuming we want to move forward. If we
2 do want to move forward, if we think it's
3 valuable to move forward under FACA, how much
4 lead time do you guys need? We have
5 recommendations about, like, amend the charter
6 for example or we want to adjust the
7 composition. If we want to have a say in that
8 when would we need to do that by to get that
9 information to you?

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, we'd
11 need it by next year for sure. If you wanted
12 continuity, you know, like, 2013 comes --
13 September, 2013, and you wanted then the
14 continuity and activity, you would need to
15 start the process next year to have that
16 continuing 2013.

17 SALLY GIBERT: So about a year?

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Uh-huh.

19 PAUL ANDERSON: If we're going
20 to continue the committee we'll have to justify
21 it because typically the default would be to
22 elect a committee.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: That's why
24 there needs to be consideration of what's the
25 purpose, you know? How effective has the

1 Council been in looking at, you know -- it's a
2 time for evaluation. Did the charter do what
3 it thought it was going to be able to do? What
4 did you learn along the way that you would
5 recommend park management considered? If your
6 recommendation is to charter a new council what
7 does it look like, what does it comprise of,
8 what's the work of the Council to meet? And
9 this is a lot of conversation with park
10 management. What do you need from us? I mean,
11 like, as representatives of stake -- key
12 stakeholder groups, what do you want to know?
13 What do you want our help with?

14 SALLY GIBERT: Well, and that's
15 reciprocal to how can we help you. So, yeah.

16 TOM GEORGE: I think when we get
17 to that discussion, and I realize we're not
18 trying to have that discussion now, yeah,
19 hearing the park's thoughts on that. But also
20 I think if we can sometime during the day get a
21 copy of the charter and maybe have it on the
22 screen to look at because I know what we're
23 doing today but I have to wrack my brain to
24 know what the charter said we're supposed to
25 do. And I think that needs to be part of the

1 foundation for discussion.

2 SALLY GIBERT: There's almost
3 nothing in the charter except for the mission
4 statement.

5 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, but we got to
6 look at the words anyhow because after all
7 that's what we contemplating either continuing,
8 changing or letting -- just letting it lapse.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. Mike's got
10 it right there.

11 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, under purpose
12 here there's five sentences.

13 TOM GEORGE: Again, we're not
14 trying to do it now but as long as we got that
15 information for later that's I think what
16 matters.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Various
18 comment about -- one piece that really struck
19 me was at the end of this time frame what do we
20 want to have that says we're complete with our
21 work or what's the package of our time
22 together? And then there's a consideration of
23 whether or not you go forward. And it's really
24 important to know what the -- to have some
25 sense of what the goal is for that two-year

1 period that's out here. And it could help
2 organize ourselves in terms of completing
3 ourselves for this period. And then the second
4 consideration is, you know, do we go forward on
5 it? And perhaps there can be some
6 consideration for that conversation. You know,
7 maybe a little bit today but, you know,
8 obviously it would be the next one -- our next
9 meeting we really need to get on it and spend
10 some time about what's the outcomes. Because
11 that helps us define what the work is we have
12 to complete.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. We
14 shouldn't get too far in the discussion right
15 now.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah.

17 SALLY GIBERT: And also it'll
18 probably come up during the fact sheet because
19 I know when I was working on that a lot of
20 these questions were coming up in my mind. And
21 that will be another opportunity. Yeah. We do
22 need to start thinking about it. Definitely
23 not too early. I mean, we do need to have some
24 kind of a sense of closure even if we want to
25 continue because we may not be able to

1 continue.

2 So any other sort of nuts and
3 bolts questions about how this works? And we
4 can continue our discussion later. Okay.

5 The sound perception activity,
6 Tom, do you want to start off?

7 TOM GEORGE: You ready for that
8 now? You guys may want to vacate these front
9 seats. You might get blasted with light.

10 This actually is a joint
11 presentation that Davyd and I are going to
12 somehow tag team on. A number of you in the
13 room participated in this activity last May.
14 The objectives were to do three things: One,
15 to get a small group of us on the ground to
16 evaluate differences between a series of
17 flights from both aircraft plane overhead and
18 offset flight patterns. We're also listening
19 for differences between a couple different
20 power settings in a twin engine aircraft and
21 comparing those to a fixed wing to helicopter.
22 So those were the three different things we
23 were trying to do.

24 And, again, this is a follow on
25 for those that weren't involved. A year

1 previous we did a related type of thing down by
2 Talkeetna. And this was now a follow on
3 narrowing the -- and having some more specific
4 objectives. And those objectives principally
5 being to start -- you know, have enough
6 information to start looking at north side
7 possible Best Practices, to put this context.

8 This is kind of the list of
9 participants, you know, the Council itself,
10 members of the Council, the Park Service. And
11 then the overflights were provided by Era,
12 National Park Service and Talkeetna Aero. Era
13 Helicopters. I had the wrong name. Not Era
14 Aviation. My first draft had the wrong name in
15 it. So please ditch that first draft I sent
16 around.

17 The venue, again, was an area
18 west of Healy. We had flight tracks that were
19 overhead and offset by one and two nautical
20 miles from our listening station. And Davyd
21 brought the Park Service soundscape equipment,
22 the same equipment they use, again, for their
23 monitoring effort, and recorded data in
24 parallel with the activity.

25 So again, for venue, here's the

1 Healy area. Eightmile Lake. This is where the
2 observers were located. The aircraft were
3 coming out of Healy, the park strip and Aero's
4 helipad. So coming over and working this area.
5 Again, to look at that, here's our listening
6 site and the three tracks, A, B and C. And
7 then there was a D track which is stacked
8 vertically.

9 So now let me look at that on
10 edge. So here are the observers on the ground
11 and the recording equipment. So we had two
12 flight altitudes at 2- and 4,000 foot overhead.
13 And then at the 2,000-foot level had one offset
14 by one and two nautical miles. Now originally
15 I had three altitudes in quite a matrix. But
16 the reality of how long it was going to take to
17 do all this kind of caused us to compress this
18 a little bit.

19 Participants -- again, if you
20 have questions along the way, holler so that we
21 don't have to go back over this.

22 We had six people on the ground
23 that were armed with clipboards and listening.
24 Here's an idea of the landscape on the north
25 side. And then the sound monitoring equipment

1 and, again, the aircraft that were flying
2 overhead. So these are the various people. We
3 didn't get the dinner into this but I guess --

4 Again, six observers were
5 listening, they had sheets. And here's just a
6 sample of one. And people were asked to rate
7 the sound perceptions of various overflights on
8 this one to five scale. This is the same scale
9 we used the previous year with one being you
10 barely noticed it and five being so loud it
11 interrupted your activity, you couldn't carry
12 on a conversation. And the observers weren't
13 told this is overflight number 1, overflight
14 number 2. In other words, they used time as a
15 basis to record whatever they heard. And this
16 is important not only because it provides a
17 little bit of decoupling knowing what kind of
18 aircraft you're looking to, although you can
19 certainly look up in the air and see it, but we
20 had a few bonus aircraft that came through that
21 weren't scheduled. And we rated and recorded
22 them as well.

23 Results. And, again, just to
24 kind of -- general conditions; partly cloudy.
25 We had a light surface wind initially. It

1 picked up a little later in the day which
2 actually shows in the sound data very clearly.
3 And we ran this operation -- even with the
4 reduced set of tracks it was, you know, about a
5 three-hour operation with 20 overflights and,
6 like I say, the three bonus aircraft that were
7 captured along the way.

8 Here's Davyd's equipment. And
9 Davyd, you want to give them kind of the
10 definitions of these?

11 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Certainly.
12 Yeah, the first one there you're looking at is
13 L50 or what is same as saying half the time it
14 was louder than this value, half the time it
15 was quieter. And that was 28.8 decibels. And
16 then the second one was just kind of an example
17 of how quiet it really was out there that day.
18 We had pretty calm, especially in the beginning
19 for the first overflights. It was pretty calm.
20 And so getting down to 15.6 decibels. That's
21 pretty low as far as the park is concerned.

22 NANCY BALE: What are the
23 components of this baseline would you say that
24 day?

25 DAVYD BECTHKAL: What do you

1 mean by components?

2 NANCY BALE: Well, was it wind
3 mainly you'd say?

4 DAVYD BECTHKAL: The wind picked
5 up later throughout the day. And the wind -- I
6 think there's a slide here coming up of some
7 basic, like, wind speed and gusts too. I'm not
8 sure if there's a slide.

9 TOM GEORGE: I think we --

10 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah. So the
11 wind was coming out of the east about
12 five miles an hour. I think the gusts were
13 infrequent but up to about ten probably.

14 SALLY GIBERT: So Nancy, were
15 you asking what the 15 -- what that was?

16 NANCY BALE: Yeah.

17 SALLY GIBERT: It was very
18 quiet. That was very quiet. There really
19 wasn't --

20 DAVYD BECTHKAL: That's the
21 absolute minimum. That was the lowest recorded
22 level.

23 NANCY BALE: Right. Well, I
24 just wondered what, I mean, would you get if
25 you were just sitting in a very quiet park?

1 Would you get 15? Would you get ten?

2 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I've been out
3 in the field and got about 17 before just
4 sitting with the meter, instantaneous kind of
5 measurements. So it's not unrealistic in some
6 parts. I'm sure it probably -- up on the
7 mountain there's been, Kahiltna Pass, in the
8 14, 13 range.

9 NANCY BALE: Okay. So that's
10 quiet.

11 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah, that's
12 quiet.

13 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, it's very
14 quiet. And now then this is the listening
15 location. These are the actual GPS tracks.
16 Some of the tracks of the -- of the found
17 aircraft, one of the three aircraft, just to
18 give you an idea of what this reality looked
19 like versus the plan. Reality and the plan are
20 often not the same. So here we had three
21 different types of aircraft. The Park Service
22 provided, again, a single engine aircraft. The
23 Bush Hawk. It made 12 passes. And they were,
24 again, more or less randomly ordered. Era
25 provided a A-Star turbine helicopter. It made

1 a couple passes. And we'll look at each one of
2 these. And then Eric's Navajo Chieftain which
3 tested a couple different power settings. And
4 we'll look at the results of that as well.

5 So going through these one at a
6 time and on the left axis here is the average
7 perception rating that the people on the
8 ground, the six people provided. So here's
9 example in this case. This was the 2,000-foot
10 aboveground level at two nautical mile offset.
11 So down here is the treatment. So this is
12 overhead at 2,000. Overhead of 4,000. One
13 mile offset. Two miles offset. These are the
14 perceptions by the people on the ground. These
15 are the decibels measured by Davyd's equipment
16 and the variability of them since we had
17 multiple flights on each track. Now bear in
18 mind we only had a few flights and we only had
19 six people observing so don't anybody run out
20 and make world claims based on these small
21 sample sizes. But none the less it's better
22 than what we did the year before in terms of at
23 least understanding some of the variability.

24 MIKE YORKE: Tom, the number on
25 the box, on the left, the 2.2, that's the --

1 TOM GEORGE: This is the sound
2 perception, that one to five scale rating from
3 --

4 MIKE YORKE: Oh, okay. I got
5 it. Got it.

6 TOM GEORGE: And this is
7 decibels over here. So the decibel range is --
8 now remember we said the median was, what
9 Davyd?

10 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I think it was
11 about 28.8.

12 TOM GEORGE: 28. Just for
13 background, the whole thing was down about
14 here. So here are actually our decibel
15 readings of the maximum sound pressure during
16 those overflights.

17 MIKE YORKE: And the blue
18 represents what the participants --

19 TOM GEORGE: What the
20 participants on the ground average rating was.

21 MIKE YORKE: Okay. Thanks.

22 TOM GEORGE: And actually I
23 should go -- we should go back and recap that
24 starting at zero. I didn't think about that
25 till right now.

1 DAVYD BECTHKAL: The scale
2 doesn't go down to zero I don't think.

3 TOM GEORGE: Well, okay. So
4 here now is the A Star. It made passes just at
5 2,000 foot overhead and at 4,000 foot overhead.
6 So here's a look at what the difference in
7 sound level and perception level is of
8 2,000 feet extra altitude over the site.
9 Actually, let me go back now and let's -- so
10 here's 2,000 feet on the fixed wing, 4,000 feet
11 on the fixed wing. So definitely as you go up
12 in altitude you get a drop in decibel. And the
13 people on the ground noticed that difference as
14 well. And as you go offset actually there's
15 even further. And we'll come back to another
16 way to look at that in a minute.

17 So, again, here's the helicopter
18 in contrast. And then here are the Navajo
19 flights. This is 2,000 foot at the two
20 nautical mile offset and the same track but
21 with a reduced power setting. And for those of
22 you in the aviation business it's about a 200
23 RPM difference in -- 200 RPM reduction is the
24 difference between these. We don't have that
25 precisely recorded, but that's -- and, again,

1 in both cases, I mean, there's a difference in
2 average number and a difference -- and actually
3 to me even perhaps more strikingly the
4 difference in perception. Now do note that the
5 variability of these are pretty large and this
6 was late in the day when the wind was starting
7 to pick up which is probably why that
8 variability is there.

9 And finally, and this one's the
10 one I think to focus on, here's all of them at
11 once. So, again, you've got your helicopter
12 overflights here, your fixed wing are these
13 four, and then the twin engine aircraft. So
14 the interesting thing, or at least one
15 interesting thing to me is that the single
16 engine piston aircraft was slightly louder than
17 the helicopter flights. And again, this is
18 also reflected in people's perceptions of it.
19 Again, we talked about the altitude difference.
20 Again, you go from 2- to 4,000 feet you get a
21 drop. And, again, here's how the helicopter
22 compares -- I'm sorry the Navajo compares. And
23 again, now it was on the two-mile offset. So
24 you got to compare that really to this over
25 here, but there definitely was a difference in

1 the values.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm sorry, I
3 was writing. I'm sorry, I missed that. Could
4 you repeat that?

5 TOM GEORGE: Probably not, but
6 you mean about the -- I'm sorry -- about the
7 Navajo?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You were just
9 comparing something and I was writing something
10 you said previously so I missed it.

11 SALLY GIBERT: I think it was
12 the Navajo.

13 TOM GEORGE: Yeah. Well, I just
14 point out that the Navajo at two nautical
15 miles -- 2,000 feet two nautical miles you need
16 to compare to the found --

17 SALLY GIBERT: So there was no
18 direct overhead by the Navajo.

19 TOM GEORGE: No, there weren't.
20 Yeah.

21 Questions on that or --

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: Tom, what kind
23 of aircraft? The single engine aircraft?

24 TOM GEORGE: Found, Bush Hawk.
25 It's the single engine aircraft the park uses.

1 ERIKA BENNETT: About the size
2 of a --

3 MIKE YORKE: Small Beaver?

4 ERIKA BENNETT: Yeah. Yeah.
5 Large 185.

6 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, large 185 is
7 what I would've thought as a --

8 MIKE YORKE: That'd be another
9 way to say it?

10 TOM GEORGE: It's not a 185 but
11 it's a similar category of aircraft as 185.

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: Is it three
13 bladed?

14 TOM GEORGE: Yes, it's a
15 three-bladed prop.

16 NANCY BALE: How does it compare
17 to a 206?

18 TOM GEORGE: Similar. Similar.

19
20 MIKE YORKE: I think maybe the
21 --

22 ERIKA BENNETT: But the engine
23 is --

24 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, I think the
25 cruise RPM is lower on that.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Something --
2 the two Navajos on the right, if those said
3 2,000 feet overhead and two --

4 TOM GEORGE: Our concern -- it's
5 not the overhead. It's 2,000 feet -- yeah,
6 2,000 foot up, 2,000 altitude and two miles
7 offset. So these are the same tracks. The
8 only difference between these is the power
9 setting.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Oh, okay.
11 Thank you.

12 TOM GEORGE: So what this test
13 was was to evaluate the difference of the power
14 setting on those.

15 MIKE YORKE: And do you remember
16 what that RPM was Eric?

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: The higher
18 RPM was 2,400.

19 MIKE YORKE: Okay.

20 ERIC DENKEWALTER: And the lower
21 RPM was 2,200. So one of them would be similar
22 to what you have in a climb. 2,400 and 2,200
23 is what we normally cruise at. So what you
24 would see over most of the park would be the
25 one to the far right there.

1 MIKE YORKE: Correct.

2 TOM GEORGE: Yeah.

3 NANCY BALE: Once you finish
4 climbing.

5 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, usually
6 you don't climb over the park. Usually climb
7 down the road. By the time you get to the park
8 you throttle back. Not all the time but in
9 general you go down the road to the south and
10 they're climbing through there. And then by
11 the time they get into the park they're up and
12 away.

13 NANCY BALE: That's in your
14 case, Eric?

15 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Correct.

16 TOM GEORGE: Well, again, so
17 just talking generically, yeah. A climb
18 setting, whatever it is geographically versus a
19 cruise.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So the Navajo
21 didn't fly overhead, it was offset at different
22 power settings?

23 TOM GEORGE: Correct. That's
24 correct. And actually I think it'd been my
25 intention for it to be overhead. But I think

1 somehow A and C somewhere got transposed. Like
2 I say, the plan and the reality, this is the
3 reality of what happened. Not necessarily what
4 the exact plan was.

5 NANCY BALE: Eric, would your
6 Navajos be comparable to the ones used by
7 Denali Air?

8 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yes. And
9 that's a fairly standard power setting for
10 Navajos. So that's nothing unusual. That's
11 very close. And it really is the RPM that
12 probably is the biggest factor, not necessarily
13 the manifold pressure but the RPM itself seems
14 to be the noise maker.

15 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, just turn
16 that RPM down to zero and that noise would go
17 away.

18 Yes, Joan?

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So the other
20 thing that I'm seeing if I'm looking at this
21 correctly is twin engine, single engine are
22 somewhat similar. But under the higher power
23 settings the twin engine was louder but under
24 the cruising RPM it was actually quieter --

25 TOM GEORGE: Yes.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: -- than the
2 smaller aircraft.

3 TOM GEORGE: Yes. Correct. But
4 what we didn't do in this case is standardize
5 the RPM across all the airplanes. So if you
6 really want to make that comparison --

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So we can't
8 really make that comparison.

9 TOM GEORGE: -- we'd actually
10 have to go in and look at -- I think I got
11 Collin's RPM written down somewhere, I'd have
12 to check. But we weren't making a -- the
13 request was to use a cruise setting and keep it
14 constant so that we weren't comparing different
15 power settings on the same kind of aircraft on
16 the same flight. So, yeah, to really make that
17 comparison you'd need to actually kind of try
18 and standardize power settings.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: But in
20 general, you know, it's -- you know, as a
21 non-aviation person coming into this my
22 assumption would have been that the double
23 engine is a lot noisier than the single engine.
24 But, you know, what you have all said
25 previously is that the new planes are a lot

1 quieter. So this is kind of double engine,
2 single engine doesn't really make a different.
3 ERIC DENKEWALTER: You know,
4 most of the single engine guys -- let me
5 clarify that - the 185s, the Founds, the 206s
6 are probably going to cruise at about 2,400
7 RPM, 2,500 sometimes. It's just the way nature
8 of the beast is. Where as on the twins you do
9 throttle back quite a bit more. On the turbine
10 aircraft we actually throttle back quite a bit
11 more, down to 17-, 1,800 RPMs. So, I mean,
12 we've changed our cruise settings on the
13 Beavers because from what we saw a year or two
14 ago, said, you know, we go back to 80 percent,
15 which it's all in percentages on the Beaver,
16 but, you know, it's in the 17- -- less than
17 2,000 RPM makes a significant different. We
18 take off and just go over town, they listen,
19 go, geez, that's noisy. And all of them at
20 takeoff are going to be noisy. The 185's
21 especially noisy because the kips a lot of
22 times are just right at super sonic speed and
23 then you get that (noise) which is -- somebody
24 was taking off Merrill Field this morning as a
25 matter of fact at 6:30 --

1 TOM GEORGE: You were out there
2 talking with him right?

3 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, no,
4 it's -- yeah, it's -- you know, there's a lot
5 to be said for that right there. And we don't
6 have a lot of data. But, you know, we thought
7 about it, looked at it and said, you know,
8 what's the quietest footprints you can make.
9 And doesn't seem to effect the flight or
10 anything else -- so the altitude, the power
11 settings all make a big difference. Not
12 perfect, but a difference.

13 MIKE YORKE: And looking at the
14 Navajo since we're talking about that on the
15 right from Davyd's side, the electronic
16 listening, that's not much difference,
17 two-and-a-half decibels. I think I'd lost that
18 bet big time. That's not much.

19 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah, it's
20 tricky with the low settings there. It was a
21 little windy at that point so the variability
22 of measurements ranged.

23 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, variability
24 makes this the weakest of our comparisons, but
25 nonetheless I think the trend is there. And

1 the fact that it's reflected in both places to
2 me I think is significant. Now Davyd came up
3 with -- and another way to try and put these --
4 because these bar charts can drive you nuts
5 looking at them, and that is looking at this
6 just in terms of the relationship from the
7 overall distance from the sound source. And
8 that's what this chart is.

9 And Davyd, do you want to jump
10 in here and --

11 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Sure. So what
12 you're looking at now is the absolute distance
13 from the aircraft to the microphone. So,
14 again, we've got each one of our routes as they
15 get farther and farther away. And then you've
16 got sound pressure level on the Y axis. And
17 you can see distance -- as you increase the
18 distance from the aircraft to the observer the
19 sound pressure level goes down. And I
20 mentioned this a little bit before, that if you
21 double the distance, like, from 2K to 4K the
22 drop should be about six decibels. And it was
23 5.6 which lines up pretty well with what you'd
24 expect.

25 Then kinda could extrapolate

1 out. 6,000 feet or little over 6,000 there
2 isn't quite a doubling of distance but you
3 could figure out approximately how many
4 decibels it should drop. And it actually isn't
5 as much as you'd expect. It dropped off faster
6 than the six decibel reduction of doubling.

7 And so I'm going to try to
8 explain why that might be. And the best way I
9 can think to do that is through an analogy.
10 Like, say you've got a bowl of water and you're
11 going to drop a drop of food coloring in the
12 water. The bigger the bowl the more dilute the
13 water -- the color in the water gets. So
14 you're getting farther and farther away. And
15 this sphere of sound -- this energy is getting
16 bigger and bigger. And so that power, the
17 amount of energy that's being radiated is
18 essentially getting spread out over a larger
19 and larger surface area of the sphere. And so
20 that -- the point being is that that's not the
21 only thing that's effecting the sound. Another
22 thing that effects it is just the air itself
23 absorbing some of the energy of that. So --

24 TOM GEORGE: Before you go to
25 that define what the green line is here so we

1 can keep track.

2 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Okay. So the
3 green line is actually what you'd expect,
4 hypothetically. And the black line of course
5 is what we measured. So you can forget all
6 about that stuff about the sphere. Really
7 what's important is that the air also absorbs
8 some energy. And you can figure for that.

9 NANCY BALE: Expectation is just
10 based on distance; right? Not on the other
11 factors?

12 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Just on
13 distance because actually physically sound,
14 really that's one of the only real important
15 things that distance -- sound pressure drops by
16 the inverse of distance.

17 NANCY BALE: And that's based on
18 studies that have been done by a variety of --

19 DAVYD BECTHKAL: That's sound.
20 That's the fundamental physics of sound.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: So you said
22 that the air absorbs the sound?

23 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yep.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: So if you
25 lower the density what happens?

1 DAVYD BECTHKAL: If you lower
2 the density of the air?

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Also a change
4 in the altitude.

5 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Sound travels
6 slower through lower density but I don't really
7 know about how much more -- I imagine it
8 probably absorbs less. So you have less dense
9 air, less molecules to absorb. It would
10 probably absorb less energy.

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: So if you were
12 at the summit which is about one-half of the --
13 like half the pressure you would expect it to
14 be louder?

15 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Probably, yeah.
16 Actually that's a really --

17 ERIKA BENNETT: But in a vacuum
18 there is no sound at all.

19 TOM GEORGE: Okay. Let's go to
20 the next slide.

21 DAVYD BECTHKAL: So this bottom
22 line you're looking at is an adjustment for
23 absorption by the air. And that's what I mean
24 by molecular absorption up here. And so that's
25 a typical value. It varies. We can't tell for

1 certain how much it was absorbing because we
2 didn't really know all the atmospheric
3 conditions, like you said, Charley. But I
4 chose a pretty typical value. And the range --
5 the values we measured again are in between
6 two. So what you'd expect physically from just
7 spreading -- the sound waves spreading out over
8 space and what you'd expect that same spreading
9 but then also with absorption by the air.
10 Okay. It falls in between those two values.
11 And that was satisfying to me in a way because
12 that meant that the measurements we took made
13 sense.

14 Okay. But now what we went out
15 to do was to compare those to perception. And
16 now you can look at perception based on
17 distance as well. And that's the bottom line.
18 And it follows, again, from what you saw in the
19 bar charts. It follows pretty well. The
20 perception matches the drop off and sound
21 pressure level.

22 TOM GEORGE: So, in other words,
23 the further away from the sound source you go
24 the less the people on the surface are going to
25 perceive it, at least using this scale and data

1 set.

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: So rule of
3 thumb in this one would be you get a little
4 over a mile and you're really getting most of
5 the benefit.

6 TOM GEORGE: That's one way to
7 look at it. This is only with six observers
8 and a few flights.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, of
10 course. But, you know, I mean, you go with
11 what you have.

12 MIKE YORKE: Right. But the
13 data shows similar.

14 NANCY BALE: If you're talking
15 about the benefit of perception. But the
16 benefit with respect to --

17 MIKE YORKE: Pretty linear.
18 Pretty linear.

19 NANCY BALE: You know,
20 Backcountry Plan is all about objective data.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm accepting
22 the subjective nature of everything that we're
23 doing.

24 NANCY BALE: Oh, yeah. I mean,
25 that is an issue.

1 DAVYD BECTHKAL: One of the kind
2 of interesting things that has bearing on the
3 standards themselves is the maximum sound
4 pressure level is kind of what we've been
5 talking about; right? The measured maximum
6 level of these aircraft. But what was kind of
7 weird is when I started looking at distance and
8 duration I noticed that there was a trend as
9 well with increasing distance. And here I
10 haven't included -- I've just included the
11 overflights for that 2K. So overhead one
12 nautical mile, two nautical miles.

13 TOM GEORGE: For one aircraft?

14 DAVYD BECTHKAL: For the sound.
15 This is just for the sound. And then I've
16 taken the kind of bigger point is the average
17 of just the smaller points. And at first you
18 say, okay, well, why is the duration dropping
19 with distance? And Tom made up this diagram
20 here and I think it does a pretty good job of
21 explaining it. If you got sort of a circular
22 pattern that's been radiated out on the ground
23 imagine you're an observer, you know, and
24 overhead you've got this whole time, this whole
25 duration. Now say the plane's offset one

1 nautical mile. The duration is again, at two
2 nautical miles.

3 TOM GEORGE: By the way, we did
4 take the found data and tried to see if we
5 could actually compute this because of course
6 you know, my mind, is well, how close to a real
7 round footprint is this? And answer is we
8 don't have enough data points to really do that
9 here. But it basically followed this pattern.
10 So this is a hypothetical, not any kind of real
11 word measurment that was used to come up with
12 this.

13 DAVYD BECTHKAL: If anyone's
14 interested in looking at those, during a break
15 or something, I brought along some of the
16 images that we came up with. Okay.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You said that
18 was kind of a surprise, Davyd, that --

19 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Well, you know,
20 it's one of these things where it's perfectly
21 logical but it just didn't -- it caught me off
22 guard I guess.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Right. Well,
24 we've kind of talked about that I guess more
25 with overhead. Is lower and shorter time

1 better or is higher and longer distance better?
2 And, again, I guess this speaks more to the
3 offset than the overhead that we get the most
4 bang for our buck with the offset is what I'm
5 seeing here.

6 ERIC DENKEWALTER: So if you
7 made that three dimensional --

8 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Well, I don't
9 have any three dimensional but what you're
10 hitting on is also true in three dimensional.
11 So if you increase at it as well. The duration
12 should also -- what Eric's getting at is if you
13 increase the altitude as well you'd be
14 decreasing the duration because --

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You would be
16 decreasing the duration.

17 DAVYD BECTHKAL: You can imagine
18 that circle kind of coming out of the screen
19 and getting smaller and smaller and smaller as
20 the plane got higher up.

21 TOM GEORGE: It's one thing to
22 draw it out abstractly, it's something else to
23 look at data and see if it matches.

24 DAVYD BECTHKAL: It might be
25 actually that it doesn't radiate in, you know,

1 the vertical dimension in the same way that it
2 does in --

3 TOM GEORGE: Well, you could
4 look at it for the Found because we have the
5 Found at two altitudes over head.

6 ERIKA BENNETT: Okay. Let's
7 look at something else here. The dark line he
8 has around the blue is a threshold. Okay. So
9 the actual sound itself is going to be much
10 wider than that. It's just going to be
11 dribbling off a little bit less, little bit
12 less, little bit less. So although we are
13 talking about just looking at two dimensional,
14 that edge there, that sharp edge, doesn't
15 really exist. It's just a threshold of where
16 you're hearing it and noticing it.

17 TOM GEORGE: That's right. It's
18 some arbitrary value.

19 ERIC DENKEWALTER: In a vertical
20 sense, that's why you can hear an airliner
21 sometimes flying over, you just have to be in a
22 right area.

23 NANCY BALE: And you'll see it
24 first perhaps.

25 MIKE YORKE: Do you have the

1 duration for the rotocraft also? I mean, I can
2 catch you at the break. Duration versus the
3 altitude. Yeah, the duration.

4 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I have got the
5 data. I don't know that I have it visualized
6 in the same way but I could probably do --

7 MIKE YORKE: No. No. I can --
8 just curious. I'll think you find the print is
9 smaller.

10 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Okay.
11 Basically a summary of three points here that
12 are pretty straight forward, we didn't make any
13 too major claims but sound pressure level
14 inversely related to distance for fixed
15 altitude flights. The fixed velocity; not
16 changing speed or direction. Change in
17 perception rating. Follow the change in sound
18 pressure level. So what people perceive is
19 actually pretty well correlated with what's
20 measured with the sound level. And duration is
21 inversely related to distance for fixed
22 altitude flights.

23 TOM GEORGE: One more slide.

24 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Oh. Questions.

25 TOM GEORGE: Terry Cartee from

1 Alaska Airmen's came up with a big mega camera.
2 So each aircraft that was going overhead he was
3 shooting it and that's where these came from.

4 NANCY BALE: Could you make a
5 summary comment about aircraft type or RPMs at
6 this point?

7 TOM GEORGE: No.

8 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I don't think
9 so. And actually to be honest, RPM stuff I
10 haven't even really heard about until this
11 morning.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So to
13 extrapolate to the Backcountry Plan and the
14 sound standards, an intrusion in the
15 Backcountry Plan is anything that goes above
16 what the background decibel level is.

17 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yep.

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So is the
19 background decibel level the 15 or the 28?
20 It's the 15 because the -- is 28 the average of
21 the background or all sound including the
22 aircraft?

23 DAVYD BECTHKAL: The background
24 level would be more like the 28.

25 JOAN FRANKEVICH: The background

1 level would be 28?

2 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yep. At least
3 that's the first close approximation. The LMAT
4 I didn't have the ability to calculate from the
5 data we had. I needed the longer data. L50 is
6 really really close. It's very similar.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So our
8 average background level was 28.

9 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yep. Over the
10 entire session for the Found it was probably a
11 little bit lower than that actually. So for
12 the first -- the fixed wing single engine
13 aircraft, it was probably a little bit lower.
14 The winds kind of set in during the break
15 between the Found and the A-Star. So it
16 started to kind of increase it a little bit.
17 But, yeah.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: Looks like it
19 was pretty successful.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We also really
21 lucked out. It wasn't raining. It wasn't
22 cold. It wasn't terribly windy. Because
23 sitting on the tundra for three hours could've
24 been not very pleasant. And it was very
25 pleasant. So it's impressive we pulled it off

1 as well as we did. And thank you Tom and
2 Davyd.

3 NANCY BALE: Great analysis.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What about the
5 bonus aircraft, because there was one that was
6 real low.

7 TOM GEORGE: We haven't really
8 run numbers. We were struggling just to get
9 this ready for the meeting.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I understand.
11 It might be nice to get that at some point
12 though. Can you continue to do that? Because
13 what was real low, like, 500 feet or something?

14 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah. They're
15 definitely a lot louder than the ones that we
16 did.

17 TOM GEORGE: We don't know where
18 it was relative to any of our tracks. But we
19 do know because of the report he made on the
20 radio what his altitude was. So we actually
21 got some documentation on it. It was pretty
22 interesting. It was a Super Cub that came in
23 and landed at Healy that flew right over. And
24 then there was a Cessna 150 that went out and
25 back up Stampede somewhere, came back later on.

1 Flew through the set.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So roughly
3 speaking that Super Cub was about 500 feet and
4 the decibel reading was about 70?

5 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah, I think
6 that's pretty fair.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Because as an
8 observer, I mean, it stood out as, whoa, this
9 really intruded on my --

10 TOM GEORGE: But you remember
11 you made the comment at the time that, gee, I
12 guess I really can't estimate altitude at all
13 because you thought it was going to be 2,000 --

14 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm like, man,
15 I could have sworn that was lower than 2,000.

16 TOM GEORGE: I had to bite my
17 tongue to not just let you have that
18 misperception.

19 NANCY BALE: Davyd, question
20 about had there been a soundscape station there
21 and you were analyzing the sound and the -- and
22 the events and all that. I know this was a
23 structured thing so you can't really -- it's
24 apples and oranges, but if there were a
25 soundscape station there what category of sound

1 disturbance would that exercise have --

2 DAVYD BECTHKAL: That whole
3 session -- you know, that's interesting. We
4 sure crammed a lot of overflights into that.

5 TOM GEORGE: It would be high.
6 I mean, you know, with the number of flights we
7 stuck in there it would have to be in the
8 medium high to high range.

9 SALLY GIBERT: There wasn't very
10 much down time between flights.

11 DAVYD BECTHKAL: No way.

12 NANCY BALE: Well, it looks like
13 it could do medium. Maximum percent audible
14 per hour, 15. Maximum number per day, 10. It
15 could be, you know, pushing the edge of medium.
16 But maximum DBA on medium was 40.

17 TOM GEORGE: So we were over two
18 of the three.

19 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Percent time
20 audible and events -- since it's an events per
21 day standard it's difficult to -- you know, one
22 of the reasons I didn't pursue that too
23 enthusiastically was because it's hard to
24 imagine that session which was pretty contrived
25 being anything like a number of events per day.

1 You know, how do you take three hours --

2 TOM GEORGE: Do you assume that
3 same number of activities for the rest of the
4 day or you're going to say that's all it was
5 for the whole day meaning -- it gets real
6 artificial real fast.

7 NANCY BALE: That kind of
8 exercise would have been objectionable if we
9 were camped on the upper Teklanika. And
10 actually the upper Tek is low. And low is
11 maximum audible per hour, five. Maximum number
12 per day, one. No.

13 TOM GEORGE: Well, you'll notice
14 we did that outside the park.

15 NANCY BALE: Right. No. No.
16 No. I'm just trying to relate this what we
17 have to discuss. But I guess what is really --
18 what I'm really noticing here is the DBA. The
19 standards have pretty low DBAs for aircraft to
20 have comply with. Do you have any views on
21 that? And if you don't want to have views on
22 it, I understand.

23 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I guess I don't
24 really, not on the sound pressure level one.
25 Might be an interesting exercise though on --

1 to do -- to measure the percent time audible
2 just to get an idea of, okay, here's pretty
3 rapid onset of aircraft, almost continuous, to
4 get an idea of what percentage of the time that
5 you were out there listening or for those three
6 hours, whatever.

7 NANCY BALE: I guess my question
8 is really when you're reviewing sound station
9 data from the wilderness fort are you seeing
10 DBA violations on a regular basis because the
11 DBAs are set pretty low?

12 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I think that
13 it's fair to answer, Nancy, that a good
14 percentage of most sites. You're talking
15 probably between 40 and, you know, 80 percent
16 of all aircraft in the 40 zone, the low and
17 medium zones, are breaking that standard. So
18 that's probably pretty fair to say. You know,
19 if you go into a 60 zone very few are breaking
20 the standard.

21 NANCY BALE: But that's only in
22 the high and very high zones, which are the red
23 zones.

24 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Right.

25 NANCY BALE: Which have been,

1 you know, established for the south side but
2 not so much the north side.

3 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I guess I could
4 temper that with saying 60 decibels is really
5 loud. I mean, it is. I guess take it how you
6 will, they're being -- the standard's being
7 broken very often but how loud something
8 actually is, 40 and 60 might be also reasonable
9 to consider. The actual level itself, you
10 know?

11 SALLY GIBERT: Brian, do you
12 have a --

13 BRIAN OKONEK: I just wanted to
14 comment that, you know, with the Best Practices
15 for Kahiltna Pass and the summit, just shows
16 that those are good things to have in place.
17 And, again, like on Kahiltna Pass, ideally you
18 would gain your altitude to cross the pass way
19 down by the east portion of Kahiltna so you
20 don't have to climb all the way up the upper
21 Kahiltna right over the climbing route and go
22 over the pass as high as possible, 2,000 feet,
23 to minimize as much as possible the sound not
24 only for the climbers at Kahiltna Pass but for
25 people camping at 11,000. And, again, the

1 further we can stay from the summit the, you
2 know, less intrusive planes are going to be for
3 those on the upper mountain.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, and it
5 seems like for that, like, the Kahiltna Pass
6 recommendation doesn't influence numbers of
7 flights at all. It's just that they're less
8 intrusive. And that seems to be having a good
9 bang for the buck.

10 TIM CUDNEY: Just for comparison
11 you don't have the sound meter with you, do
12 you?

13 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I've actually
14 got it.

15 TIM CUDNEY: You mentioned a
16 15.2 decibel reading when it was calm in the
17 morning. You also always mention that at
18 Kahiltna Pass one day when it was quiet and
19 there was minimal wind or no wind at
20 14-something; correct?

21 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah, that was
22 pretty much the lowest level that has ever been
23 in my --

24 TIM CUDNEY: What is it in this
25 room, say, when the air conditioner comes on or

1 when, like, air comes on or there's --

2 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Well, that's a
3 hard question to answer, Tim. Because you're
4 talking about, you know, every increase in a
5 decibel is ten times as much. So there's a lot
6 of room for error. But if I was going to say
7 -- one thing I could probably say is when the
8 air conditioner kicks on it's not quiet as 15
9 in here. If we're all to listen for a second
10 you might be about --

11 TIM CUDNEY: Because we get --
12 we all get accustomed to the day-to-day
13 background noises.

14 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Exactly.

15 TIM CUDNEY: And I've been at a
16 pass or at a summit where it's dead wind, it's
17 almost scary that there's no sound. You think
18 that you're in outer space or something. And,
19 you know, whether it's on the street, you know,
20 or in our car, we hear the air on, or home, the
21 heat comes on. We always got something in the
22 background. And I know a lot of these readings
23 are still, like you say, perception. But you
24 take in perception with account of everything
25 else that's going on, you know, around you.

1 And, like, hiking. When you're hiking you're
2 making noise. And then, like, if you're
3 cross-country skiing, even though it's dead
4 silent, you're making noise with your clothes.

5 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yeah, and the
6 skis too.

7 TIM CUDNEY: Exactly. Exactly.
8 So I just -- I'd like to see some more --
9 obviously you had optimum conditions the first
10 thing in the morning. And then the afternoon
11 they were a little bit skewed.

12 TOM GEORGE: Or a little bit
13 more realistic depending on how you --

14 TIM CUDNEY: Absolutely.

15 DAVYD BECTHKAL: It's true in a
16 way, yeah.

17 TIM CUDNEY: And we always talk
18 about some of the flights out of the park
19 strip. Well, the park strip, historically, is
20 the noisiest place in the park, you know?
21 Between the rail, between the motor coaches,
22 between the private aircraft coming in, between
23 the park aircraft, that is, like, no area to be
24 doing a sound study because you've got all
25 these different background noises that are

1 there. Peak season, off peak.

2 NANCY BALE: Park tried to close
3 it.

4 TIM CUDNEY: Who built out at
5 the Sand Lake gravel pit out there off of Sand
6 Lake Road? Who built the airport right next to
7 those, you know, \$500,000 homes that don't
8 qualify for the new window upgrades -- the
9 soundproof upgrades that the other houses do
10 off of Jewel Lake Road?

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: There's an
12 airstrip at --

13 TIM CUDNEY: Yeah, it's called
14 Ted Stevens.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Recently there
16 was some more expensive homes built out there?

17 TIM CUDNEY: Absolutely.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: I would like
19 to throw an idea out there for you guys to
20 consider which is the work that you produced,
21 it seems to have some really -- some -- it's
22 made tangible what others have said they've
23 experience; right? And so perhaps we can use
24 this report in some -- at a summary level in
25 part of our communication because you talked

1 about how you educate, right, as part of our
2 program and how we communicate to the aviation
3 community and to the climbing or the
4 backcountry. So the possibility that some of
5 this information can be used in our
6 communication is just to throw it out there.

7 TOM GEORGE: Well, I guess I
8 want to be a little careful here. I think the
9 principal reason we did this was kind of for
10 information for the group especially, you know,
11 leading in to talking about north side Best
12 Practices. Now before you start putting some
13 in a publication and make hundreds of copies,
14 that's where real science needs to come in
15 here. And the fact that we did this with six
16 observers that aren't necessarily
17 representative of the population that visits
18 the park, and only three overflights at each
19 altitude, you know -- so now I don't think we
20 want to get carried away and start -- I think
21 you need peer reviewed results for things like
22 that. This was more designed to inform us so
23 that we could sit down and actually have a
24 discussion about Best Practices and have a
25 feeling for whether RPM reductions or high or

1 offsets have more benefit to us. I think if we
2 get further than that we really need --
3 somebody needs to do the real work to put real
4 numbers behind it. So, yeah, I would caution
5 that we don't want to get too carried away with
6 that.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Virtually no
8 risk in making some summary. What's at risk?

9 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I think the
10 meeting's, you know, going to reflect it. And
11 we found a few things but I don't think -- and
12 I think it's good for forming our discussions
13 but I think we want to be careful that we don't
14 say, okay, we have found that and then make
15 these broad generalizations.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. But I
17 think that it does inform us and it's useful.
18 And it was a really successful event. So how
19 do we use it? That's all.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yes. Well, I
21 think we use it amongst ourselves for now. The
22 one thing that I think it would be useful to
23 figure out how to -- well, in fact that's
24 exactly what you're just saying. How do we
25 characterize -- how do you sort of summarize

1 the results without capitalizing the results?
2 Maybe that's what you're saying. And then also
3 thinking about are there ways that we can --
4 doing -- designing some more exercises? Are
5 there specific avenues that we want to try and
6 test again at some point? Because it really --
7 it was a small number of people and small
8 number of flights. And we got a lot of really
9 good information. And can we do that again and
10 play with another couple more variables? We
11 can start to kind of build it a little bit or
12 even compare one summer to the next, you know,
13 have some different people or something.

14 Tom?

15 TOM GEORGE: I guess I think
16 if -- I mean, this was designed specific to
17 some questions of the Council. And working
18 with the aviation working group which, you
19 know, is working on -- in the more detailed
20 level of Best Practices, you know, kind of
21 answer that question. I think if we're going
22 to get deeper into that we need to make
23 recommendation to the Park Service and get the
24 science community to do that. Because now
25 that's -- those are the people that are really

1 skilled to do this. And I don't think trying
2 to turn this into a research group is going to
3 help us.

4 SALLY GIBERT: That's that a
5 good point. Good point.

6 TOM GEORGE: That's not to say
7 if there aren't some other little things we can
8 do along the way to answer some very specific
9 practical questions that it might not be worth
10 doing at a very low level. But to get into
11 this at any step beyond that you really need to
12 let the people that -- that's their job and
13 they've got the credentials to do it. And now
14 you can publish that far and wide and try and
15 make bigger policy decisions or whatever you
16 need to do with it. So, yeah, we just kind of
17 need to get this in perspective as to the scale
18 of the operation.

19 SALLY GIBERT: The other thing I
20 was going to say, even though the information
21 that we have that doesn't have a capital R for
22 results, it can influence what north side's
23 Best Practices might be invented and then that
24 is what gets kind of observed and measured. So
25 it can be measured in a context setting as

1 opposed to the actual just raw numbers.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Just as an
3 observer on the ground my perceptions of that
4 activity was definitely higher was better. It
5 wasn't hugely better. My sense was sitting out
6 there in my own little space on the tundra
7 anything that was -- if it was directly over my
8 head it felt intrusive. You know, off to the
9 side was definitely -- you know, and part of it
10 was -- even if the sound was the same, I don't
11 know, there's something psychologically when it
12 goes right over your head. It feels like it's
13 in your space. So off definitely felt better.
14 And higher was definitely better. It was
15 definitely noticeably better but it wasn't
16 hugely different.

17 The other thing I really got out
18 of it is I expected the helicopter to be much
19 more irritating than the plane. To me they
20 were very similar. And that was a learning
21 thing for me as well. And that's the other
22 thing I observed.

23 I'm curious what other people's
24 overall impressions were.

25 SALLY GIBERT: I had the

1 exact -- the straight overhead was more
2 intrusive than offset and that I thought the
3 helicopter was not intrusive. In fact in some
4 ways it seemed less -- the sound itself seemed
5 less intrusive which I thought was interesting.

6 NANCY BALE: It's kind of a
7 different sound. It's a two-part sound.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. But also
9 it wasn't -- it was just cruising. It wasn't
10 like, you know, hovering or anything like that.
11 So that's a difference too. But, yeah, the
12 offset thing was what I was surprised at how
13 much benefit there was sort of psychologically
14 having it not overhead even at the higher
15 altitude. Like, lower and offset was better
16 than higher straight up --

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yes. Yes.

18 SALLY GIBERT: -- you know, by a
19 significant margin.

20 TOM GEORGE: Which suggests that
21 there are other factors besides just the sound
22 that go into your perception. That thing's
23 coming straight at you.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Right. Any other
25 sort of subjective -- Eric?

1 ERIC DENKEWALTER: In Talkeetna
2 a few years ago we changed the traffic pattern.
3 Planes used to come in directly over the town
4 and then go to the far side and then circle in
5 and land. And just by not flying over town at
6 the same altitude and the same speed and
7 everything else made a huge difference. Again,
8 just a little bit of an offset out over the
9 river there makes all the difference in the
10 world. I don't know how we could implement
11 that into the park because my offset might be
12 directly over your head. But it is something
13 to think about. Once we started staying away
14 from right overhead town, nobody seemed to have
15 a problem anymore. Very few complaints
16 compared to what we had.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Well, it would be
18 interesting looking at how the north side is
19 laid out, you know, how the geography -- it's
20 like you got the road, and, like, when people
21 for example are going south -- I don't know how
22 far it is to where people sort of -- kind of,
23 you know, drop down and go across and they get
24 up into the hills, what that distance is and is
25 there room to, you know, fly a plane down the

1 middle?

2 NANCY BALE: I think we actually
3 talked about that.

4 SALLY GIBERT: When you're first
5 leaving the road, like, your first day or
6 something like that, you're going to have more
7 planes. But when you get, you know, up to kind
8 of where -- about your farthest-out point then
9 you're kind of beyond it on the other side.
10 And I'm wondering if there's any value in that
11 line of thinking. So from that perspective it
12 would be very useful. And my thinking here
13 is -- and I appreciate what I think Tom said
14 that we aren't a research group. And I don't
15 think that when the National Park Service
16 advocated for this group they thought that we
17 were going to do -- get everything vetted down
18 to a T so that -- I think the Park Service
19 expected perhaps that we would be able to make
20 some recommendations with a certain amount of
21 vetting and then let them move on with it. So
22 I don't think that having to vet things to a T
23 it's necessary for us to make recommendations.

24 TOM GEORGE: Not arguing at all
25 with that. But also don't go out and publish

1 the results of this as a vetted piece of
2 information.

3 NANCY BALE: Well, we would
4 probably couch any recommendations we made with
5 an introductory remark that we would probably
6 wordsmith for a long time. I bet.

7 SALLY GIBERT: And we already
8 do. I mean, all the recommendations we have so
9 far are heavily caveated.

10 AMANDA SMITH: Would be
11 interesting to learn sound perceptions in
12 winter as well because there are backcountry
13 users in winter. Well, not just users but, you
14 know, there's obviously a lot less traffic.
15 Just a thought. I mean, we're going at a time
16 when soundscape is one thing. I don't know
17 what the difference is in decibels or quiet.
18 And I'm thinking -- I mean, winter is simulated
19 at the higher elevations obviously. And
20 it's -- I don't suggest it's a priority but
21 it's something to think about. I've been
22 thinking about this pretty much solely during
23 the summer, extended summer season, but it
24 would -- it's good for us to at least consider
25 other places. Maybe with such less traffic

1 it's less of a consideration.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Is there very
3 much flightseeing in the winter?

4 MIKE YORKE: That's going to
5 change, isn't it?

6 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I fly all
7 winter.

8 MIKE YORKE: Japanese are coming
9 to Fairbanks.

10 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah, this
11 year the Japanese have 18 charters coming in
12 starting the end of December to the end of
13 March.

14 TOM GEORGE: But what's your
15 frequency of operations that time of year
16 versus summer?

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, I do --
18 you know, each airplane will do two flights per
19 day at most.

20 TOM GEORGE: Versus -- what's a
21 summertime typical?

22 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah, which
23 is just, you know -- we go -- actually, by the
24 time we get to the park we're 10-, 12,000 feet.
25 And I cruise power. We get about I guess along

1 the fault line, start climbing again. And then
2 around the summit and then drop down to about
3 ten or 12. And then come over to, like, the
4 cove area if it's a nice day or something and
5 then back out and then kind of move over
6 towards Stampede and go out that way.

7 I've never seen evidence of
8 anybody on the ground. We're probably pretty
9 high over most of it till we get over around
10 the Stampede area and then we're down lower.

11 BRIAN OKONEK: But there's just
12 no comparison between summer and winter for the
13 flight.

14 MIKE YORKE: Nor no comparison
15 about occupants in the park.

16 TIM CUDNEY: Davyd, in the
17 winter with certain snow densities and stuff,
18 does that have a tendency to absorb sound?

19 DAVYD BECTHKAL: You know, I
20 don't know anything about how snow effects
21 sound. This isn't actually directly answering
22 your question, but I could also say that as far
23 as monitoring stations in the winter, I pick up
24 a lot fewer propeller aircraft. And certainly
25 the jets don't really change at all.

1 SUZANNE RUST: Do the levels
2 that you hear the jets at change? Does it
3 sound different?

4 DAVYD BECTHKAL: That's a really
5 interesting question. I haven't really ever
6 taken a close look at comparing winter sets to
7 summer sets.

8 TOM GEORGE: Dave, with the
9 difference in temperature in the atmosphere --

10 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I usually don't
11 sample in the same place in the winter time
12 than I do in the summertime.

13 SUZANNE RUST: But you could.
14 You could.

15 SALLY GIBERT: So is there
16 anything we need to do to kind of wrap up this
17 discussion? Just trying to think how we sort
18 of summarize. I'm still kind of stuck on how
19 we summarize the results without a capital R.
20 Or maybe we don't. Maybe we just inform
21 ourselves and --

22 TOM GEORGE: I think you've got
23 that presentation and whatnot.

24 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, the last
25 three bullet points.

1 TOM GEORGE: I think we're
2 there.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that's
4 true. That's true. Yeah, they're on the
5 slides.

6 TOM GEORGE: So I think you got
7 what you need.

8 SALLY GIBERT: And is that on
9 PowerPoint? Is that going to be posted on the
10 Web site?

11 TOM GEORGE: Well, I presume
12 that would become part of the documents, the
13 presentation materials from the meeting, which
14 I think we post, don't we Miriam?

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, most
16 things.

17 TOM GEORGE: And I left a copy
18 of it on your computer. No charge.

19 NANCY BALE: I would like to
20 request that Davyd be scheduled to present to
21 park staff sometime. I think I found it very
22 interesting.

23 SALLY GIBERT: So I think we
24 probably can take a break.

25 Before we do that I just want to

1 thank again Tim and Eric for participating in
2 this exercise.

3 MIKE YORKE: Yeah. Yeah.

4 TOM GEORGE: Here here.

5 SALLY GIBERT: It was a
6 significant cost. I mean, it cost them.

7 TOM GEORGE: And you can thank
8 Paul as well.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, and Paul.
10 Anyway, that was -- it was very valuable.

11 TOM GEORGE: Thank you.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Break.

13 (A break was taken.)

14 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Next is
15 north side feedback mechanisms.

16 Nancy, do you want to do your --

17 NANCY BALE: Well, I'm not sure
18 what --

19 TOM GEORGE: This is a Park
20 Service --

21 NANCY BALE: I don't think
22 that's quite us yet.

23 SALLY GIBERT: You're right.
24 This was feedback. That's right.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So here we

1 go. We were asked to have some -- since
2 everybody felt that the south side was going so
3 well in terms of, you know -- I'm going to have
4 the terminology wrong -- unusual events,
5 aircraft events. Is that what we settled with?
6 And you had requested that there be something
7 done on the north side of the park. I think
8 when Phillip was with us months ago he said
9 he'd look into it. And there was a couple
10 criteria he offered.

11 One of our wilderness
12 coordinator positions, which was actually a
13 backcountry and district ranger position, that
14 has not been filled. And so there was a big
15 logistical piece and somebody overseeing the
16 staff that would be providing the feedback of
17 the group. And then secondly our ecologist
18 position. I apologize because sometimes we
19 change the title on this. The person who's
20 responsible for the implementation of the
21 Backcountry Plan, overseeing all this, that
22 position is not yet filled. So there's a
23 couple hiccups from an operational logistical
24 perspective.

25 I think Phillip was pretty clear

1 about also sharing with you the value that we
2 have on the south side of the range is that our
3 mountaineering rangers are returning. And we
4 have a great -- we have a very low turnover in
5 our mountaineering staff. So people who know
6 the resource know what to be gauging things
7 against. When we say it's unusual, it's truly
8 unusual. And there was a concern that we don't
9 have that quite on the north side. We also
10 don't have staff concentrated in one area like
11 we do on the mountain on the west buttress. So
12 there was a couple of pieces there that really
13 needed to be looked at.

14 What I thought I heard from the
15 Council though is that you were still
16 interested in those things that were unusual,
17 knowing about them so that you could take some
18 immediate action. Is that still true?

19 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah, that was
20 part of it. And then we were just interested
21 in what the perception was of the rangers on
22 the ground. Just how much activity is taking
23 place? In the upper Refuge Valley is there
24 lots of airplane traffic? You know, very basic
25 information like that just to get some feedback

1 from your backcountry rangers.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So Paul is
3 here today. Going to be a commitment made
4 about staffing and operations.

5 TOM GEORGE: And can I say one
6 more thing in terms of, again, our motivation
7 for feeling the need to talk about this now,
8 not three years from now is if, you know, we
9 are contemplating Best Practices on the north
10 side, which means if a Best Practice alters
11 things that are going on today or even if it
12 doesn't, you know, the potential for the full
13 life of this council of taking a problem and
14 just displacing it somewhere else exists. So
15 it seems like before we go messing on the north
16 side and recommending Best Practices that might
17 shift or in some manner define patterns, to
18 have some kind of feedback mechanism shorter
19 than the ten-year inventory of sound that is
20 going on, to get that feedback, again, while
21 it's fresh so that -- if it is there to operate
22 our aircraft there's an opportunity to take a
23 look at it while it's still fresh and figure
24 out what went wrong or if anything was wrong at
25 all. So, again, I just -- I think that's why

1 we're still kind of pushing for this. And even
2 if you don't have your perfect long-term
3 solution with all these different staffing
4 things, you know, if we can go with plan B even
5 in the meantime to have some kind of feedback,
6 whether it's perfect or not, I think makes
7 sense before, you know, kind of as a lead-in
8 step to actually recommending Best Practices.

9 PAUL ANDERSON: Okay. So a
10 couple of things to put out there.

11 As Miriam said, we haven't
12 filled the backcountry district wilderness
13 coordinator position nor the ecologist
14 position. We have applications for both and
15 they'll both be hired within the next few
16 weeks. Certainly before Thanksgiving.

17 Those two positions then will be
18 focused full time on the backcountry and
19 implementation of the Backcountry Plan. And
20 the highest priority for implementation of the
21 Backcountry Plan if you will -- strategically,
22 not necessarily operational details, but
23 strategically -- is to deal with the -- and
24 they will be working full time in the
25 backcountry district as well with the

1 ecologist. So this will be the first time that
2 we've really ever had anybody assigned directly
3 to -- in both resources and rangers to work
4 directly together to implement this plan that
5 was assigned in 2006. We never got funding for
6 it through the appropriations process. So what
7 we've done is rearranged priorities in the
8 park -- fill the positions with base funding.

9 So I would expect that we're
10 going to see a lot more attention over the next
11 six months to the next year, significant change
12 in direction in terms of our focus in the
13 backcountry. So anyway that -- and I think
14 that'll be helpful in the feedback that you're
15 talking about.

16 Part of the problem I see with
17 the feedback in talking with Phillip as well,
18 it is really expensive to do what we're asking
19 to do if we do it in a structured fashion. You
20 can get feedback from the backcountry rangers
21 on their patrol reports. You know, there were
22 two helicopters flying over me when I went to
23 this location. Or I was in Refuge Valley for a
24 day and 25 twin engine Navajos came over and
25 whatever, but I didn't see any aircraft at all.

1 You know, that's not hard to gather. But to
2 gather anything that's structured in such a way
3 that it could really -- you know, like a --
4 what do you call it? Attentive listening or
5 whatever. That's an expensive proposition.
6 And because the mountain -- because the rangers
7 on the mountain, it makes -- it's not that
8 expensive. It would be more time consuming and
9 we can still do that. But, again, more time
10 consuming than the north side just because of
11 the logistics. So that's basically that.

12 You know, in terms of -- not to
13 jump the gun but in terms of dealing with the
14 north side and what we want to do on the south
15 side, and what we've already done and what's
16 left to do, you know, Tom, we talked earlier on
17 about, you know, what is the broad vision, if
18 you will, for the backcountry of Denali from
19 the park management point of view? And what is
20 it that we really are trying -- why are we
21 doing all this stuff? And maybe it would be
22 worth while to at least share some of those
23 thoughts with the group that might help focus
24 some of what we do or how we go about it. And
25 having thought about this for several years,

1 five years I guess, I'm fairly prepared to do
2 that at this point if people want to hear it.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Yes, definitely.
4 It definitely would inform our discussion about
5 our future.

6 PAUL ANDERSON: It may inform
7 your discussion about my future.

8 Anyway so, you know, going back
9 to the very beginning of this whole project in
10 the process of developing the Backcountry Plan,
11 you know, we didn't know very much about what
12 the whole big picture was going to look like
13 when we started. And we've learned a lot as
14 we've gone along. Not that we've learned a lot
15 of scientifically sound information but we've
16 gotten a lot more perception and a lot more
17 input.

18 In trying to simplify a vision
19 for what's this whole soundscape plan about, it
20 seems to me that we can boil it down to two or
21 three things based upon a couple of principles.
22 One of them is that aviation's not going to go
23 away. It's an essential part of the culture in
24 the landscape, if you will. And so trying to
25 focus attention that sometimes people are prone

1 to do on, well, let's just get rid of
2 overflights altogether, then we don't have to
3 worry about it. It's a waist of time.

4 At the same time though there
5 are values and characteristics that we are
6 charged with protecting. And so how do we
7 identify those in a -- in concept and in
8 specific? And then how do we develop actions
9 to deal with it and still provide for aircraft
10 access and use?

11 So in my mind that boils down to
12 something different than what the landscape
13 looks like today and soundscape plan. And it
14 boils down to this: There should be places
15 over the park that are of such scenic
16 significance that -- and are best viewed,
17 enjoyed, experienced by air that we allow
18 significant amount of air traffic from scenic
19 tours, glacial landings, et cetera. But that
20 would not be the whole park. It would be those
21 places that we designate through the planning
22 process as particularly -- not susceptible, but
23 particularly conducive to large numbers of
24 aircraft flights. And the soundscape standards
25 and the management standards for those areas

1 should be set accordingly. We shouldn't be out
2 there expecting people to enjoy the park
3 through aircraft and set the standard so that
4 nobody can go there.

5 Secondly, there should be places
6 in the park, and particularly in the designated
7 wilderness, where there's no aircraft
8 overflights, quote/unquote. And the wilderness
9 character and soundscape is maintained to the
10 highest degree possible.

11 And then thirdly, there should
12 be other places in the park where aircraft are,
13 say, routinely seen, used, observed, but
14 they're not the frequency or the -- you know,
15 it's not at a level that would significantly
16 falter somebody's experience. And perhaps a
17 large portion of the park should be like that.

18 So then the question to me
19 becomes -- and so there's -- that's my vision.
20 How do we get to that? Well, it seems to me
21 like this group could have a significant role
22 in helping to define from a practical
23 standpoint, where are those places? How big
24 should they be? How could we manage the park's
25 sounds scape with aircraft overflights? And

1 those aren't the only noise pollutions.
2 There's other noise pollution; buses on the
3 road and other kinds of activities certainly
4 causes noise as well. But how could we create
5 this model or this map of the park that would
6 accomplish those things? And we need to meet
7 the park visitors, the aviation users and the
8 folks that want to ensure that they're
9 making -- that the wilderness and the character
10 of the park are adequate.

11 And then given that we could do
12 all of that it would seem to me that if we came
13 up with a proposal that looked like that, that
14 we could go out with it and say, look, folks,
15 here's how we think soundscapes ought to be
16 managed in Denali into the future. Knowing six
17 years more than what we knew when we started
18 this project and six years more realistic than
19 some of the things that we did six years ago
20 might have been. Then we could say, okay,
21 let's go through a public process and we can
22 adjust the soundscape standards.

23 So that's kind of my vision for
24 how this might work. Will there be people that
25 think it's a really bad idea? Absolutely,

1 there will be. Are there people that think
2 it's a great idea? I don't know. I think it
3 might work, but we'll see. But I think if --
4 you know, from a superintendent's point of view
5 you guys have done a lot of really good things
6 already. If I could leave this place when I
7 retire, and you could leave this place when the
8 group retires, whenever that is -- whether it's
9 two years from now or eight years from now,
10 whatever -- would it not be a management
11 strategy that made sense from a aviation point
12 of view, made sense from a land management
13 point of view, made sense from a visitor point
14 of view that could be sustainable? And so that
15 to me would be my charge to you. Help me out
16 here.

17 TOM GEORGE: Makes sense. All
18 we need's a couple weeks; right?

19 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, you got
20 two years.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So Paul, are
22 you planning or possibly planning then a public
23 process to re-evaluate how soundscape standards
24 are in the current plan and potentially change
25 that; is that what you're saying?

1 PAUL ANDERSON: We committed in
2 the current plan to go back -- we committed in
3 the current Backcountry Management Plan to go
4 back and visit the soundscape standards at some
5 point in the future. And from my point of view
6 I would expect that we would hold to that. But
7 how we do it is -- you know, how we go back and
8 revisit them is not well defined. And it
9 certainly could be -- one way to do it would be
10 to say, you know, take Davyd and Denver and
11 say, are the standards adequate or not? And if
12 they say, oh, yeah, that's fine and just -- we
13 did it. Another way to do it would be what
14 we're talking about here. And another way to
15 do it would be just to have the Park Service
16 come up with some proposal and put it out
17 there. Anything that this group does, which if
18 we make changes in the soundscape standards of
19 the plan, we need to go through the whole
20 public process.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Right. But
22 what I gather you're saying or what makes sense
23 to me is this group could come to a proposal
24 and agreement that would take a long -- that
25 would go a long way in taking it to the public.

1 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, I mean --
2 because the group represents the interests of
3 so many different interests on all different
4 sides of the issues I would expect that it
5 probably would help. My assumption would be
6 that this group would come up with a,
7 quote/unquote, preferred alternative, if you
8 will, amongst a set of alternatives for the
9 soundscape for the park.

10 SALLY GIBERT: And Paul, are you
11 thinking of this as kind of a two-step process
12 that the -- sort of look at this -- you know,
13 kind of a larger vision, for lack of a better
14 word, and kind of get -- and if it's any
15 consensus about that, then look at the
16 standards to see how they serve that?

17 PAUL ANDERSON: Right. So first
18 we need to define what we wanted to --

19 SALLY GIBERT: Where everybody
20 wants to go kind of thing. I think that's a
21 good step to make it a two-step process.

22 NANCY BALE: When are you going
23 to be finished characterizing the existing
24 condition? That's still ongoing, isn't it?
25 How many years?

1 DAVYD BECTHKAL: This is the end
2 of year six. So there's four more years left.

3 NANCY BALE: I wouldn't think
4 you could propose anything new for at least
5 four years.

6 PAUL ANDERSON: It will take
7 us -- if we started right now we won't be
8 finished in four years. I mean, just knowing
9 how everything goes at Denali, it's not -- I
10 mean, it would be an amazing thing if we were
11 making a decision within four years.

12 NANCY BALE: So that could
13 effect our attitude about our survival too.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: It certainly
15 could have an impact.

16 SALLY GIBERT: And to ask a
17 question I'm sure that's on people's minds, if
18 there's a intent on the part of the Park
19 Service to define areas that we have as close
20 to zero as possible overflights are you -- how
21 are you thinking about that in terms of -- that
22 would be something you try and work with FAA on
23 regulatory approach or would it be something
24 that if there was enough consensus about it, if
25 they were appropriately chosen areas that

1 everybody could get their arms around to keep
2 it as a voluntary thing? Or have you thought
3 about that? Because that's obviously the --

4 PAUL ANDERSON: I've thought a
5 lot about that.

6 SALLY GIBERT: I'm sure you
7 have. Anyway, what's your --

8 PAUL ANDERSON: I sit on the
9 National Air Tour Management Council. And so I
10 get healthy doses of this whole thing every six
11 months.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I mean,
13 obviously because what works for us --

14 PAUL ANDERSON: We are far ahead
15 of most -- at one time all of the parks, far
16 ahead of all the other parks in terms of their
17 tour management. And the reason that we are
18 there is because of voluntary nature in this
19 community. I mean, I would -- it would
20 surprise the daylight out of me to see the FAA
21 make some regulation that limited, restricted
22 or prohibited aircraft overflights over any
23 portion of the park. But I think that if we as
24 the interests that come together to determine
25 this, to manage it, to make recommendations on

1 it, agree that it's in everybody's interest to
2 do this, and we can put out recommendations and
3 advisories to the community that are reasonable
4 that will never get to 100 percent pure. But
5 we probably can get pretty close on a voluntary
6 compliance basis. And if we don't we'll have
7 all the evidence we need to figure out what the
8 appropriate response is going to be which we
9 don't have now.

10 But I think FAA's a critical
11 part of that. And we're lucky to have Mike
12 here representing the FAA so that we got a
13 reasonable ear that can say, look, you know,
14 here's FAA's mission, this is how we do our
15 job. We're going to have some restrictions on
16 what we can do, but here's the way we might be
17 able to make that happen.

18 And I think -- you know, I was
19 talking to a regional director yesterday about
20 a public process and how we operate at Denali
21 in general, this committee being a good example
22 of it. It is -- you know, my expectation is
23 that we would continue to operate in exactly
24 the same way that we're operating now as we go
25 about implementing the Backcountry Plan and

1 that the public involvement, assessment,
2 evaluation, ideas, support, commitment, all
3 those will be critical to the success no matter
4 how we go about it and that we should continue
5 to do that. So is the road not going to be
6 coming -- no-fly zone and screw up my
7 experience? It happens. Hopefully it won't
8 happen --

9 TIM CUDNEY: -- uninformed.

10 TOM GEORGE: And the aviation
11 community then may have a very active interest
12 in helping do some of that informing as opposed
13 to leaving it to the government or some other
14 stakeholder.

15 ERIKA BENNETT: We have ways of
16 getting word out to the general aviation public
17 that work pretty well in Alaska.

18 BRIAN OKONEK: And, you know, a
19 lot of these flights in the Alaska range, if
20 the operators were doing flightseeing as a
21 business, buying into it and volunteer, that's
22 the vast majority of the flights. You know,
23 the rest of the flying by small aircraft in the
24 range is fairly low. So it would have a huge
25 impact on what's going on if the commercial

1 operators all were volunteering to do whatever
2 procedures we're talking about.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: And by the way,
4 the Park Service is part of this as well. And
5 in fact, based on our discussions from years
6 past and evaluations, last year we got a brand
7 new helicopter really cheaply that can do all
8 kinds of -- and we added it to our fleet. And
9 things just went (noise). And so this year we
10 managed the helicopter out of the park. We
11 didn't get rid of it but we had it for rescues
12 on the mountain. Instead of bringing it to the
13 north side and using two helicopters and two
14 airplanes on the north side, we operated with
15 essentially one helicopter as we have in the
16 past and farmed that helicopter out to other
17 parks around the region for their use. We
18 significantly reduced the amount of aircraft
19 overflights and at a time over the park over
20 the course of a summer.

21 And I think with a new district
22 ranger operating as the wilderness coordinator,
23 et cetera, that we will be seeing -- I don't
24 think we'll be seeing -- I think we'll be
25 successful in reducing further overflight time

1 and routes for administrative use in the park.

2 So we're committed to that too.

3 TOM GEORGE: I guess I think
4 this is a good approach. In thinking back now
5 I only wish there'd been a group like this, you
6 know, then this wouldn't have to been this
7 formal or under this specific set of guidelines
8 going into the Backcountry Plan as opposed to
9 coming out. So I think at this point, yeah, to
10 take the involvement that exists now across
11 these different groups and move forward prior
12 to starting any kind of a public process would
13 probably make that public process a lot
14 smoother.

15 I know we have a military action
16 going on right now that where we're all wishing
17 that a similar thing would've happened prior to
18 just the formal kicking out the door and now
19 you're immediately into just public hearings
20 and other things which, you know, are good
21 things to do, good information comes out but
22 it's not necessarily the best way to design
23 where to go.

24 So I think this good. And it
25 also suggests though that these two positions

1 you're about to hire are going to be pretty
2 dang critical to this group. And so we need to
3 be patient a little longer I guess and look
4 forward to meeting them at the next one of our
5 meetings I hope.

6 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, I can
7 assure you that amongst the criteria for
8 qualifying for the positions that we're going
9 to be rating everybody against will be their
10 ability to work with these diverse interests in
11 a positive and constructive way.

12 SALLY GIBERT: So we can expect
13 they'll probably be attending most of our
14 meetings?

15 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah, I would
16 think so. Maybe I should put it a different
17 way. I would expect that.

18 BRIAN OKONEK: Thank you for
19 that.

20 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, very helpful.

21 SALLY GIBERT: And I think
22 timely also.

23 PAUL ANDERSON: Thank you, guys.

24 TOM GEORGE: In fact on that
25 basis, move to adjourn.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So do we want to
2 spend any time talking about this right now or
3 just kind of ponder a little bit?

4 ERIKA BENNETT: Everybody should
5 go take their little maps and start --

6 TOM GEORGE: Well, so I guess
7 though in terms of the feedback mechanism we
8 just have to be patient. So I guess going
9 forward as soon as you get those people on
10 board, yeah, certainly expressing the desire
11 for at least some element of thinking about
12 this, realizing that they're going to be facing
13 a mountain of new things to learn and
14 recognizing that whatever happens, you know? I
15 mean, that too can be an incremental thing. It
16 might be very crude in year one and more
17 refined in year two and year three. Which
18 leads me back to the south side. Yeah, I think
19 at one point we did have a discussion about
20 kind of asking for the unusual -- I can't
21 remember the exact terms we used -- but the
22 unusual event feedback which is what we wanted
23 soon in near real time so that especially the
24 year-two operators would have the opportunity
25 to go check and see whether their aircraft were

1 or weren't part of this and the time to
2 evaluate it.

3 But then there was this notion
4 of actually asking for listening. You know,
5 the attentive listening training. The best of
6 my knowledge the attentive listening thing kind
7 of went out the window because it just wasn't
8 being practical.

9 So, again, there's example,
10 yeah, we've tried one thing and we're making
11 adjustments as we go along. So I don't think
12 anybody thinks that we have the final answers
13 on these things, but just the importance of
14 some thought about feedback so that as we're
15 trying to craft these Best Practices we're --
16 especially if we're creating a problem that
17 didn't exist before. Kind of having everybody
18 on board to be attentive to that I think is
19 very important to our success or lack there of.

20 SALLY GIBERT: So Paul, do you
21 think next season, especially with the greater
22 emphasis on sound management or whatever you
23 call it, that there might be able to be a
24 little bit more of the not formal attentive
25 listening but just a little more emphasis on

1 the rangers to kind of pay more attention to
2 what they kind of observed?

3 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah, I do think
4 that. And I think maybe even more structured
5 attention --

6 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that'd be
7 even better.

8 BRIAN OKONEK: I think that's
9 very important because I feel like we've missed
10 quite a few years of that because we've asked
11 for this for quite a few years.

12 PAUL ANDERSON: It's taken
13 awhile to find the money and get everybody
14 headed in that direction.

15 BRIAN OKONEK: I'm sure. I'm
16 sure. I think you have an excellent idea in
17 what you've thought about over the years. And
18 I think everybody in this room has been
19 thinking about many of the same things.

20 But one useful tool are those
21 flight maps that show the overlays of the air
22 taxi operators and where everybody's going.
23 And you can see very quickly there the terrain
24 that has been chosen as being the most
25 spectacular for scenic flight. It's pretty

1 obvious where the concentration of flights are
2 and it's very obvious also where there's not
3 concentrated flights. And those would be good
4 areas to look at for areas where in the future
5 it could maybe stay that way because it's --
6 there won't be concentrated flights there.
7 Because there are some beautiful wilderness
8 areas that people can still enjoy today without
9 being underneath a lot of scenic flights all
10 day long when the weather's good. And I sure
11 hope that long after I'm gone there can be
12 those places in this park for people to enjoy.
13 I love seeing it from the air and I've spent a
14 lot of time in the air, but I hope there can be
15 places that won't see that kind of traffic that
16 we're getting around, you know? The main thing
17 that's attracting that traffic is Denali.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Any other
19 thoughts right now?

20 AMANDA SMITH: I have a question
21 about the uninformed -- the private pilots and
22 planes that are -- private planes I guess that
23 are flying over head. We can track Park
24 Service planes, commercial interests have, you
25 know, vested interest in working this out.

1 But, you know, the two of you I suppose
2 represent that group of people. Do we have
3 really any sense of how many people, how many
4 planes and where they're going? That Super Cub
5 that flew over. Do we've any sense of that or
6 is there a way to get a gauge of that number?
7 Or maybe moving into this summer is where we're
8 going to be hearing some of that feedback with
9 the new people in place. Just because that
10 still seems to me like one of our biggest
11 unknowns, not being able to recognize a given
12 plane in the air or who's doing what. And
13 sometimes those can be the most egregious sound
14 offenders simply because it's an unknown. So
15 do we have a sense of that or how to find that
16 number? Or is that important?

17 TOM GEORGE: I'll have a stab at
18 answering that. I don't -- break it down into
19 two components.

20 Those aircraft that are flying
21 on instrument flight plans, which are things
22 that counts of some sort are tabulated and with
23 the appropriate amount of work could be pulled
24 up. Generally those are going to be high
25 flying, those are your jets going to Prudhoe

1 Bay or jets and turbo props going Fairbanks to
2 Anchorage, et cetera. So that element of
3 traffic I think could be quantified.

4 Now the other component is are
5 the airplane craft operating under visual
6 flight rules? That's a much harder thing. And
7 I don't know of any numerical way from
8 government records to do that.

9 The sound data that Davyd
10 collects itself is one approach to that. In
11 fact we talked about the notion that if you
12 actually had an array of sound stations you
13 could triangulate not unlike what radar does.
14 And that would be one way of doing it. There's
15 work in doing that. I'm not asking anybody to
16 run out and do it, but that would be a way to
17 do it.

18 I think in -- from just our
19 experience in general we can tell you that the
20 highest concentration of that kind of VFR
21 traffic is probably, you know, right through
22 Windy Pass, right near park headquarters
23 because that's a major flyway between the two
24 largest population centers in the state. And
25 it probably drops off from there.

1 Now at a much lower level
2 obviously you have, you know, places the
3 airplanes land and take off, airports. And we
4 have those at, you know, the park headquarters
5 itself and at Kantishna. And there are flights
6 that go back and forth between those, both Park
7 Service administrative flights as well as the
8 air tour operators as well as just private
9 individuals. So you have to -- I don't know of
10 a way to quantify that.

11 I think as Brian has stated
12 though the percentage of that amount of traffic
13 relative to the air tour and the stuff, it's a
14 much smaller percentage. So I guess how much
15 effort you want to put into trying to quantify
16 it is an open question. I guess I think the
17 strategy we've kind of taken in this council is
18 focused first on the things that are the
19 highest concentrations of use, which are the
20 air tour operator. And of course the Park
21 Service has looked at their own use. And this
22 was before you were on the Council.

23 So if you haven't seen the maps
24 from the one year that they actually put GPS in
25 most of the either park aircraft or aircraft

1 flying, about half of the park. That's a
2 fascinating map to look at to understand what
3 impact the administrative use of aviation plays
4 in the role of this park. It's really neat.
5 I've got copies of those. I'll show you if you
6 can't get them any other way.

7 So I think where we need to
8 continue as we are with the Best Practices,
9 which are focused on air tour operators -- I
10 think a secondary thing, and we've talked about
11 we even have on paper but it really hasn't done
12 much yet, a work group to then try and figure
13 ways to translate those into the appropriate
14 forms and places as an education effort to the
15 general aviation community, which, again, is
16 much more diverse. It's not near as easy to
17 get ahold of as the air tour operator. So to
18 me that's some of the work yet to be done.

19 But I think, you know, the track
20 we're going now of trying to at least -- until
21 we think we've got all that we can do for the
22 moment, get Best Practices identified for the
23 high volume operators. That will drive the
24 rest of those things. And so I think that's
25 kind of how we're addressing it so far. And at

1 least that strategy seems reasonable to me
2 as -- again, if you put in perspective the
3 volumes of these uses.

4 But back to your original
5 question, other than the IFR traffic I don't
6 know of any good way to quantify the VFR
7 traffic to tell you the truth.

8 MIKE YORKE: The only way we can
9 from the FAA side is with flight service. If
10 you were to fly a flight plan to Fairbanks it
11 might typically look like this.

12 Anchorage/Talkeetna,
13 Talkeetna/Nenana/Fairbanks. So we could pull
14 VFR flight plans going that way. And the
15 reason I know we can do this is because we're
16 doing it for Lake Clark for some different
17 reasons. But they're kind of really the
18 reasons -- one of the reasons we're already
19 here. That wouldn't get you your information,
20 it would just get you that somebody went that
21 way. You would not know the track or anything,
22 Amanda.

23 TOM GEORGE: What it might get
24 you is a relative sense of people that took
25 that route versus Fairbanks, Minchumina,

1 McGrath or some other route. The reason being
2 that VFR flight plans are not a requirement and
3 for plenty of very legitimate reasons people
4 don't file them. So it'd be an indicator but
5 not an absolute measure of those activities.

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: My question,
7 as a rule of thumb, how many private -- or
8 maybe Tom, you can answer it. How many private
9 aircraft are there in Fairbanks and Anchorage?
10 How many aircraft are there?

11 MIKE YORKE: You mean flying
12 Anchorage/Fairbanks?

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: No. No. Just
14 how many aircraft -- registered aircraft are
15 there?

16 TOM GEORGE: In where now?

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Anchorage,
18 Fairbanks, the corridor. What do you think? I
19 mean you've got, like, in the state -- how many
20 are in the state? 30,000?

21 TOM GEORGE: No. No.

22 SALLY GIBERT: There's 10',000
23 licensed' pilots in' Alaska.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: But how many
25 aircraft do you think?

1 MIKE YORKE: And we fly 900,000
2 hours in the state of Alaska.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: 900,000 in the
4 state.

5 MIKE YORKE: 900,000 flight
6 hours.

7 TOM GEORGE: And actually the
8 number of active aircraft I think is around
9 4,000. This is something we can get numbers
10 for because the FAA does a survey on it,
11 statistically valid survey. And that've been
12 doing 100 percent sample in Alaska here for the
13 last few years, so we could get some numbers on
14 that. But it's somewhere in the 4,000.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: 4,000
16 aircraft?

17 TOM GEORGE: Active aircraft in
18 the state of Alaska.

19 CHARLIE SASSARA: And this is a
20 guesstimation from your guy's perspective, is
21 three-quarters of it right here in that
22 corridor, say, like 3,000 of them? Because we
23 got a --

24 TOM GEORGE: Well, I mean, you
25 know, look at the population of the state of

1 Alaska. Over half the population's right here
2 in this basin. And so proportionately probably
3 that number of aircraft are also in this basin.
4 But what that doesn't tell you is whether --
5 whether they go that way or not. You could be
6 based here and fly through Lake Clark.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, just
8 curious.

9 TOM GEORGE: But I'm guessing
10 off the top of my head 80 percent of the
11 aircraft between Fairbanks are registered in
12 Fairbanks or Anchorage. But it doesn't -- I
13 don't think that translates at all into any
14 measure of traffic back and forth on that
15 corridor.

16 MIKE YORKE: But where you're
17 registered may not have the full value.
18 Example, Temsco has 43 helicopters in Juneau;
19 correct, Tim?

20 TIM CUDNEY: No.

21 MIKE YORKE: You've got 42?

22 TIM CUDNEY: In Juneau there are
23 15.

24 MIKE YORKE: 15. Okay. Let's
25 use that as an example. And you have seven;

1 correct?

2 TIM CUDNEY: No. I'm not going
3 to tell you how many I have.

4 MIKE YORKE: Anyhow, whatever
5 number you have there, who knows whether
6 they're registered in Louisiana or not. So
7 we're getting the apples and the oranges.

8 TIM CUDNEY: Because all of our
9 aircraft are registered in Louisiana.

10 MIKE YORKE: And that's what I
11 was trying to say.

12 TIM CUDNEY: And a lot of
13 Temsco's are also registered in Texas.

14 MIKE YORKE: That's correct.

15 TIM CUDNEY: For some of their
16 VMF operations.

17 MIKE YORKE: That's correct.

18 TOM GEORGE: So aircraft
19 registration, again, is not a pure measure even
20 of how many airplanes are operating in the
21 state.

22 MIKE YORKE: But to get where
23 Charlie's going, that GA survey that Tom's
24 talking about was sent out by the FAA. And it
25 was pretty well received and responded to which

1 is a good thing on our side. We could look at
2 the airplanes at Merrill, we could look at the
3 airplanes at Lake Hood and Anchorage and come
4 to some type of consensus there. Take Hageland
5 Aviation for example. 43 aircraft. Not a one
6 of them are registered in Anchorage here. Not
7 a one of them are based in Anchorage here. So
8 that would be a hard thing -- not a hard thing
9 but there'd be a lot of variables in there,
10 Charlie.

11 TIM CUDNEY: I thought there
12 were more than 10,000 licensed pilots in
13 Alaska.

14 MIKE YORKE: That's our number.
15 That's our number.

16 TOM GEORGE: And the number of
17 pilots licenses issued for life, and it's your
18 medical that determines whether you're actually
19 using it or not. So that number of licensed
20 pilots is, again, probably an over-estimate of
21 the number of active pilots. And that is
22 creating challenges for you and the FAA. I
23 hope you solve that problem.

24 MIKE YORKE: How's that for an
25 answer, Amanda?

1 AMANDA SMITH: It's a good one.
2 Just one thing I'm thinking about is while it's
3 such a small proportion of who's up there,
4 empirically it feels like they're the most
5 egregious offenders for sound.

6 TOM GEORGE: And why does it
7 feel that way or what's the evidence for that?

8 AMANDA SMITH: I think there
9 were some comments about it from some of the
10 pilots in the room at a couple meetings ago
11 saying that it's evident when folks are flying
12 overhead. Just in discussions of when people
13 are making comments on planes, pilots are
14 talking about, you know, it's clear when
15 someone's not from there trying to read the map
16 and give their location from a safety
17 standpoint so that they're there. And I guess
18 I don't have -- aside from talking to folks and
19 listening to who's out there, that's just an
20 impression that I have. And so maybe it's --
21 you know, we could throw it out right away but
22 it's just something that I've been hearing
23 about. That Super Cub, it was an example that
24 we heard it loud and clear and we don't know
25 what plane that was.

1 TIM CUDNEY: Well, the
2 perception of what aircraft are actually on
3 tour and what aircraft are actually on charters
4 is very skewed. And like this summer we -- and
5 I can't remember if it was Joan or Nancy or
6 whoever did, somebody had called in two
7 helicopters that there was noise issue for
8 Triple Lakes. So what I did was I pulled up
9 our flight history and said, no, those weren't
10 ours because here's our flight history. Just
11 because we've got four pads at the north
12 location, at any given time there may be one
13 aircraft there that is dedicated to utility or
14 charter or flyers or whatever. It still looks
15 just like all our tour aircraft. We do all air
16 support, that aircraft may be perceived as a
17 tour aircraft by a ground user or someone on
18 the ground or backcountry user yet is doing a
19 contract job for the park. And they're going
20 to fly entirely different patterns, altitudes,
21 et cetera, et cetera. So the perception is
22 very skewed. Lance Williams, who does a lot of
23 OAF stuff and flied in Super Cub, he does a lot
24 of stuff that's very low level but yet doesn't
25 say Park Service on the side of it. The park

1 aircraft, the park helicopter says Temsco right
2 on the side. That's park aircraft and it still
3 gets called in as a --

4 TOM GEORGE: Well, I guess from
5 kind of an anecdotal basis in the past and
6 going back to comments received in response to
7 the 2006 plan itself, often it appeared that
8 the aircraft that were most noticeable or most
9 obnoxious to some people were aircraft
10 involved, like, in game surveys or other
11 activities which you've got to be at a low
12 level to carry that out. So I think there is
13 that element and issue.

14 And, again, I think that's why
15 this business of a feedback -- there are some
16 particularly egregious operations. It's to all
17 of our benefit to hear about those and have --
18 while it's fresh enough, again, to try and
19 figure out what the source of it is and feed
20 that back into wherever we go in the future
21 with this. So in the future if it turns out
22 it's a bunch of private aircraft that are
23 causing the problem, well, then we'll focus
24 more on that. So I think that is an important
25 part of going ahead with this.

1 PAUL ANDERSON: Start with the
2 larger volume and then develop a practice, and
3 then communicate the practice. Then practice
4 it, manage it and then communicate it. And so
5 the communicating the practice is one that
6 hasn't really taken a hold yet, per se. And
7 there's some discussion on that. And that
8 would be how you would reach out to the private
9 person.

10 TOM GEORGE: Well, even other
11 commercial operators, non-air tour and then
12 private. There's several little bins in there
13 that we can get to down the road that focus
14 each one on.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Anymore
16 discussion on this agenda topic? Feedback?
17 You had a -- you want to do your --

18 NANCY BALE: I don't have
19 anything else beside just a little refresher
20 about north side Best Practice. What we've
21 done so far.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Should we -- we
23 only have, like, a little less than half an
24 hour until noon. Actually Suzanne has to leave
25 at 12:30. So is it okay if we press on

1 until --

2 TOM GEORGE: I think we should
3 press on. Absolutely.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Oh, and Nancy,
5 you said you had some sort of public comment
6 you wanted to read.

7 NANCY BALE: Well, I need to get
8 into the computer.

9 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Oh.

10 (A break was taken.)

11 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Nancy has
12 the floor.

13 NANCY BALE: Okay. This really
14 does have what Paul was talking about. We just
15 wanted to start with a review -- this is
16 completely review -- before we start talking
17 about north side Best Practices. A review of
18 kind of what we have going in.

19 And you know how Paul mentioned
20 there are part of the parks that the Park
21 Service decided were areas where aviation was
22 the only way that you could get into these
23 incredibly scenic areas and also had a mandate
24 in ANILCA. And those are basically the areas
25 where climbing occurs although you'll see that

1 one little area which is red because of snow
2 machine activity. So those are the areas that
3 Park Service sort of allowed or accommodated
4 those kinds of uses.

5 The red area's where the
6 soundscape standards are especially high. And
7 you all know this, we've talked about this for
8 a long time.

9 And then just another thing that
10 the Park Service did is they created areas in
11 the old park, OP1, which is the quietest area
12 of the park. And I've sort of resinated to the
13 idea of creating an area using the FAA and Best
14 Practices and so forth. That was already still
15 quiet, already quiet and would be a good place
16 to advocate remain very quiet. That's OP1.

17 And then OP2 has very, for the
18 most part, low and medium sound standards
19 because both those areas are designated
20 wilderness. So this dovetails right from what
21 Paul had mentioned to us regarding the
22 Backcountry Plan in 2006, attempted to
23 designate management areas where at that time
24 with that degree of knowledge, park purpose
25 plus standards would kind of intersect. So

1 that's the existing plan. And everybody should
2 have a executive copy of the Backcountry Plan
3 that has this map. And if you don't I'm sure
4 that you can get some from the Park Service.

5 Now just to go back to another
6 way of showing this, this is the Amanda Peacock
7 map which came into our deliberations probably
8 the third or fourth meeting. And she had put
9 GPS on various planes and had flown routes. So
10 this is a little old. It's back in the earlier
11 2000s but it's good enough for our purposes
12 today to show typical routes that are used by
13 flightseeing units. And what you notice right
14 away is these are superimposed on sound
15 standard areas. So the areas with low sound
16 standards are in that kind of yellowish. And
17 then the areas with higher sound standards are
18 the blue and pink and yellow. And the pink and
19 yellow down below are the highest sound
20 standards. And you'll see that was done to
21 accommodate a mountain approach, and the red
22 areas that are listed in the plan.

23 But you also can see from this
24 that there's plenty of flying over the old park
25 which has the most restrictive sound standards.

1 So that's why Joan began the discussion. And
2 she and I put together some maps to show the
3 area in the old park with the lowest soundscape
4 standards that we felt needed some work. So
5 that's kind of the basis of what we're doing.

6 And just to give you an idea of
7 the maps, this is all stuff we've done before,
8 this is the sound sensitive areas map that we
9 designed. It shows areas both inside and
10 outside the park. And if you recall, the red
11 areas are areas where there's quite a bit of
12 backcountry use and there's been a lot of
13 comment with respect to the loudness of
14 aircraft. The yellow areas are areas where
15 there's still quite a bit of use but not as
16 much comment. And the green areas are areas
17 where there's a fair amount of aircraft use
18 either around the surrounding airports as in
19 Healy and here by the Denali Park airstrip.
20 Not the in-park one but the private one outside
21 the park. And also the flight tracks from
22 Talkeetna up to the mountain. So those are all
23 outside of the park areas that aren't a direct
24 concern of the Council but certainly are
25 pertinent because they provide staging for the

1 impacts in the park.

2 And finally -- well, not finally
3 but just continuing on. Next. You asked us to
4 get together with Amanda, Joan and myself
5 mainly. Talked about those areas on the north
6 side where there's a lot of hiking and where
7 there could be people underneath these flight
8 paths. So we just did a rough draft of the
9 typical used routes in those backcountry use
10 zones south of the road. You know, here's the
11 park road, here's the crest of the range and
12 here's the very commonly hiked routes on the
13 various drainages in the park. So those are
14 those.

15 And then finally the map that
16 we're going to use to talk about Best Practices
17 today is our bubble map which -- yeah, here
18 they are. Sound sensitive areas with the
19 bubble. This is the area that Joan and I put
20 together to provide a context for our
21 discussion about Best Practices on the north
22 side. So we can certainly leave that up while
23 we're talking, but if the people sitting in the
24 front of the room want to come back to their
25 seats, I can take it off. Also, Eric has some

1 ideas about Best Practices too that he's been
2 developing between meetings.

3 So that's basically the
4 background. Wanted to make you aware of what
5 we've been doing and kind of refresh
6 everybody's mind about what we've been doing
7 and the purposes of the Best Practices, north
8 side discussion.

9 But I know that Sally had given
10 me some time to bring this data from a person
11 who lives near the airstrip at Kantishna and
12 had been gathering data on aircraft on three
13 separate years; 2009, 2010, 2011. And you'll
14 see his average daily aircraft data. This is
15 at the Eagle's Nest which is located on No Name
16 Creek which is up from Moose Creek. It's about
17 maybe eight miles from Kantishna airstrip
18 facing the mountain. And of course a lot of
19 traffic could easily be going by the area
20 because of the closeness of the airstrip. Now
21 when Greg Lahey came to our meetings he said
22 that typically what he tries to do is to take
23 off to the north and go around Mt. Brooker and
24 approach the mountain on that side which
25 reduces the impact of sound from using the

1 airport on the local lodges, which represent a
2 lot of ears listening. But Rusty's data -- his
3 name is Rusty Lachelt -- show that there's
4 still even with those accommodations, and of
5 course Greg is only one of the pilots in the
6 area, there is a lot of aircraft use per day.

7 So I'll just -- I'll leave that
8 up -- I'll bring it back up but I just wanted
9 to read his comment so that it can be read into
10 the record. It's a pretty short comment. And
11 then we can look -- if you want to look at the
12 chart again you can. I think you got an idea
13 that there's between 12 and 20 aircraft per
14 day. He's there usually in August for a couple
15 of weeks. So that's his surround of time.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Could you
17 please repeat, where is he located? Where is
18 he?

19 CHARLIE SASSARA: Show us on the
20 map.

21 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, show us on
22 the map.

23 NANCY BALE: No Name Creek is
24 east of Camp Denali. It's right about where
25 the hand is.

1 TOM GEORGE: And where's the
2 Kantishna airstrip on that map? So it's a few
3 miles east of the Kantishna --

4 NANCY BALE: Eight or nine
5 miles.

6 TOM GEORGE: Okay. Got it.

7 BRIAN OKONEK: And he would be
8 northeast of Wonder Lake.

9 NANCY BALE: Yeah, Wonder Lake
10 is right here. And this is a blue -- blue zone
11 which is medium. And I think Park Service made
12 it blue because they recognize there is an
13 airstrip there. They actually had it red at
14 one point. They had it with high soundscape
15 standards in draft Backcountry Plan, just to
16 show you the Backcountry Plan again. This is
17 blue. So this airstrip is here and the Eagle's
18 Nest is right there. So, you know, it's on
19 approach and a take off, especially if you were
20 taking off and going back to the park entrance.
21 If you weren't going this way, which Greg tries
22 to do a lot also. So I'm not even saying it's
23 Greg, I'm just saying there's a lot of aircraft
24 use. And he did want the Council to be aware
25 of the amount of aircraft use.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So this is a
2 private cabin near Camp Denali?

3 NANCY BALE: Yeah, he talks
4 about himself.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Does he live
6 there?

7 NANCY BALE: He talks about
8 himself so I'll just read the comment.

9 DCC, in light of the upcoming
10 Aircraft Overflights Advisory Council meeting I
11 would like to bring attention to the increasing
12 number of aircraft overflights which are in my
13 view diminishing the Moose Creek/Wonder Lake
14 area experience. Gone, particularly the clear
15 morning stillness of the Alaska range as tour
16 flights throttle through a ten to 12 minute
17 climb out. Gone is the uninterrupted daytime
18 quietude of wind and water. Gone is the soft
19 hued silence of the evening alpine glow.

20 During the three weeks or so
21 that I spend at my cabin near Camp Denali I've
22 noticed over the years a marked increasing in
23 aircraft overflights so much so that three
24 summers ago I started an informal tally of
25 daily aircraft sound events. See the table

1 attached. Which I just showed you.

2 From 2009 to 2011 the average
3 number of aircraft sound events per day
4 increase by one per year, up to 14.4 this year.
5 An increase of one aircraft sound event per day
6 isn't a partly startling statistic in itself,
7 but from the perspective of my 37-year history
8 in the area the increasing numbers are
9 striking. In the 1970s and for many subsequent
10 years a single aircraft per day was a rarity
11 warranting a heads up to see who might be
12 arriving or departing Kantishna. Back then the
13 notion of 20-plus audible aircraft overflights
14 per day would've been inconceivable.

15 As a former commercial
16 helicopter and private fixed wing pilot I have
17 an appreciation and all things airborne. And
18 as a former seasonal worker I have an
19 appreciation of the need to amass as much in
20 the summer months as possible.

21 But at what point do we step in
22 to protect the soundscape of this area?
23 Fifteen aircraft sound events per day? 20?
24 30?

25 And then he goes to talk about

1 one of our board members: A recent piece in
2 the DCC news "Standing Still on a Moving Line"
3 was timely indeed. What is our status quo?
4 What's our breaking point? My status quo, the
5 relatively quiet soundscape of the 1970s. My
6 breaking point? This past August when over the
7 course of a single day the sound of 24 aircraft
8 overflights interrupted the quiet. Russell
9 Lachelt, inholder, Denali National Park and
10 Reserve.

11 Just wanted to get that read
12 into the record. And we don't have to discuss
13 in particular Rusty's experience but I think
14 the point that he does raise about, you know,
15 what's our standard, what's our baseline and
16 where do we draw the line, I think those are
17 very pertinent topics for the Council to
18 consider.

19 And then I think, Joan, you were
20 going to go ahead --

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yes.

22 NANCY BALE: -- and talk a
23 little bit more about the bubble. And then we
24 can get into as much discussion as we're able
25 to make while Suzanne is still here about Best

1 Practices.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. Great.

3 Can you hand me the pointer?

4 Okay. Most of you are familiar
5 with this. This was I think first introduced
6 in a work group over a year ago. We talked
7 about it at a full council meeting about a year
8 ago. And so I kind of wanted to look at this a
9 again in light of what we learned this summer.

10 And with the goal being to look
11 at, is this our best option? Are there better
12 options? What are some other ideas to best
13 mitigate noise problems on the north side of
14 the range? My goal is -- you know, we're going
15 into four years of this committee -- that by
16 this coming summer we have some recommendation
17 at least to field test on the north side. I
18 think we're ready for that.

19 And so kind of what I'm thinking
20 is we'll massage this. Throw it ideas. Toss
21 it all together. I don't care. But if we
22 could at the end of this discussion maybe have
23 some ideas, send that to the smaller working
24 groups and then they can continue to massage
25 it, fine-tune it. I'm assuming we'll have

1 another council meeting in the spring to
2 approve it. And then, even if it's just a
3 trial basis, you know, try some new things this
4 coming summer. That's kind of my goal for
5 today's discussion and where I'm heading with
6 this.

7 And just to give a little
8 context, which I think has already pretty well
9 been provided by Paul and Nancy but, you know,
10 just a reminder, we live in an increasing
11 motorized, noisy, mechanized world. And, you
12 know, this country has seen the value of
13 setting aside natural places since the mid
14 1800s. And it seems to me even all the more
15 important in today's digital world. And on top
16 of that as you are familiar, the core area
17 here, is designated wilderness which comes with
18 legal protections; no structures, no motorized
19 intrusions, and a whole host of other things.
20 And the gift Denali I think really gives to the
21 world is this is very accessible wilderness.
22 This is probably one of the premier places in
23 the country where you can go and get away from
24 it all and experience nature as it's always
25 been. And hopefully we will be able to for

1 generations to come.

2 And the Park Service has, you
3 know, for on the ground, they have really
4 managed the backcountry to keep it as a
5 wilderness experience. A backcountry user here
6 won't see a bridge, you're not going to see a
7 fire ring, they're not going to see a
8 designated camp site. They may not even see
9 another tent or another person because the
10 limits in this area are only four, six people
11 to keep it a very wilderness experience.

12 So here's the entrance. Here's the
13 park road. You know, obviously all the units around
14 the park road are the most used because they're the
15 most accessible. And so a backcountry user into one
16 of these units, you know, might not see anyone else
17 but they might hear 30 planes. To me that's a
18 problem. That's what we're trying solve here.

19 And similar to Rusty's experience,
20 this Council's heard a lot of reports of people who
21 have been woken up in their tents, you know, by the
22 sound of aircraft. They have been watching the
23 alpine glow on Mount McKinley and been interrupted
24 by aircraft. There was one where somebody was
25 listening to the sound of a wolf howling. First

1 time they'd ever heard it and then it was drowned
2 out be an aircraft. Some people have reported
3 hearing 30 -- every 30 minutes on average hearing
4 aircraft. Not everybody, but this is some of the
5 reports we're hearing and have for years in this
6 region.

7 So I don't know this for certain but
8 I think complaints are largely what prompted
9 creation of this council. Is that true, Paul? I
10 guess it's south side too. But anyway, it's time to
11 start looking at the north side and hopefully see if
12 we can come up with something that's workable.

13 So one option that's on the table --
14 again, this does not have to be the option that
15 stays. It's just something that was put together by
16 a group of us that got together some time ago. And
17 the idea, the goal was to avoid this area if
18 possible. And I'm sorry, I didn't make copies of
19 this but I can resend this by e-mail or whatever. I
20 should've brought copies.

21 So the preferred area was to fly --
22 here's the spine of the ridge. So most backcountry
23 users, they go up to the edge of these glaciers.
24 Some people go over but not as common. So the first
25 goal is to fly -- you know, to avoid this area by

1 flying on the other said of the ridge to avoid the
2 area and get to the mountain that way if you're
3 coming from the north side.

4 Second goal is to go five miles north
5 of the park road and go around this way. So, you
6 know, the ideal situation is to stay out of that
7 area. But we've also heard that people don't want
8 routes. They don't want to be constrained to an
9 area. And of course safety is -- you know, we
10 recognize safety trumps everything.

11 So the idea was we created this
12 bubble. And not that you don't fly there but if you
13 do fly there you fly higher. So FAA's
14 recommendation is you fly 2,000 feet above ground
15 level. And so our recommendation with the bubble
16 is, you know, avoid it if you can. If you can't or
17 you don't want to, fly higher. And so we had
18 recommended fly 4,000 feet over the bubble area if
19 you're going through that to kind of protect that
20 area.

21 And that's kind of what led to our
22 Stampede listening session. Because as I recall
23 Suzanne said, you know, before I tell my pilots to
24 fly twice as high, twice as high isn't necessarily
25 twice as quiet, I want to know that that's really

1 going to make a difference.

2 So the idea now is to kind of revisit
3 this. The sense I got from that listening thing is
4 directly overhead feels intrusive. Higher is
5 better. It's not a whole lot better I guess is kind
6 of what I got out of it. Offset seems to be more
7 important.

8 So that's kind of some of the
9 thoughts. Welcome to any other thoughts on ideas
10 where this works, doesn't work, totally different
11 plan. Open it for discussion.

12 Nancy, did -- Eric, Nancy said you
13 had some ideas.

14 BRIAN OKONEK: While Eric gets
15 hooked up, I -- I took a little hike, Diane and
16 I did, from Eielson south this fall. And it
17 was past high season. It was late September.
18 And it was a nice day. You could see that
19 there were clouds on the south side of the
20 range and pouring over the passes. And so what
21 scenic flights were coming by were on the north
22 side of the spine. And I must admit, I'm
23 probably more sensitive to the sound of
24 airplanes than a lot of people. But as we got
25 further from the road we got more and more

1 airplane noise. And our furthest point from
2 the road we had the most impact from airplanes.

3 TIM CUDNEY: What time of year
4 was this again?

5 BRIAN OKONEK: Late September.

6 TIM CUDNEY: Like, late late?
7 After the 21st?

8 BRIAN OKONEK: It was the last
9 weekend of the September. It was right around
10 the 20th. Right in there.

11 TIM CUDNEY: After the road
12 lottery?

13 BRIAN OKONEK: A day before the
14 road lottery. So when was the road lottery?

15 TIM CUDNEY: The day before
16 would be the 17th. 16th or 17th.

17 BRIAN OKONEK: Okay. So my
18 dates are off. It was the middle of September.
19 But the point being that you can hear the
20 airplanes. And they were high. You know, they
21 were plenty high at that point. But it was --
22 the sound is perceptible enough that if you're
23 sitting and listening to Sandhill Cranes the
24 airplane noise trumped the cranes until the
25 airplanes passed.

1 TIM CUDNEY: They have bigger
2 engines.

3 BRIAN OKONEK: It is noticeable.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Where were
5 you, Brian?

6 BRIAN OKONEK: South of Eielson.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Walking
8 towards the range?

9 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah. Yeah.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I forgot one
11 important part too of the recommendation of the
12 bubble concept. It was Brian's suggestion and
13 it fits in to when Eric flew. You know,
14 under-power climbing, is noisier than when
15 you're cruising. And so another recommendation
16 is -- because, like, Denali Air especially I
17 think likes to do a loop south of the range and
18 north of the range -- that you do your loop
19 when you're climbing on the south side. Do it
20 this direction so that when you're over the
21 sound sensitive area you're not climbing. So
22 you would be going clockwise I guess.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: This is
24 called Spidertracks. And I just put this in
25 this year. There's an aircraft identification

1 that was in -- you zoom in here on the map
2 here. I thought I lost my track point here.
3 This is returning from Eldridge, but it'll tell
4 you altitude, air speed, time, date, the whole
5 thing.

6 Okay. So it's excellent for
7 operational control. And not only do I know
8 where my airplanes are, my pilots know that I
9 know where my airplanes are. So here's the --

10 NANCY BALE: Is this based on
11 GPS?

12 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yes, it is.
13 Very, very accurate. So Refuge Valley is,
14 like, right in this area. See, they're cutting
15 it a little bit close there but stayed away
16 from it a little bit. Range of mountains over
17 in this area, they're kind of going back this
18 way. And then down Triple Lakes over here. So
19 they're not too far away from it. And then
20 back into Healy.

21 So these are all recorded. I
22 don't want you reading anything into this, FAA.
23 Well, you know, I mean, it's --

24 MIKE YORKE: It's a good thing.
25 It's a good thing.

1 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It's
2 important that we get this to work. Couple
3 things here you can see, he took off from
4 Eldridge. And it doesn't give you an exact
5 route. He took off at exactly this time and
6 came on at this time. Give me a speed up point
7 and a slow down point. This is not the exact
8 path. Every five minutes is what I have it set
9 up for. So they could have done some wandering
10 around in here. But you can look and go is
11 that about right for five minutes? Pretty
12 close. He probably just went down here and
13 made the turn, went down to the bottom and did
14 a little bit of wandering around.

15 But it gives you an idea, pretty
16 close. If you had to do it every two minutes
17 you could do it. Whatever you want to set it
18 up for. So we set it up for every five minutes
19 to give us a good idea. And this one works out
20 well. See a lot of sights. Kind of stay away
21 from the sensitive area.

22 If there is something going on I
23 ask them, hey, what's happening here? Why'd
24 you go there? Weather. It seems to be the
25 single biggest thing.

1 This is a great view through
2 here. A lot of times they'll kind of go down
3 the trench, cut over in this area here. Y the
4 west fork. Try to stay away from this area
5 here but you can cut into the mountains here
6 and make a pretty nice tour. Take a look at
7 the Wickersham Wall and drop over into the Amp
8 or to the Eldridge.

9 I'm not implying anything with
10 this. I'm just saying from my point of view
11 keeping track of what's going on and by keeping
12 a -- I hate to show you this. There's every
13 flight. So I just wanted to show you that. I
14 just wanted to show you that there are methods
15 out there for someone like me to watch and see
16 what's going on.

17 And if you were to say to me,
18 hey, was that one of your airplanes on this
19 date flying over there, I can look it up and I
20 can see what's going on. Like I said, I don't
21 want to get into the sometimes you look here
22 and go, how come you guys were at 11,999, which
23 is a code word of how high you are, and I say
24 because of weather.

25 Okay. So I don't use this for

1 anything more than just observation to see
2 what's going on. It works well.

3 That's my daughter, she's the
4 one that signed up for it.

5 We also get things like a
6 message that comes in on the phone that says
7 slow down point and then a speed up point, less
8 than 25 knots, more than 25 knots. So if
9 you're not watching the screen you hear it come
10 in on the phone, beep, beep, look at that, you
11 open up the screen, take a look at it. But
12 we'll have one of these set up in the flight
13 offices that'll be watching these things at all
14 times.

15 NANCY BALE: Is the initial
16 investment fairly spendy?

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: It depends on
18 what you mean by that. It's over a grand,
19 yeah, per plane to fly.

20 TIM CUDNEY: But also with the
21 five minutes you aren't exorbitant on the ping
22 drops.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Right.

24 TIM CUDNEY: If you drop it down
25 it really increases; correct?

1 TOM GEORGE: But there is a
2 monthly user fee.

3 ERIC DENKEWALTER: There's a per
4 fee and a monthly. But, you know, in the great
5 scheme of things it's not that bad. My planes
6 fly together as a group so I see one I see them
7 all type of deal. Navajos don't. But I was
8 really more concerned about the --

9 NANCY BALE: Are you actually
10 getting real time feedback?

11 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Oh, yeah.
12 I'm watching them go on the map. Just clicks
13 along. So you're seeing it -- you don't wait
14 until the end of the day. You're watching it
15 right then and there.

16 And one of the reasons we did
17 this was because the airplanes were supposed to
18 call in when they're getting ready to land.
19 And they'd call the Talkeetna office and say
20 we'll be landing in five at the Eldridge. And
21 we couldn't always hear that because of the
22 weather. You know, they were staying lower and
23 it was blocked. And so we said this isn't
24 working. You know, you send them as a group
25 for safety reasons and whatnot. Also, it

1 compresses three events into one event which
2 works out well. So you're going to be annoyed,
3 might as well be annoyed for a little bit.

4 I should have gone back to that.
5 Here's one. This is me coming back from -- I'm
6 coming back from Healy on this flight here.
7 Takes a minute for the train to show up. So
8 I'm just coming down the gorge and stuff.

9 So if we were low we wouldn't be
10 able to call in. So this way I can see when
11 they're landing and whatnot. It isn't just
12 waiting for a message. Wondering if they'll
13 take off the same way.

14 BRIAN OKONEK: The one thing
15 about your flight path there is you would
16 disturb the fewest number of people.

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: And then my
18 brother said that he -- they're pack rafting
19 from Cantwell and coming up through Windy Creek
20 and dropping in to the upper sanctuary there.
21 I didn't know there are people over there.
22 Yeah, so there's going to be a little --
23 somebody's going to get bothered.

24 BRIAN OKONEK: And occasionally
25 people walk the fault line, trench you call it.

1 And, you know, we've hiked the Dunkle Mine area
2 and all sorts of different places out there.
3 There's definitely places where people are
4 hiking. But the numbers are fewer than on the
5 north side. You know, the north side is where
6 there's very easy access to get into the
7 backcountry.

8 ERIC DENKEWALTER: The one area
9 we didn't know about earlier was this Glacier
10 Creek area. We didn't realize there were
11 people going in there. But I haven't hiked
12 that. I mean, there's -- I spent just a little
13 bit of time around here. We got one of those
14 lottery tickets this year. It's great. We
15 went all the way to where it says end of the
16 road. I said, all right, now I got to get your
17 picture at the end of the road.

18 And I'll have to admit that we
19 were camped out at, wherever it is back here,
20 right at that Savage thing, and, yeah, there
21 was airplanes flying by and you can definitely
22 hear them. They're coming in to land. And I
23 know of them said, well, they were told not to.
24 We stayed away from the Savage Gap area because
25 I know there's a lot of day hikers in this

1 area. You show it as a yellow area there but
2 there's an awful lot of people that get off
3 here and hike this Primrose Ridge area here.

4 BRIAN OKONEK: And there's a
5 trail down the canyon now. You can use it all
6 the time.

7 ERIC DENKEWALTER: So that'd be
8 kind of nice to avoid that area.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: So you have an
10 idea what the practice would be or proposed
11 practice for that?

12 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah, I think
13 that -- I mean, I've tried this for a couple
14 years. We used to go through Savage Gap and
15 head right to the mountain from there. And
16 then we started looking at, you know, saying we
17 can go down the Parks Highway. You know, you
18 get past the park headquarters area, by that
19 time you are 6-, 7-, 8,000 feet climbing out
20 and stay south and east of Fang Mountain which
21 keeps you out of Refuge Valley. I don't really
22 know how many people there are in those other
23 areas.

24 PAUL ANDERSON: There's not very
25 many.

1 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I don't think
2 so. That's not -- you know, sometimes we'll go
3 by the erratics there and once in a while
4 you'll see a tent up there. And there's
5 probably people that hike up to the erratics.
6 I'm sure they do. So that's not perfect. But
7 I'm trying to stay away from Triple Lakes at
8 the same time so I got to balance it in there
9 somewhere. And then stay south and east of
10 Fang Mountain and then stay just over the
11 bottom of the Cantwell Glacier and then we'll
12 go. So that works.

13 Now the big thing of course is
14 weather, you know? A lot of times you got
15 clouds packed up against the south side. Okay.
16 Exactly what are we going to do here? I don't
17 have an answer for that. That is a big
18 consideration. Have I flown over the road.
19 Yep, I've flown over the road? And that's the
20 only route we've got. And you don't want to
21 get caught on top so you drop down underneath,
22 work your way along, throttle back just do the
23 best you can. Get home and go, okay, now what
24 type deal? So I'm sure people are going to
25 say, oh, I saw your airplanes flying there.

1 Yep.

2 But that's not really where we
3 want to show people anyway. Want to show them
4 glaciers and stuff, that's what they want to
5 see. And so going over to the trench area
6 there's glaciers on both sides which I think is
7 great. Looking at these over here and those
8 over there. Talking about the sun angle having
9 a big difference on them. Look at this, look
10 at this. People have a good time the whole
11 time. It's a good trip. And I'm just speaking
12 for myself. We're satisfied. If the weather
13 stayed good that's where we'd go all the time.
14 And go the Ruth, the Eldridge and over to base
15 camp if we have to from there.

16 PAUL ANDERSON: When you say
17 flying over the road what would that look like?
18 I mean, does that mean right over the road or
19 does it mean within a mile either side?

20 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, you
21 know, we actually stay -- because the way the
22 clouds are you could stay south of the road,
23 but then you're right in that area where there
24 are people. So it's kind of like, okay, how
25 exactly are we going to do this here? Who are

1 we going to annoy the least? So a lot of it is
2 if you can stay high we do. If you're up at
3 8,000 or so and throttle back, I mean, you saw
4 what it was like just at 2,000 feet. I think
5 probably minimum annoyance there.

6 The weather seems to be the
7 absolute deciding factor on routes and what you
8 can do. We've gone all the way around the
9 Wyoming Hills on the north side there and going
10 over there. That's boring but that's the way
11 it goes sometimes. You just tell people --
12 start talking about something. Make up some
13 stories about who knows what, caribou hears
14 that you've never seen or whatever.

15 TOM GEORGE: Suspicions
16 confirmed.

17 In terms of flying down the
18 road, I mean, at that point weather's forcing
19 you down. So you're looking at the low route
20 through the terrain is what's driving you. So
21 that might be the road or it might even be a
22 little to the south of the road.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah, this is
24 south of the road. Yeah. So it does happen.
25 And I've personally been involved doing it.

1 It's not that often. I mean, I'll tell you,
2 it's so rare that we forget what the check
3 points are over there which annoys the hell out
4 of our other fliers over there.

5 BRIAN OKONEK: For the
6 backcountry user, you know, if you couldn't go
7 south of the range it would almost be better
8 going over the road because then at least when
9 you leave the road you leave the planes and the
10 buses behind and enter the range.

11 PAUL ANDERSON: Apparently the
12 Park Service has been encouraging people not
13 the fly over the road.

14 BRIAN OKONEK: Right. Right.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: But there's
16 also an increase of day hiking from the road.
17 So it's kind of like, where are those people?
18 Those people are within a two-mile corridor all
19 along the road.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And there's
21 camp grounds on the road and people picnicking.
22 So six of one, half a dozen of the other.

23 CHARLIE SASSARA: How would
24 you -- Joan or Eric, would you be able to
25 articulate -- how would you articulate a Best

1 Practice? What would we say? What would you
2 say?

3 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I can only
4 speak for myself. I don't want to get into
5 that about talking for anybody else and which
6 way they should fly or anything else.

7 I mean, I showed you the route
8 that he came back on, the Eldridge. And I
9 showed you also sometimes you like to go down a
10 little bit closer to the trench just -- if you
11 go down the trench, like you say, it's great
12 views on both sides. Perfect. Do a couple
13 S-turns for photos. Then head just barely
14 north of Mather there which puts you out of the
15 soundscape for Glacier Creek. And then up in
16 Brooks Glacier and over there and can see the
17 Wickersham Wall, whatever, make a left-hand
18 turn, drop into the Ruth or the Eldridge and
19 land. So it works very well for me for what
20 I'm doing for the length of flight and
21 everything else.

22 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, Joan's
23 idea was some sort of -- it's a bubble; right?

24 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: And you're

1 taking a route outside the bubble.

2 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: So it wouldn't
4 -- some version of the bubble, if you will, is
5 a possible articulation of a Best Practice.
6 And then you have an adaptation or route that
7 you're just doing that's your business.

8 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah. I
9 don't see the bubble as a -- it's not an issue
10 unless we get into weather. And then we're
11 kind of --

12 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, that's
13 life.

14 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah. But
15 the weather can be -- it can be extensive. I
16 mean, you can have a weather pattern where you
17 got three or four days where the clouds are all
18 packed up on the south side and, okay, now
19 what?

20 TOM GEORGE: You know, to really
21 get down to try wording and whatnot, we have to
22 try and get the other stakeholders involved in
23 this because it's voluntary measures. If
24 they're not involved with us in writing it
25 there's not going to be any buying into it.

1 But I think the difference here is that other
2 things we've dealt with so far have been fairly
3 localized areas where it's, like, how to get by
4 or around or through this area. This is a
5 different case entirely. A very important case
6 obviously based on where all those visitors and
7 everything are, and even down to the legal
8 aspects of wilderness. I won't be surprised if
9 this ends up being a composite of things
10 including, again, this information. Instead of
11 trying to prescribe some exact thing it much
12 more is -- you know, the bubble itself, with
13 whatever boundaries, the information, the
14 routes underneath, in other words, conveying to
15 the operators and eventually to GA and other
16 pilots where the general areas of sensitivity
17 are and to try and avoid it.

18 So I think this may end up being
19 a very different kind of recommendation than
20 the sight specific kind of thing we've done in
21 the past which makes this a challenge. But,
22 hey, we're up for challenges. We're creating
23 new things all the time.

24 So actually the information we
25 presented here today I think we need to try and

1 get actually all of that on a single piece of
2 paper or, I mean, it might be multiple maps
3 pulled together, because I think in this case,
4 you know, recognizing, again, you got these
5 weather factors which are going to play a role
6 in this. But the notion is going to be to show
7 what are the areas that are most sensitive and
8 trying to describe in some combination of
9 things. And my guess this is not going to be
10 one that's just in words alone. Some of these
11 graphics will be part of the recommendation or
12 the Best Practice -- the definition of it.

13 SALLY GIBERT: I think you're
14 right. Flipping it around and starting with
15 identifying on a map the sensitive areas and
16 then having a variety maybe with some potential
17 priorities but not necessarily -- you know, a
18 variety of ways to respond to that which are
19 going to be weather dependent and where you
20 start from.

21 TOM GEORGE: Well, that's where
22 Eric's interpretation of it and use of it based
23 on his operation may be very different than
24 Greg Lahey because they're starting at
25 different places, they're going different

1 places. And that may not be written down
2 actually. I mean, what the actual individual
3 operators do is at one level kind of their
4 business. Our challenge is to at least come up
5 with a way to communicate whatever we can
6 about, you know, whatever's important and what
7 we can say about how to operate, including
8 avoid where possible.

9 And of course, safety comes
10 number one. Weather; you go where you have to
11 go due to weather. But as far as when you can,
12 basically on this, to avoid that bubble you
13 either fly south of the divide of the range or
14 the Stampede Corridor to avoid the bubble when
15 you can. I think with a map and in not very
16 many words that can be conveyed pretty easily
17 for voluntary Best Practices.

18 NANCY BALE: I think Joan had
19 something five miles north of the park road is
20 another variable there instead of just flying
21 through Stampede. Because I have some
22 constituents in Stampede that don't want
23 to have that happen.

24 TOM GEORGE: And there you have
25 it. There's a challenge.

1 NANCY BALE: They're not in the
2 park though.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's just that
4 first four miles that pilots should definitely
5 be aware of the subdivision out there. I'm
6 sure they already are.

7 TOM GEORGE: And that kind of
8 thing actually maybe can be specifically
9 depicted on certain maps. And this almost
10 get's back to the -- use the example you hear
11 about in Talkeetna where in and out -- and this
12 is common practice in and out of airports
13 around the nation. You sometimes adjust to
14 traffic patterns and arrival/departure routes
15 to try to minimize impact.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: And it doesn't
17 all have to be writing. Talkeetna operators
18 know people who live up the Susitna River who
19 don't enjoy having 80 aircraft fly over their
20 head a day. And the Talkeetna operators avoid
21 them like the plague because they're hounded by
22 them when they do fly over.

23 TOM GEORGE: But it does help if
24 some of these things are in writing because,
25 again, you still have -- even though it might

1 be ten percent, a small percent, of people that
2 don't know all those local conventions. And so
3 that's where actually they try and have some
4 material and push out and educate more people
5 through time even though that too is an
6 imperfect process.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Who else
8 besides Lahay is the next group that's most
9 effect? Is there another operator?

10 TOM GEORGE: Tim and Denali.

11 CHARLIE SASSARA: What do you
12 think?

13 TIM CUDNEY: Well, like I had
14 the conversation with Joan the other day, we've
15 done -- even for next year where we're reducing
16 flights again but not because of the noise of
17 overflights. We're reducing to take them to
18 different areas wherever the customer draws.

19 BRIAN OKONEK: Is that because
20 -- to land on the glacier? Is that the main
21 draw?

22 TIM CUDNEY: Uh-huh. But, you
23 know, we've also been on three years of the
24 downturn in the economy. And this year it
25 rebounded enough that gave us a little bit of

1 hope for the future. A little bit of light at
2 the end of the tunnel.

3 But I need to also protect the
4 integrity of the business and say in 2012, '13
5 or '14 comes around where the draw is to go
6 back into the National Park, we're flying back
7 into the National Park. You know, we've
8 reduced our flights not entirely of this
9 process. I mean, we've mitigated our flights.
10 We've done Best Practices and such. But I'm
11 kind of at a point now, like, what else can we
12 do? Really, what else can we do?

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, and this
14 specific case, what do you think about this
15 one, you know, as it relates to your --

16 TIM CUDNEY: The five miles? A
17 big impact. A big impact. And I know Eric has
18 an entirely different departure out of Healy.
19 You know, requires a lot more than I do. A lot
20 more departures. I can't speak for him, but
21 you know how vocal he is because he's
22 basically -- you know, he may just tell people
23 to pound sand and walk away. That's just him.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah. Yeah.

25 TIM CUDNEY: But it -- I mean,

1 it does have an impact. I wish I had a crystal
2 ball to see what next year looked like. We had
3 a great summer with the exception of August
4 where the weather just really knocked us to
5 death. That skewed all the numbers. But
6 people are coming back. They're not going
7 away. They're coming back. They want more.
8 They still want to do air tours.

9 And the number one visitor
10 survey on exit polls is air tours. Glacier
11 landings and air tours. I'm sorry, it's not
12 the backcountry users. It's not the guys --
13 it's not the people that are going out in the
14 backpacks. And I'm not saying that there
15 shouldn't be a lot of consideration for every
16 single user group. But Lois can tell us and
17 Lois knows what the numbers are, skewed as far
18 as the visitor surveys, what they're doing when
19 they go through the national park.

20 There's a lot of people that
21 still want to take air tours. And I think it's
22 going to increase in the next couple of years
23 as long as our economy is relatively stable. I
24 don't want to share too much information here
25 but last year we saw more people advance

1 booking than we had in the last three or four
2 years. Saying, hey, look, I'm going to spend
3 3- or \$400 on a tour and they're locking it up
4 in advance.

5 You talk to the other operators
6 that have cabin night and rafting and the
7 dinner theater and smaller venue, their numbers
8 were down. Their numbers are down. And these
9 are the 79, 89, \$102 tours. Their numbers are
10 down. Food and beverage sales were down. But
11 spending the high-end tours, they're going to
12 go all the way to Alaska, they're going to
13 figure this is the deal. We had the same
14 meetings in Juneau this year. Things are
15 changing.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: That's why we're
17 here.

18 TIM CUDNEY: Exactly. Exactly.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tim, when you
20 talk about it being a big impact, you're kind
21 of referencing -- so going further is -- will
22 effect the bottom line or may make your --
23 let's say your compensation for that by
24 increasing your price point.

25 TIM CUDNEY: Correct. Correct.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. But
2 now you're competing against somebody because
3 it's a voluntary measure who can maybe offer
4 the trip at a lower rate --

5 TIM CUDNEY: Sure.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: -- because
7 they're just going to go through the park.
8 They're not going to go around the bubble.

9 TIM CUDNEY: Right. Right.
10 Right.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Except there's
12 nobody else doing what Tim is doing.

13 TIM CUDNEY: There certainly
14 could be. But, you know, we all want to
15 protect the integrity of our product, whether
16 it's Suzanne or Eric, whatever the cost of
17 their flight per hour is X. And to get at X
18 you have to have Y number of people on that
19 aircraft or else that aircraft isn't going to
20 go. If Eric were to shave off or Tim was to
21 shave off six or eight minutes of point one or
22 whatever on a tour, you compromise the
23 integrity of that tour. But yet you still have
24 to charge X.

25 And I've fought price increases

1 and fuel surcharges and stuff for years. And
2 every year I shake my head going into the next
3 year going, oh, my gosh, here we go. And the
4 minute we raise our prices our customers, they
5 really scream because what they have to do is
6 they have to add onto their price. Of course
7 it adds whatever. But any time that there's a
8 change in aviation unfortunately it's the most
9 regulated. It's also the most expensive
10 product to operate.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: But you also
12 said because it is such a desirable product
13 that even at its high cost and the current
14 economy, that's what people want. So, you
15 know, seems like people are willing to pay for
16 it because it's such a quality product.

17 TIM CUDNEY: But I think we've
18 hit a demographic of passengers now that is in
19 this little golden zone between 55 and 67 or 55
20 and 66 or so that they're not necessarily
21 inflation proof but they're the people that
22 survived the stock market highs and lows. And
23 they've said, you know, we're going to go and
24 do this, boom. But once that demographic's
25 gone then you're hitting the baby boomers that

1 are hanging on to their money. So we're kind
2 of in a flux right now. And, granted, next
3 year two more ships will be in and the numbers
4 will change again.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So, Tim, if
6 this concept doesn't work for you, do you have
7 other ideas on ways to improve the soundscape
8 in those areas that would be easier for you to
9 do?

10 TIM CUDNEY: I wish I had the
11 golden answer.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So does this
13 work at all? Does it make it more difficult?

14 TIM CUDNEY: Makes it more
15 difficult.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: But not
17 impossible?

18 TIM CUDNEY: Not impossible.
19 Not impossible.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

21 TIM CUDNEY: We all have -- it's
22 like I said the other day, since '97 we have
23 reduced our park tours by 80 percent. And in
24 2012 I'll reduce them by another five percent
25 because I'm taking that particular aircraft or

1 that particular departure and moving them to
2 the state lands where the visitors want --
3 where the customers want. That's what they
4 want to do with us. But that doesn't mean that
5 I don't want to lose that right in 2013 or 2014
6 to put another aircraft there and bring them
7 back.

8 NANCY BALE: You say 80 percent
9 of your tours?

10 TIM CUDNEY: 80 percent of my
11 park tours.

12 NANCY BALE: Are -- have been --

13 BRIAN OKONEK: Reduced it by
14 80 percent?

15 TIM CUDNEY: Correct. Correct.
16 I mean, when I first started over there in '97
17 that's all we did was fly into the park.
18 That's all we did.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yes. No,
20 that's great. It's a huge improvement.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: The changes
22 were because you have expensive aircraft to
23 fly. It's an expensive aircraft and you don't
24 have the range that the other ones have. So is
25 it because you're being able to get the same

1 experience in the --

2 TIM CUDNEY: Because we do a
3 glacier landing versus the flight only. And I
4 can't -- I do not --

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: But that's the
6 unique part.

7 TIM CUDNEY: Right, but also, if
8 you look at some of our information and look at
9 some of our media stuff it doesn't say Mt.
10 McKinley. It says Denali National Park. And a
11 lot of time because of the altitude that we fly
12 and the route that we fly we're not going to
13 show the summit. We're not going to show Mt.
14 McKinley. We might show it 40 percent of the
15 time because that's basically our average last
16 year. 40 percent viewability (sic) last year,
17 average.

18 But we're showing other aspects
19 of the national park. That's one tour. And
20 then the other side is we have a glacier
21 landing. That's outside of the national park.
22 And that's been a challenge also because
23 everybody thinks that they're going to land in
24 the national park. So we have to educate
25 everybody and we have to be very careful of

1 truth in advertising in our brochure. But that
2 right now is our marquee product. So we have
3 been able to mitigate our flights by customer
4 draws in other areas thankfully.

5 But, you know, again, there's no
6 secret, we could shut that base down tomorrow
7 and put those aircraft to work in the Gulf of
8 Mexico at probably twice the rate. But then we
9 may sacrifice the Juneau operation, which is
10 the same company, because a lot of people that
11 -- if they don't fly in Juneau they're going to
12 fly with us in Denali and vice versa. So then
13 you don't want to obviously devalue-ise the
14 product or the company.

15 But we're also very fortunate
16 that we're a very large company and we have
17 close to 110 percent utilization on the
18 aircraft, because when we're not flying tours
19 we're doing something else. A lot of our
20 aircraft go on Army contract September 20th and
21 fly other jobs for the Army. And we get them
22 back April 1st. I mean, it's a good deal. So
23 we're fortunate that way.

24 But true, we are at a point and
25 it's not -- it's very common knowledge that

1 we're at a price point right now where I'm very
2 costly at raising any rates. So what do I do?
3 Pay my pilots less? Get lesser experienced
4 pilots? That's not going to work. Fly
5 shorter? I mean, how do you --

6 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's why you
7 go on the state side because it's shorter;
8 right?

9 TIM CUDNEY: Well, it's shorter
10 but it's also where to land.

11 BRIAN OKONEK: It's got a
12 glacier.

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's got the
14 features that you're looking for and you can
15 get it.

16 TIM CUDNEY: There are users out
17 there. We know the hunter groups that go out
18 there. We know some of the private land owners
19 out there. We work with those folks and we try
20 to talk with them. We know September 1st
21 they're going to be doing X. We know
22 August 10th they're going to be sheep hunting
23 and Y. So it takes a lot of management
24 unfortunately. It's paid off for us.

25 BRIAN OKONEK: Before we take a

1 break and while Suzanne's here, can I -- how
2 did that Best Practices for the Ruth area go?
3 Were people trying to do it?

4 SUZANNE RUST: Absolutely.

5 BRIAN OKONEK: Okay.

6 SUZANNE RUST: We had a meeting
7 before the season, all discussed it. My
8 perception was things went well because I
9 didn't get feedback this year. And I talked
10 with our climbing guides and they felt things
11 were going well. So that was my perception for
12 my place in the world.

13 BRIAN OKONEK: And safety-wise
14 it felt good for the pilots and stuff.

15 SUZANNE RUST: Yeah. This year
16 I think it went well. I mean, weather's always
17 a consideration. But I think that it was
18 really workable.

19 NANCY BALE: Have you formally
20 done a Best Practice with that?

21 BRIAN OKONEK: As far as I know
22 we certainly did.

23 TOM GEORGE: We did, yes.

24 NANCY BALE: We actually wrote
25 it into a document?

1 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, we did.

2 NANCY BALE: Was that last
3 meeting?

4 SUZANNE RUST: And I didn't hear
5 feedback from other companies saying that they
6 were having --

7 BRIAN OKONEK: And when did you
8 say you got together with the other companies
9 and talked about it?

10 SUZANNE RUST: Yeah, we talked
11 about it. We had a meeting at the beginning of
12 the year. Just kind of talked about -- we get
13 together occasionally. Just talked and
14 reviewed what we're going to be doing, as I
15 recall. I mean, we've had meetings throughout
16 the year. But we revisit these things. But
17 we'll revisit them again.

18 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah, I think
19 it'd make a big difference for those on the
20 ground.

21 SUZANNE RUST: And then, you
22 know, it was funny because I went and talked
23 with Ed Craver, he has a farm off the end of
24 the runway. Just went and visited with him.
25 And I'm standing out there and there comes one

1 of my planes. There comes one of somebody
2 else's planes. Okay. We need a refresher.
3 That's one of the things that happens. And
4 then there were several planes that were really
5 offset. And then there were planes that had
6 moved down and it's -- you know, I think some
7 of it is making certain that we refresh and are
8 continuing to have that talk with our pilots
9 about things.

10 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah, that's key.

11 SUZANNE RUST: It is for sure.
12 So, again, I went out as soon as I was at Ed's
13 and revisited that with all of our staff and
14 made certain -- at least had a reminder. So we
15 can do simple things to make a difference.

16 TOM GEORGE: So I guess I think
17 our next step is to try and get an aviation
18 working group meeting and specifically focus on
19 the north side. I mean, we can -- as we've
20 always done in the past we should review any of
21 the other procedures again for feedback. You
22 know, inquiring about to see if anybody's
23 having any difficulty with them. And we're
24 thinking, what, in early February or --

25 SUZANNE RUST: Mike, I have my

1 notes from you, you're available. And I can't
2 remember if it was a date that was better for
3 you.

4 MIKE YORKE: IOS 5 updated. I
5 lost everything, I'm sorry.

6 SUZANNE RUST: I have it on my
7 e-mail.

8 MIKE YORKE: And I do too.

9 SUZANNE RUST: I think there
10 were a couple days in January and early
11 February. I think.

12 MIKE YORKE: And I'll look here
13 too.

14 TOM GEORGE: So I think that's
15 what we need to do is make sure we get nailed
16 down from a bunch of dates to one and get it on
17 everybody's calendar. And, again, work real
18 hard to get all the principles from the air
19 tour operators that are there. That's
20 essential to go forward. But I think actually
21 compiling those various charts and things if we
22 can into a single piece of paper as a -- and
23 I'll talk with you afterwards.

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah, I mean,
25 I'm not sure all of what you want. Yeah,

1 that'd be great to -- sure.

2 NANCY BALE: And would there be
3 any problem with -- let's just say time-wise it
4 worked better for operators to attend a full
5 meeting of the council and it to be discussed
6 there. Is there a problem of doing it that
7 way? Because we're all busy and people do take
8 winter months to have vacations. So I think
9 there's been a little trouble with the working
10 group having everyone who really had a
11 pertinent interest able to attend.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Plan it far
13 enough, I mean, Tom and Suzanne are looking so
14 far out that --

15 SUZANNE RUST: And Greg's still
16 going to be gone.

17 TOM GEORGE: But we got him last
18 time to telephone in and that seemed to work.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Oh, he's going
20 to telephone in?

21 NANCY BALE: Not right now, he
22 can't.

23 SUZANNE RUST: No, for the
24 working group he can. He said he would. And
25 R.G. said he would be back.

1 TOM GEORGE: There's some
2 behind-the-scenes work that needs to happen.

3 SALLY GIBERT: I think there's
4 value in doing it separate from a full meeting.

5 NANCY BALE: Well, I don't
6 disagree with that but I don't think that
7 there's any need to delay a decision if it
8 meant we could make one if they were to attend
9 a full meeting.

10 TOM GEORGE: So what are you
11 proposing? I guess I'm confused.

12 BRIAN OKONEK: Well, if they
13 can't come to a working group meeting --

14 NANCY BALE: Then we shouldn't
15 have a another meeting of the full council with
16 no vetting having occurred. So I guess my plan
17 would be if the work group can't get all the
18 principles together in the interim time then
19 that activity should be pushed to the next full
20 meeting. There's no reason not to do it at a
21 full meeting in my opinion. I guess I don't
22 want the general Council to feel or be
23 hamstrung by that problem because the operators
24 do have trouble meeting in interims. They have
25 trouble meeting in the summer, they're busy.

1 Are they going to have trouble meeting in the
2 winter because they're gone?

3 SALLY GIBERT: I think the
4 Council, we have to set a date for the next
5 meeting. So if we set that at a time where it
6 seems that there's a sufficiently generous time
7 between now and then for the working group to
8 get together it's going to be their
9 responsibility to deal with that.

10 TOM GEORGE: And if there's a
11 problem with that then we go some other way or
12 whatever.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Knowing that this
14 is something we want to talk about at the next
15 meeting I'm hoping that vetting occurs one way
16 or another.

17 SUZANNE RUST: Maybe we can even
18 get creative even if we have to go and meet
19 one-on-one. There are different options.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Well, I guess,
21 can everybody agree to the goal that ideally
22 we'll have a working group meeting? I expect
23 that we will. I assume we're going to have a
24 council meeting in the spring with the goal
25 that we will pass something forward at that

1 time to field-test this summer.

2 TOM GEORGE: Absolutely.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: As long as
4 we're all good with that I'm good with that.
5 And we'll hopefully make the work group --
6 ideally, you know, we really need to get down
7 with the nitty-gritty with it with all the
8 operators.

9 SUZANNE RUST: We need the
10 participants. That is really so important to
11 have everyone at the table. And that is a bit
12 of a challenge.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And I think
14 what Nancy's saying, you know, Greg's out of
15 town or somebody can't come, you know, we're
16 not going to not do something.

17 BRIAN OKONEK: Are we going to
18 hold off another year?

19 NANCY BALE: And we can even
20 develop a more formal recommendation right now
21 for vetting.

22 SUZANNE RUST: I think the hard
23 thing is, yes, we can. I think obviously we
24 could move forward with the recommendation. I
25 think the hard thing is it's the voluntary

1 measures. There's a reality that if somebody
2 doesn't volunteer. And that's what it is.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's worth
4 going through the --

5 TOM GEORGE: Yes, absolutely.

6 SALLY GIBERT: I mean, you've
7 already got a straw-dog proposal.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And it's been
9 out there for a year, year-and-a-half. So
10 we're not springing this on anybody.

11 TOM GEORGE: Right, absolutely.

12 SALLY GIBERT: So it's not new
13 and it doesn't -- I don't think it needs to be
14 adopted as a draft or anything. I think it
15 could just be there to be worked on. And then,
16 you know, it sounds like the intention of the
17 group is to try and refine that to the best
18 possible next spring for field testing. And
19 then whatever vetting and fine-tuning can
20 happen between now and then is just going to be
21 better.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Sounds good.

23 NANCY BALE: So the straw-dog
24 proposal, what I understand is, stay outside
25 the bubble and there's a couple of subsets; fly

1 south of the range, fly five miles north of the
2 park road, fly higher and disperse routes.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah, we
4 didn't write that in formal. I mean, we have
5 this all written up.

6 NANCY BALE: Yeah, are all those
7 things on it?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah. We
9 don't have the disbursed which would be a good
10 one to add.

11 SUZANNE RUST: Can I --

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I can
13 re-forward it.

14 SUZANNE RUST: If you'll
15 re-forward it because then I could send it out
16 before the meeting.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And I
18 should -- I wasn't thinking far enough ahead.
19 I should've sent it out before this meeting and
20 I neglected to do that. So I'll send it to
21 everybody after this meeting.

22 NANCY BALE: And then you'll
23 need a copy of the map, the bubble map for the
24 interim meeting and anything else that --

25 SALLY GIBERT: Any other maps

1 can get posted on the Web site.

2 Okay. That sounds like a plan.

3 So this is going to be obviously one of the
4 topics that we'll take up at the spring
5 meeting. So we're referring to a spring
6 meeting so I'm hearing that we're only going to
7 have one more meeting before next summer.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I didn't mean
9 to imply that.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Because
11 I'm a little bit concerned about that.

12 We'll break for lunch. Back at
13 2:00.

14 (A break was taken.)

15 SALLY GIBERT: Need to summarize
16 this morning's discussion in terms of what
17 happens for the next steps on the north side.
18 And I think my understanding is where it was
19 left is we have the -- what I call the
20 straw-dog proposal. And that's been there
21 awhile. People need to be thinking about it's
22 still there. The intent will be for the
23 Council to come up with a refinement of
24 whatever recommendations there will be for Best
25 Practices, whatever that is. And then in the

1 meantime the aviation working group or some
2 combination of those interests will be working
3 either as a working group or, you know, small
4 group, one-on-one or whatever. So that vetting
5 process will hopefully have happened to the
6 maximum extent possible by that spring meeting
7 when we figure out what we want to recommend
8 for north side Best Practices.

9 Does that summarize it?

10 TOM GEORGE: Sounds good.

11 Sounds good.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Great.

13 Okay. So let's see. I think
14 we've already covered south side feedback.

15 So I think we're at the fact
16 sheet. First of all is there anybody that
17 has --

18 TOM GEORGE: Do you have more
19 copies of the fact sheet?

20 SALLY GIBERT: I made exactly 12
21 because I was running out of paper.

22 Is there anybody that needs to
23 leave before 5:00?

24 TIM CUDNEY: 4:30 at a minimum.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So at

1 4:00, 4:30 at minimum we need to make sure that
2 we know when our next meeting is. Okay.

3 That's what I wanted to know.

4 Scott, how long do you think --

5 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Less than
6 ten minutes.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Ten minutes.

8 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Yeah.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Do you want to
10 maybe do that now?

11 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Yeah,
12 just real fast.

13 Talking to the group from a
14 military perspective -- I'm going to talk about
15 JPARC here in a second. But when I talked to
16 Miriam earlier I think back in May -- but I
17 just wanted to see real fast from the Council
18 here, and I just talked to Brian as well, if
19 any perception from the people all of you
20 represent if you had any negative or positive
21 experiences with the military aircraft in
22 Denali in the past summer.

23 And the two incidents I know
24 about, we got three Army helicopters that took
25 off outside of Talkeetna airport and basically

1 flew over downtown Talkeetna, which Miriam let
2 me know. And ran that to ground and basically
3 they never bothered to read, look in the sub.
4 It's stated in the IFR sub not to do that.
5 They were just unaware.

6 And then Brian just pointed out
7 to me that they saw two fighters probably -- I
8 think you said April time frame.

9 BRIAN OKONEK: Late April.

10 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Had two
11 fighters do a high-speed low-altitude pass over
12 Kahiltna Glacier. And of course I ask, could
13 you tell what type of aircraft they were? Like
14 I said, it always matters whether it's a F-15,
15 F-16, F-22. To all you guys they may look the
16 same. But I'm trying to find out whether
17 they're -- depending on what they are, you
18 know, we don't -- if they're based here in
19 Alaska or if they're some of our TDY air crews.
20 Because up during the summer we have probably
21 over 600 pilots to come up here to fly during
22 RED FLAG-Alaska. And, you know, we assume
23 that's probably one of the TDY, one of the
24 world people you guys were talking about.

25 Besides that, that's all I've

1 heard about. And like I said, when Miriam
2 e-mailed me, you guys -- any time you see
3 them -- I don't know if you saw any out there
4 in your soundscapes.

5 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I got a
6 photograph from one of the janitors at the park
7 of a Galaxy C-5 jet.

8 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Of a C5?

9 DAVYD BECTHKAL: It was flying
10 pretty darn low. I got the picture. I can
11 show you it. It's crazy. I mean, it's a crazy
12 picture. It's got USAF on the bottom of the
13 wing.

14 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: A
15 thousand AGL I hope at least?

16 Okay. And just to clarify, the
17 thing by Eric, the military does not have
18 Spider on any of their aircraft. So we have no
19 idea where they are at any given time. So your
20 U.S. military is lacking that technology. So
21 pilots still have the ability to debate
22 healthily whether they were really there or
23 they were one valley over. Besides that,
24 obviously, we do get a couple guys that go
25 rogue, and when we find them they are

1 immediately grounded. I don't think we have a
2 problem too bad and there will be a couple that
3 will continue no matter what we do. That's
4 just a fact of life. But I think we continue
5 to educate the military staying out of Denali
6 Park and that is our objective.

7 A C5 there, that guy's
8 definitely lost.

9 BRIAN OKONEK: The incident at
10 base camp, the fighters went by at eye level,
11 you know, going down glaciers. And Roger
12 called it in but apparently it never went
13 anywhere from the Talkeetna office.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, that's
15 a bummer. I'll talk to John. I'll talk to the
16 staff about they can either talk to John or --
17 like, when it occurred, I mean, I experienced
18 the three helicopters coming off of -- but, you
19 know, people are just going to start calling
20 and get upset. And we could just -- I figured
21 they just didn't know.

22 BRIAN OKONEK: Sure, and that's
23 usually the case.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I appreciated
25 Scott got right on it. I mean, it was just

1 kind of like, well, let's make sure they have
2 the right information to be successful.

3 BRIAN OKONEK: And I'm sure
4 somebody at the ranger station has Scott's
5 number.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I don't think
7 so. But we will now.

8 TOM GEORGE: Well, they did
9 publicize it. The military added to their
10 publication that they update annually the phone
11 number -- actually a series of phone numbers;
12 two for Elmendorf, two for Eielson, of numbers
13 to call if somebody has either an unpleasant
14 encounter or -- I can't remember the exact
15 wording. But there is a published set of
16 numbers now, which in fact everybody ought to
17 be aware of here so that it's not counting on
18 Scott who, you know, often runs off to the
19 Pentagon and who knows what he does there.
20 Because, again, a timely feedback is real
21 important to try and understand whether we're
22 dealing with problems with Best Practices or
23 rogue operators or something that we don't know
24 about yet.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So Scott,

1 didn't that number have some catchy little --
2 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Yeah,
3 1-800-JET-NOISE. But you guys on this board,
4 you guys can call me directly. I don't know if
5 my cell phone's out there, but I want to
6 provide my service to you. They were on a
7 handout. I've given them out before. And I'll
8 bring some more the next spring meeting we
9 have. I'll give you as many as you guys want
10 to pass out. But it'll have the new numbers
11 and it'll probably have additional information.
12 I mean, Mike's looking at one right now. So
13 that number's published there that you will get
14 information.

15 But obviously the military
16 continues to try to stay out of Denali National
17 Park. And I think we're trying to do a good
18 job.

19 That same subject leads right
20 into -- obviously most of you all saw the ADN
21 three Sundays ago when the big near midair
22 between the -- FAA was in the highlights about
23 the FAA investigating the C-17 and is Cessna
24 150 out in the Mat-Su Valley. Not Denali
25 National Park. But that generated a lot of

1 interest with the FAA and the military and of
2 course with all the aviation community.
3 Everyone here who flies aircraft are interested
4 in avoiding near midairs. And the FAA has set
5 up a couple working groups to continue that.

6 And obviously in Denali National
7 Park you guys talk about bubbles and things
8 like that. But, like you said, the more you
9 reduce this ability of aircraft to fly they're
10 going to get closer to each other. And
11 obviously none of us want a near midair, you
12 know, in Denali National Park. When you push
13 aircraft together in between mountains the
14 margin of error continues to decrease.

15 The C-17 incident, we're still
16 investigating it as is the FAA. And there was
17 some misunderstanding just about -- you know,
18 between the two pilots and what actually did
19 happen and how close the aircraft really was.
20 And, you know, it's an ongoing battle to
21 educate everybody. And that's what half of our
22 job here is, to educate people a bout airplane
23 noise in the park and how it effects you and
24 everything else. So we'll continue to work
25 with that.

1 Just on the JPARC real fast.
2 That's a very slow moving train. The Joint
3 Pacific Alaska Range Complex expansion as most
4 of you guys know about. Some of you all did
5 submit a specific letter to us, to the Air
6 Force or ALCOM actually. We got over about 800
7 comments when we had the public comment period
8 on the issue. And, you know, Alaskan's are
9 very passionate about their air space and their
10 hunting space and their noise. So the process
11 is moving forward, still very slowly.

12 We did actually have a meeting
13 with the other aviation groups the end of
14 August. And like I said, where Tom said, we're
15 trying to bring other agencies into the DOD
16 process earlier to try to get some input. We
17 kind of missed the boat a little bit because
18 the military said we want this air space and
19 that's what came out. And there's not a
20 process right now to get AOPA's inputs,
21 landowners, other groups in in advance. And
22 that's something that headquarters in D.C. is
23 working on to try to -- before the military
24 goes forward with an air space action. Get
25 everybody in first. After that saying this is

1 what we want and then trying to, you know, work
2 out the friction down the road.

3 But the next big thing for JPARC
4 is -- they're saying 31 March, the draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement will be
6 released. Right now I'm thinking that may slip
7 again further down to road. That'll be the
8 next opportunity for all the public to look at
9 it. And right now I think it'll be a minimum
10 of a 45-day comment period and maybe go
11 further. We'll probably have another meeting
12 between now and then. And I'll give another
13 update then to make sure we get your comments
14 as we continue to negotiate with the FAA and
15 AOPA and everyone else who has an interest in
16 this, and all the landowners and other people
17 on the ground.

18 But unless you guys have any
19 other comments, you know, positive or negative,
20 that's an update for now.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: You said
22 March 31st?

23 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: March
24 31st is the planned release of the draft EIS,
25 Environmental Impact Statement. At this point

1 that's given to you guys and you look at it and
2 you say -- again, your chance to respond.
3 Again, we'll take your inputs and change the
4 proposals based on your inputs, you know, how
5 many there are and how it'll effect other
6 people. And then it'll be -- actually there'll
7 be one more after that's done. There may be
8 another. And then the Air Force will look at
9 all these inputs. And then at some point we'll
10 make a final EIS statement to the public. And,
11 again, just do comment after that. At least
12 two more opportunities for you to voice your
13 opinion and concern of what the military's
14 trying to do.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So it's a big
16 plan covering a lot of area and a lot of people
17 commenting. But the Council commented just
18 trying to make the military aware of where the
19 flightseeing flights are and how that overlaps
20 the MOA. I mean, do you think that message got
21 through to anybody?

22 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: It did.
23 I made sure because I know you guys put the
24 effort in. We took all those comments and they
25 were compiled and, again, they go to a

1 contractor. We contract with SAIC who gets
2 together and puts all those comments together.
3 Last time I checked your letter was there. It
4 was one of the written comments that came in
5 along with all the other ones. It's receiving
6 its due process.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay.

8 LT. COL. SCOTT BABOS: Along
9 with the other 799 comments. Don't worry.
10 Certain groups -- obviously if you represent a
11 group by virtue that represents -- there's more
12 interest than just an individual. So every
13 comment's important. But anybody representing
14 a group definitely carries more weight.

15 If you guys have questions or
16 concerns or you hear rumors please call me or
17 e-mail. I mean, that's my job to make sure
18 we're getting the word out. Like I said, not a
19 lot going to happen between now and the spring.
20 So I'll give another update then.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Great.

22 Thank you.

23 Fact sheet. I finally spent
24 some time working on it. Last time everybody
25 reviewed it was last April. And I got feedback

1 from a few people. And I incorporated that
2 plus just my own thinking about stuff that
3 we've been talking about since then and other
4 things that we wanted to add to the fact sheet.
5 And I looked at some previous Park Service fact
6 sheets to kind of see how long they were. I
7 think for some of you that have higher capacity
8 e-mails you got a copy of the RSS. That one
9 was 1,600 words approximately which is too
10 dense, I think personally. There's too many
11 words on the page. And so I actually got a
12 couple more which I'll pass around. The
13 soundscapes is 950 words, which I wrote down.
14 My draft is just shy of a thousand. So it's
15 closer to these in terms of density of words.

16 So just pass those around so you
17 can kind of look at them.

18 So I was trying to sort of
19 balance how much information was put in the
20 fact sheet versus reference to other places,
21 maps or Web sites but still kind of provide a
22 flavor. There's references to recommendations.
23 There's a little bit about the process, how we
24 operate. There's a little thing in there about
25 kind of the value of this kind of voluntary

1 model, which I think my first draft was a
2 little bit over the top. Anyway, so I e-mail I
3 think it was last night Tom's edits which are
4 highlighted on top of my edits. And there
5 weren't very many.

6 So before trying to do a
7 line-by-line right off the bat I think it would
8 be helpful just to sort of see how you guys
9 think about the -- just in terms of the balance
10 of content. How is it working? And also the
11 relative role of photographs, pictures and use
12 of captions. I kind of wrote this before doing
13 the pictures and captions. And then I was
14 looking around on the Park's Web site for
15 pictures and just kind of looking for some
16 representative pictures of certain topics, not
17 that I'm proposing that the exact pictures that
18 I made copies of are particularly good, but
19 just to kind of get a representative of the
20 types of things and a few concept captions.

21 So I was hoping to have
22 something a little bit more potentially kind of
23 finished looking. But there were too many
24 choices to make before -- I kind of needed more
25 discussion from you guys. So if you want to

1 share any sort of general feedback about how
2 it's kind of coming together and what you
3 think.

4 BRIAN OKONEK: I thought overall
5 the text covered what we've been talking about
6 all these years and, you know, helping to
7 convey to the public. I agree with you, you
8 don't want it -- if it's too wordy it'll never
9 get read. So I think you probably got about as
10 much text as -- if we can tweak a little bit
11 more.

12 SALLY GIBERT: I don't think we
13 want to add a lot of text, that's for sure.

14 And I was thinking potentially
15 we could move some of the text associated with
16 the photographs. We could take some text out
17 of there and put them in those photographs.
18 But then need to be careful that you don't lose
19 your narrative message.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Saying a lot
21 in a little space. My favorite quote from
22 Mark Twain is I'm sorry, if only I'd had more
23 time I would've written a shorter letter.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, yeah. I'm
25 definitely familiar with that.

1 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I thought,
2 Sally, I didn't see -- I was only able to open
3 up the draft, just the text. But I thought it
4 read very well. I thought it sounded really
5 good. It's pretty general, but really I think
6 that's probably the best approach because since
7 we're in process and things are changing, you
8 know, it can't be too much more specific. I
9 thought it sounded really good.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

11 BRIAN OKONEK: You did have the
12 one sentence that, you know, I had all the
13 different ideas for changing it. And then you
14 had -- you'd written another couple sentences
15 below there. That highlighted it very well.
16 It was very -- I think you hit the mark.

17 SALLY GIBERT: I don't know what
18 you're talking about.

19 BRIAN OKONEK: You got a copy of
20 it right there?

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

22 BRIAN OKONEK: You had one edit
23 you played with the wording.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, the
25 alternative wording.

1 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. So that
3 was original language that we had adopted a
4 couple years ago. And this was --

5 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah, the
6 alternative.

7 SALLY GIBERT: You thought that
8 was good?

9 BRIAN OKONEK: Uh-huh.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Yeah, I
11 wanted to point that out because that was a
12 change to something we had formally adopted.

13 BRIAN OKONEK: And I think the
14 links you have in there are good ones and very
15 necessary. You said you didn't want to have a
16 whole page of links, but those are needed.
17 People are going to need to be able to find the
18 Park Service aviation map to, you know, be
19 exposed to different information out there.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. What about
21 for the general aviation community? Do you
22 think this is enough? Tom or Mike, are there
23 any other links that would be particular good
24 to add?

25 BRIAN OKONEK: Read the links

1 you have.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. I've got
3 the overflights page, our page. The fact sheet
4 on soundscapes, which is actually one of the
5 ones that's circulating.

6 DAVYD BECTHKAL: There's a new
7 one out now too. That one is I think from
8 2003. It's an older one. So there's a newer
9 one from 2010. Just got put up actually a few
10 weeks ago.

11 SALLY GIBERT: And that's
12 actually the one I downloaded from last night.

13 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Okay.

14 SALLY GIBERT: And the Denali
15 Aviation map. Yeah.

16 MIKE YORKE: And I might be able
17 to help on that, Sally, a little bit. Several
18 months ago things were put up to get this in
19 the sectional with the Web site on their Go Fly
20 Alaska. We had talked about the NPS Web site.
21 We talked about getting the high frequency in
22 there. That is in the supplement. The only
23 bad part is we don't have this on here in high
24 frequency just yet. It's getting changed in
25 the aviator's handbook, which we're getting

1 ready to mail out another 10,002. We also had
2 the map in here of Denali. And it is going to
3 remain the same one that's been so prevalently
4 passed around with the reporting points.

5 Everybody seems to like that.

6 These links are now available on
7 our Web site called Go Fly Alaska. We, like
8 any other organization, have a problem
9 maintaining Web sites. But we have somebody in
10 our office now that's committed to doing it for
11 a year or so. So I think we can get a lot of
12 good things out of there. Colonel Babos
13 brought up about the C-17 thing, we're able to
14 immediately put that on our Web site. We used
15 to have to control it through D.C. We now have
16 control locally downtown. So when somebody has
17 an issue or something that they'd like to get
18 put on there we could. So I'd like to see that
19 on there.

20 SALLY GIBERT: This is an FAA
21 site?

22 MIKE YORKE: It's Go Fly Alaska.
23 And I can get it to you exactly. And it's
24 actually listed on a chart. So if you picked
25 up the paper chart, went to the NPS Web site

1 you would still -- and our idea is to get some
2 other upcoming events on there and issues.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. That's
4 good.

5 TOM GEORGE: We do need a
6 primary link to the Park Service's aviation
7 map.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

9 TOM GEORGE: Which I think
10 you've got listed here.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Right. And then
12 if we wanted to use that as a graphic, try to
13 take that whole map and shrink it down into the
14 little thing, it's kind of not going to work.
15 It's supposed to be representative. So what I
16 did -- that's when I was playing around with
17 looking at the photographs.

18 TOM GEORGE: Cropped it.

19 SALLY GIBERT: I just cropped
20 it. We can even crop it in more.

21 TOM GEORGE: You could crop it a
22 little tighter yet.

23 SALLY GIBERT: I was trying to
24 get the box and Talkeetna. Although you could
25 crop it tighter and get less of the box and

1 whatever. Just so people could see what that
2 was without it having to be the map. The map
3 itself wouldn't be the link. I guess you could
4 even make the map itself a clickable link too.

5 TOM GEORGE: Well, I think if
6 the link goes to the aviation page that the
7 Park Service has, that gets you -- that'll get
8 you to it.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

10 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, I think using
11 a chunk of the map as a graphic, because it's a
12 visual manifestation of one of the products
13 that's available, we're not trying make this be
14 the map but to -- I think that's better than
15 just a bunch of words saying, oh, yeah, there's
16 a map somewhere.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Right. So did
18 you all see Tom's comments? I sent them out
19 last night.

20 MIKE YORKE: I did.

21 BRIAN OKONEK: I did not see the
22 ones that came out last night.

23 NANCY BALE: Are they the ones
24 that are in track changes?

25 SALLY GIBERT: Well, they're

1 highlighted. Yellow highlighted. Because when
2 he sent them to me, his corrections on top of
3 mine, you couldn't tell mine from his.

4 Tom, you want to walk through
5 them a little bit because they're so small?

6 TOM GEORGE: I didn't bring a
7 copy of them. They're all very minor.

8 SALLY GIBERT: They are. But
9 it'd be nice to have as much closure as we can
10 today on this. My goal for today if it's
11 possible, I don't know if it's possible, is to
12 get enough closure on what's in here or ought
13 to be in here so that all of these things can
14 be handed off to Miriam who can work with
15 whoever it is that does the fancy stuff and,
16 you know, get it corralled.

17 TOM GEORGE: Move to adopt.

18 NANCY BALE: Does somebody have
19 a copy of the sample sheet?

20 BRIAN OKONEK: The one that was
21 passed around.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Tom's
23 first change was a real good one. Under Broad
24 Representation. And the second line, to change
25 private aviation to general aviation. I'm not

1 even sure why I wrote private.

2 Okay. And in the discussion of
3 the Benefits of the Denali Overflights Council
4 Model. This is where I think I went a little
5 too over the top here. My original was that
6 the Council's focus on voluntary measures will
7 provide stakeholders with latitude to explore a
8 variety of constructive responses in a
9 risk-free context without fear of becoming
10 locked into an inflexible regulatory approach.
11 And he suggested to say, to explore these
12 things in a variety of constructive responses
13 in contrast to an inflexible regulatory
14 approach.

15 So I think that's good. Take
16 out the risk-free approach.

17 TOM GEORGE: Nothing's
18 risk-free.

19 NANCY BALE: I have a questions
20 on that sentence. The latitude to explore a
21 variety of constructive responses. I don't see
22 that as a contrast to an inflexible regulatory
23 approach. I don't -- I think they're apples
24 and oranges. I know what you're trying to get
25 at, but I'm not sure we're quite there yet.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

2 NANCY BALE: And I think we
3 could probably just end the sentence right
4 there at responses.

5 TOM GEORGE: So what would the
6 sentence read then?

7 NANCY BALE: The Council's focus
8 on voluntary measures provide the stakeholders
9 latitude to explore a variety of constructive
10 responses. And, you know, I don't know, maybe
11 we should define what a response is.
12 Solutions, discussion points. I guess a person
13 in the public might wonder, well, what is it
14 that we're actually talking about. Providing a
15 forum to facilitate ongoing dialogue among
16 these stakeholders is a key benefit. The
17 Council's focus on voluntary measures provide
18 stakeholders latitude to explore a variety of
19 instructive ideas related to aviation at
20 Denali. Although it's a little bit tighter --

21 SALLY GIBERT: It's kind of
22 going back to the voluntary measures. I think
23 I kind of spent a little bit of time on that.
24 And I thought, well, we're already talking
25 about voluntary measures so maybe we don't need

1 to say it again. But I do agree it's just a
2 little bit vague.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: What about the
4 term Best Practices?

5 NANCY BALE: I think we've got
6 that somewhere down the line.

7 SALLY GIBERT: Well, and
8 actually it's more than Best Practices. I
9 mean, we've done a lot of stuff in addition to
10 Best Practices that have been very helpful.

11 NANCY BALE: Well, we could just
12 expand voluntary measures. The Council's focus
13 on voluntary measures to mitigate noise impact,
14 provide stakeholders latitude for a variety of
15 constructive solutions? Restates it a little
16 bit.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Solutions. How's
18 solutions? So is everybody comfortable with
19 taking out the reference to an inflexible
20 regulatory approach?

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Uh-huh.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. What about
23 if it didn't say inflexible, it just said
24 regulatory approach?

25 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I kind of like

1 it because it helps people understand this is
2 voluntary measures and, you know, if we can
3 succeed -- you know, if we don't succeed we
4 might go to regulatory --

5 SALLY GIBERT: And in contrast
6 to the Lower 48 model which is being pushed by
7 legislation toward regulatory.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: But maybe take
9 out the inflexible.

10 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, I think
11 that'd be a good compromise so we're not
12 coloring it too --

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Does that work
14 for you, Nancy?

15 SALLY GIBERT: Or we could say
16 instead of --

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: In contrast
18 to.

19 SALLY GIBERT: In contrast to.
20 Yeah.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And I think
22 there's --

23 NANCY BALE: Even if we were
24 trying to develop regulations we would still
25 feel we had latitude to explore a variety of

1 constructive solutions.

2 SALLY GIBERT: To me it's
3 helpful to have it in there some way or
4 another.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, you want
6 this system to be inherently adaptable.

7 NANCY BALE: Okay. Well, keep
8 going with that.

9 SALLY GIBERT: How about
10 adaptive solutions instead of constructive?
11 That'd be more meaningful. Adaptive solutions.

12 NANCY BALE: No, that sounds
13 kind of --

14 SALLY GIBERT: Well, but it also
15 implies that --

16 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, that they're
17 -- you modify them as needed.

18 SALLY GIBERT: And regs
19 certainly are not adaptive.

20 NANCY BALE: How about
21 constructive solutions that are more adaptable
22 than inflexible regulations? So provides
23 stakeholders latitude to explore a variety of
24 constructive solutions that will be more
25 adaptable than regulations. Designed to be

1 more adaptable than regulations.

2 TOM GEORGE: I think your
3 adaptive responses --

4 NANCY BALE: That seems kind of
5 like a --

6 TOM GEORGE: Too jargony or
7 what?

8 NANCY BALE: Jargony. Yeah.
9 Too jargony to me. Maybe I'm just making this
10 a little bit too -- I think constructive is
11 great. But we need to modify it in some way to
12 --

13 SALLY GIBERT: Well, we do. I
14 mean, there's plenty of other places in here
15 that talk about the fact that they're subject
16 to change. So I don't think we need to beat a
17 dead horse in this particular case.

18 TOM GEORGE: So just keep it
19 constructive?

20 SALLY GIBERT: Constructive
21 solutions. In contrast to a regulatory
22 approach?

23 TOM GEORGE: Yeah.

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I like that.

25 TOM GEORGE: Yeah.

1 NANCY BALE: How about just
2 putting that phrase, the Council's focus on
3 voluntary measures in contrast, comma. In
4 contrast to an inflexible regulatory approach,
5 comma, provide stakeholders latitude to explore
6 a variety of constructive solutions.

7 TOM GEORGE: You added more
8 words.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Without the
10 inflexible.

11 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, we pulled the
12 inflexible.

13 NANCY BALE: Oh, okay. Yeah,
14 take the inflexible out. Just putting that
15 phrase after measures.

16 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that's good
17 because then you end on a positive. That's
18 good. Okay that's good.

19 So I'll read this again. The
20 Council's focus on voluntary measures in
21 contrast to a regulatory approach provides
22 stakeholders latitude to explore a variety of
23 constructive solutions, period.

24 Going once. Going twice.

25 TOM GEORGE: Sold.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Cool.

2 And then there was the editing
3 of the previous closing paragraph from the
4 Starting Assumptions, which we adopted in '08
5 or something. So the new one is now, thus our
6 challenge on the Overflights Council is to
7 recommend ways to balance the needs of public
8 safety, public use and access, protection of
9 the Park's natural soundscape in a way that is
10 acceptable to all parties.

11 See, what I did was I
12 accepted -- the one in green is not the right
13 one. I forgot the green thing. That was a
14 remnant of the previous one. The Council's
15 challenge is to recommend ways to balance the
16 needs of public safety, public use and access
17 and protection of the Park's natural resources
18 and soundscape values in a way that is fair and
19 effective.

20 And Tom's next one, which I
21 almost did to start with, was changing three to
22 four meetings to several. And then just with
23 several -- no, wanted to --

24 TOM GEORGE: No, it was -- well,
25 insert several in place of three or four and

1 then delete the second use of several.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Delete the second
3 use of several. Okay. Which is what it says.

4 So it would read under how the
5 Council works, the full Council meets formally
6 several times a year with public comment
7 opportunity at each meeting. In addition, the
8 Council assigns ad hoc working groups of
9 interested Council members and effective
10 stakeholders in small, "role up your sleeves"
11 discussion groups where needed. And I thought
12 that worked well.

13 Any other comments on Tom's
14 comments?

15 AMANDA SMITH: I just thought
16 that it might be a place to cross that out if
17 we list the stakeholder groups. In a fact
18 sheet I think -- are we trying to shorten this
19 a little or are we set with the size?

20 SALLY GIBERT: I think if -- it
21 doesn't really need to be shortened anymore.
22 We don't need words, we're just trying to get
23 rid of them. My first draft was like 1,400
24 words. And I thought, nah, that's too big.

25 Okay. And then the last change

1 of Tom's which was under the section called --
2 was after View all current Council
3 recommendation, for that link. The first
4 bullet we changed the increase the soundscape
5 data to acquire soundscape data.

6 Okay. So any other details,
7 changes no matter how small?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I have a very
9 small one. When it's talking about the example
10 under Best Practices and how people climb
11 Kahiltna Pass and it uses the word to avoid
12 orbiting at climb power. Orbiting seems like
13 an odd word. Is circling a more commonly used
14 word?

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I'm glad
16 you brought that up. I took that right out of
17 Best Practices. I think that's kind of a term
18 of art for air tour operators. And I agree
19 that that doesn't necessarily -- is a little
20 bit of a strange word.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. To me
22 circling sounds better. Now I don't know what
23 the other folks think.

24 MIKE YORKE: I think you're
25 right.

1 TOM GEORGE: Well, I think
2 you're right. Now the question is if you're
3 actually putting an example and if that's the
4 way it's worded. But circling is fine.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. Or what
6 about spiraling? It kind of implies you're not
7 going -- so climbing? Avoid -- what's the
8 word?

9 TOM GEORGE: Circling.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Circling. Okay.
11 Good. And this wasn't -- this was a reduced --
12 a condensed version of the one that's actually
13 in Best Practices.

14 TOM GEORGE: Oh, it is? Okay.
15 Well, then we're free to do anything we want.

16 SALLY GIBERT: I did scrunch it
17 down.

18 BRIAN OKONEK: I noticed that.
19 The other one also talked about the climbing
20 route up to the pass. But this is good enough.
21 It's in the general area.

22 SALLY GIBERT: And it's an
23 example.

24 TOM GEORGE: It's an example and
25 it gives a link to where to find the whole

1 thing.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Okay.

3 Thank you for noticing that.

4 Anything else?

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: When you think
6 about captions for the photos, I'm sure a lot
7 of people -- I tend to just read everything
8 that's bold, the headlines, I look at the
9 pictures, I read the captions. You know,
10 people might not read anything else. So I
11 think when we're developing that it's good to
12 think what are our primary messages and try to
13 convey that just in headline titles, photo
14 captions.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's worth
17 giving that some thought that we're kind of
18 condensing.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Right now I think
20 the only things that do that in terms of
21 headings -- well, broad representation, that's
22 a message. Benefit of the Denali overflights
23 model. That doesn't tell you what the benefit
24 is but it's saying that we think that there's a
25 benefit for this model. So there's a message

1 there. Might be able to work with how the
2 Council works to make that more of a message.
3 Best Practices is probably good the way it is.
4 Do you have any ideas?

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'm just
6 thinking, like, under captions. You know, it
7 might say something general, like, Overflights
8 Council is working to balance the needs of air
9 tour passengers and backpackers, or something
10 like that. As opposed to just describing the
11 picture.

12 TOM GEORGE: In other words,
13 replicate the idea in the captions as
14 appropriate. Absolutely right, there are even
15 documents that say that people pick up
16 brochures, look at the pictures first, the
17 captions second and if there's any time left
18 over they might read the words.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah. So you
20 want to try to get the gist of things across --

21 SALLY GIBERT: And I didn't
22 spend much time at all on the pictures. I just
23 kind of snatched some and I wrote a couple of
24 potential captions. But I agree that that's
25 definitely where -- in fact, I think I wrote --

1 are we done with the narrative and we start
2 talking about the pictures?

3 NANCY BALE: There was one other
4 thing on the narrative that I just looked at.
5 Purpose. This pretty much comes out of the
6 charter. The Council is also charged with
7 developing voluntary measures for assuring the
8 safety of passengers, pilots and mountaineers
9 and for achieving desired resource conditions.
10 Should we say for the soundscape at Denali?
11 Because we're not really trying to achieve
12 resource conditions for every aspect of the
13 Backcountry Plan.

14 BRIAN OKONEK: This is true.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah. What does
16 the charter actually say? Does anybody have it
17 handy? Mike?

18 MIKE YORKE: I do.

19 NANCY BALE: It's pretty close
20 to what's in the -- it just says achieving
21 desired future resource conditions at Denali.
22 So I guess if it doesn't say it in the charter
23 we don't have to say it here.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, but we
25 can --

1 TOM GEORGE: I'd keep it broad.

2 BRIAN OKONEK: Except what we
3 are working on is the soundscape.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: Soundscape is
5 the reason we're here.

6 NANCY BALE: We haven't talked
7 about soundscape very much. Has the word been
8 used at all?

9 AMANDA SMITH: In the very
10 beginning.

11 NANCY BALE: Where is it did you
12 say?

13 AMANDA SMITH: It's on the first
14 page.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Actually in the
16 very first sentence it's not clear we're
17 talking about sound. And I think that's an
18 issue.

19 MIKE YORKE: Under purpose?

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, very first
21 sentence.

22 MIKE YORKE: It's pretty close
23 to what's in there. I can read it right here.
24 It's five lines. The charter.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.

1 MIKE YORKE: The purpose of the
2 Council is to advise the Secretary of the
3 Interior through the director of National Park
4 Service on matters relating to mitigation of
5 impacts from aircraft overflights at Denali
6 National Park and Reserve. So maybe aircraft
7 overflights covers it. Council will develop
8 voluntary measures to assure the safety of
9 passengers, pilots and mountaineers and for
10 achieving desired future resource conditions
11 for DNP.

12 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That whole
13 thing's pretty wonky. Your average public
14 doesn't know what you mean when you say
15 overflight, desired future conditions. We
16 might want to revamp that in everyday language.

17 SALLY GIBERT: We could.

18 AMANDA SMITH: We could say to
19 reduce the sound impact from aircraft flights
20 over Denali National Park and Reserve. Yeah,
21 in that first sentence it would say, the
22 Secretary of the Interior on mitigation efforts
23 to reduce the sound impacts from aircraft
24 flights over Denali National Park and Reserve.

25 NANCY BALE: We could even use

1 the term soundscape impacts, couldn't we?

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Soundscape's a
3 little wonky too.

4 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, it is.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Most people
6 don't know that word. It's a general audience
7 we're writing this for.

8 NANCY BALE: We are trying to
9 bring that word into a more general following I
10 would say. But sound works for me.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Voluntary
12 measures and to reduce sound impacts from
13 aircraft flights over Denali. How's that line?

14 NANCY BALE: Over rather than
15 in?

16 SALLY GIBERT: Over.

17 NANCY BALE: But it says
18 overflights.

19 AMANDA SMITH: So we took out
20 overflights. From aircraft flights over.

21 SALLY GIBERT: So we took out
22 the buzz word overflights even though it's in
23 the title.

24 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah.

25 TOM GEORGE: Are we advising the

1 superintendent through the Secretary of the
2 Interior? That feels backwards to me.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: It's all -- all
4 has to do the bureaucracy.

5 TOM GEORGE: Right.

6 PAUL ANDERSON: So you are
7 chartered by the Secretary of the Interior?

8 TOM GEORGE: Right.

9 PAUL ANDERSON: And I work for
10 the director of the Park Service who works for
11 the secretary.

12 TOM GEORGE: But we advise the
13 secretary.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: The secretary
15 generically.

16 TOM GEORGE: And this says we
17 advise the superintendent I guess is what I --

18 SALLY GIBERT: That's the
19 language of the charter. And that was actually
20 --

21 TOM GEORGE: No, this is the
22 charter I'm looking at. It says we will advise
23 the secretary. That's why I'm -- they're
24 flipped is why I'm asking. I mean, we know
25 Paul's phone number. I'm not worried about

1 that.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And the fact
3 sheet says superintendent?

4 TOM GEORGE: Yes.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I would
6 recommend --

7 NANCY BALE: I would mate it all
8 and say it just advise the National Park
9 Service.

10 SALLY GIBERT: That's what I
11 would like to say.

12 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, National Park
13 Service. Let's keep it generic and simple.
14 They all work for the Park Service.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, you know
16 what's interesting? The italic section, the
17 one that's right below the Purpose, you know,
18 plane paragraph and then the one below it is
19 the italics. That was my attempt to deal with
20 all this jargon and set it aside as that little
21 sidebar.

22 BRIAN OKONEK: Read it.

23 SALLY GIBERT: It says, the
24 Council is charged with recommending voluntary
25 measures that reduce the noise impacts of

1 aircraft overflights in Denali and to assure
2 the safety of passengers, pilots and
3 backcountry visitors on the ground.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: That sounds
5 good.

6 SALLY GIBERT: And think that's
7 sufficiently different, that it can still --

8 TOM GEORGE: Well, and, again,
9 it's a sidebar. So, yeah, it's fine.

10 BRIAN OKONEK: It wouldn't be a
11 sidebar. It would be the purpose. This was
12 Sally's attempt to streamline the purpose.

13 NANCY BALE: So are we okay with
14 overflights in the full quote --

15 TOM GEORGE: Right, but she
16 would show it in the deal. It would show up
17 not in the line of text but as a little
18 sidebar.

19 NANCY BALE: -- or taking it out
20 because we thought it was too wonky?

21 TOM GEORGE: And it works. That
22 way you just read one little thing, you got
23 them reading the full --

24 SALLY GIBERT: Just kind of like
25 the same thing as what Joan was talking about

1 with the bold. The little italics in this case
2 is meant to be a shorter --

3 TOM GEORGE: Version of the --
4 yeah.

5 NANCY BALE: But we're okay
6 about leaving overflight in the full quote
7 then?

8 SALLY GIBERT: Actually right
9 now the way we talked about it, it's not in
10 full quote but it's now --

11 NANCY BALE: In the full quote.
12 You know, the little thing.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, the sidebar.
14 It's up to you guys whether --

15 NANCY BALE: I mean, we had a
16 big argument about it in the main. I mean, I
17 don't care one way or another.

18 SALLY GIBERT: It's kind of nice
19 to have it both ways especially since it's in
20 our title. And that way when people are
21 analyzing it they can see that it's basically
22 the same thing.

23 AMANDA SMITH: I like both ways.

24 TOM GEORGE: You didn't bring a
25 copy of the draft formatted into -- a formatted

1 version of this?

2 SALLY GIBERT: I did.

3 TOM GEORGE: You might just pass
4 that around for those that haven't seen it.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, it's this
6 version. And just go -- I put it on the back
7 because I didn't have any paper. Yeah, I'll
8 pass that around. So don't look at the back
9 side.

10 TOM GEORGE: Because it does
11 make a difference how you interpret the
12 document.

13 SALLY GIBERT: It does. It
14 does.

15 Anything else on the narrative?

16 NANCY BALE: The only -- I guess
17 the only other thing that I might find
18 confusing if I just walked into the NFLC and
19 pulled this off the shelf is who's doing these
20 voluntary measures.

21 TIM CUDNEY: Well, stakeholders
22 and operators.

23 SALLY GIBERT: It's not just the
24 air tour operators. Part of it's education.
25 Part of it's education and everybody's

1 participating in that.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And we have
3 the example which kind of -- up at Kahiltna it
4 kind of gives you an idea of what some of the
5 recommendations might be.

6 TOM GEORGE: I think at the
7 level of this document I think to try and
8 further define it or qualify it isn't
9 necessary.

10 NANCY BALE: I mean, some of the
11 things that we educate -- I wouldn't call
12 education a voluntary measure. I'm sorry, Tom.
13 I mean, I --

14 TOM GEORGE: It's required
15 education? Okay.

16 NANCY BALE: We know the
17 voluntary measures are what we're hoping that
18 operators will do because their air space is
19 not in the park land. But if the Park Service
20 determined that they were going to make the
21 rangers do reports or conduct a study or make a
22 fact sheet, that's really not a voluntary
23 measure. That's something else.

24 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, but you
25 could say -- you could say that education all

1 by itself could reduce the effective noise
2 impacts of aircraft overflights. You know,
3 part of it is getting the message out.

4 NANCY BALE: Oh, I know. And of
5 course education, it's just not a voluntary
6 measure. And because the charter was vague we
7 can leave the fact sheet vague.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Uh-huh. I think
9 if we tried to caveat that and say, and other
10 things, that would be kind of weird.

11 NANCY BALE: I mean, arguably
12 the charter just wanted us to develop these
13 voluntary measures. They didn't -- they
14 weren't as interested in having education.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: We made that
16 up on our own.

17 NANCY BALE: We made that up on
18 our own.

19 TOM GEORGE: That's the trouble,
20 you put a group together and it actually does
21 things.

22 NANCY BALE: I mean, there's
23 things that aren't in the sheet that would be
24 in a good piece of investigative journalism.

25 BRIAN OKONEK: Which people can

1 certainly do. If you want to dig there's the
2 information here to go much further.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Any other
4 suggestions for maybe some more of these little
5 sidebars to highlight? Are there any things in
6 here that -- you know, the highlights right now
7 are the -- well, the first one about the
8 purpose. The membership, which is kind of a
9 little bit different. And the safety first.
10 And the subject to change are the things that I
11 thought would merited highlighting. Are there
12 other key messages that could either go with
13 a -- with either a highlight-type thing like
14 this or as a caption for the pictures?

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It might be
16 nice to have something on just, you know,
17 you're getting away from it all and natural
18 sounds is a part of that as a caption on a
19 picture.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Well, in fact
21 that's one of the things if you wanted to start
22 looking at the pictures --

23 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, let's.

24 SALLY GIBERT: I was kind of
25 playing around with that at that time bottom of

1 page 2 or the top of page 1. Those two
2 pictures to me kind of spoke to that concept.
3 You know, it could be expanded into more of a
4 statement or enjoying the sounds of the
5 wilderness. I mean, that's a recognition that
6 that's a value.

7 TOM GEORGE: Well, on the first
8 one of those, detail for map showing common
9 pilot reporting points. I'd strike the word
10 common. Reporting points. But the audience
11 doesn't necessarily know what those reporting
12 points are for. And this may be too jargony but
13 I was just going to say, for situational
14 awareness.

15 NANCY BALE: Where are you, Tom?

16 TOM GEORGE: The first caption
17 under the subset of the map. I'm sure there's
18 room for improvement beyond that. That's just
19 as far as I got.

20 SALLY GIBERT: There's a little
21 bit of redundancy here. You could say, detail
22 from the Denali aviation map.

23 BRIAN OKONEK: It's going to be
24 pretty hard to -- people are going to have to
25 get online or get the booklet and find out more

1 because it's going to be pretty hard in here --

2 MIKE YORKE: To capture that
3 all.

4 BRIAN OKONEK: Yeah.

5 SALLY GIBERT: What about
6 special pilot information is available --

7 TOM GEORGE: Flight chart map
8 for --

9 SALLY GIBERT: For more pilot
10 information see Denali aviation map.

11 TOM GEORGE: Well, again, I even
12 think the essence of what it's for along the
13 line of -- in fact, probably sticking the whole
14 link in here isn't going to work because I
15 think the link's going to be lengthy. And
16 you've got links elsewhere in the document.

17 SALLY GIBERT: That's another
18 thing I wanted to mention is I think there
19 needs to be sort of two versions of this that
20 are basically the same, but the differences
21 would be in the electronic version as opposed
22 to the printer-friendly version. The
23 electronic version --

24 TOM GEORGE: Could actually have
25 a link. Yeah.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So Denali
2 aviation map is the link where that doesn't
3 work on a paper copy.

4 TOM GEORGE: So in that case you
5 probably do want to use the term Denali
6 aviation map. And, again, like I say, an
7 online version that would actually be an
8 underlined -- you know, the link symbol so you
9 click on it. But it wouldn't be there for the
10 print version.

11 SALLY GIBERT: On the print
12 version you'd need to know where to go though.
13 So you'd need to say available from blah, blah,
14 blah.

15 TOM GEORGE: Well, now you've
16 just split into two versions of this which
17 might be what you need to do.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Is that -- do you
19 guys do that? Have two versions like that?

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Do we have
21 some that are electronic and some that are
22 printed? Yes. So the one that -- I don't know
23 that we -- the electronic postings have the
24 photographs or links. Maybe the photographs
25 are links too.

1 AMANDA SMITH: I was able to
2 pull up the soundscapes. The photograph didn't
3 pull up on this but they might on a computer.
4 And I don't know if there are any links in
5 here. I didn't see.

6 DAVYD BECTHKAL: That's the old
7 one again.

8 AMANDA SMITH: Oh, is it? Well,
9 I just pulled up the new one and it -- and I
10 can look right now.

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Can I offer a
12 suggestion? When it comes to the visuals there
13 will be people who will only pay attention to
14 your pictures. So tell the story of the
15 Council. So there's people, there's the
16 research that the park does. So there's
17 administrative overflight use of the park;
18 right? There's the flightseeing, as Paul was
19 describing today. There's beautiful areas of
20 the park that are best experienced from the
21 air. There's the person on the ground, the
22 backpackers, that has a level of impact. And
23 then you kind of have this connection to and we
24 want to help educate; right? I mean, you want
25 to educate and inform as a council. Kind of

1 have --

2 I mean, if you break it down to
3 what you're really trying to say in the
4 photographs you have some -- I mean, this one
5 where they're all on the glacier and they're
6 all in red and they're obviously happy on your
7 glacier landing, it kind of tells the whole
8 story. We came here in an airplane and we're
9 having a great time. It was like one photo I
10 was looking for from Suzanne where everybody's
11 inside the plane and they've got their -- you
12 know, they're happy. It's kind of like there's
13 great joy in experiencing the park that way
14 just like people find great enjoyment in
15 experiencing the park a different way.

16 TOM GEORGE: So the day hiking
17 picture.

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: That is the
19 challenge of the Council. And I don't know if
20 the -- even though I agree that the
21 mountaineering photos are important to us,
22 okay, there's kind of less of a broad
23 connection to people like that. A lot of
24 people are going to, like, yeah, I'm out there
25 in my shorts, I could be there. Yeah, I can

1 understand that. But this isn't going to
2 resonate with me, because, man, I'd never do
3 that. Just a way to, like, winnow down what
4 you really want to say with the photos.

5 TOM GEORGE: Yeah. Yeah. No, I
6 think you're absolutely right.

7 BRIAN OKONEK: I think then for
8 a caption for the map, the most important thing
9 would be to let pilots know in a very short
10 sentence that if you're going to fly there you
11 need to learn more about the area. And, you
12 know, that this is a busy flight zone and you
13 need to educate yourself before you go there.

14 TOM GEORGE: But I guess the
15 pilot's probably about one percent of the total
16 population. And if this is aimed at the
17 general population, the notion is the council
18 is supporting products which convey
19 information, rather -- in other places we'll
20 target things just for pilots.

21 So I think in this case it's
22 really the general public that needs to
23 understand that one of the ways we're doing
24 this thing is through materials such as this,
25 even though we didn't make this map. This is

1 not the result of this group which I want to be
2 quick to admit before other parts of the Park
3 Services gets mad at me. Yeah, I don't think
4 we need to worry about this as much as the
5 pilot piece, because that's a real small
6 percentage of people I think that are going to
7 look at this. And we have other ways to do it.
8 But the notion that it -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: I'm sorry.
10 The one graphic that seems to tie all those
11 things together to me as it relates to the map
12 is the one that has the routes on it because it
13 says that this is what's going on.

14 NANCY BALE: You mean the GPS?

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, the GPS.
16 Because it ties together the location and the
17 activity in a visual way as opposed to the
18 static of these images. So just a thought.

19 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I've
20 actually thought about that. I was really
21 hesitant to put a map with routes on it for
22 fear that people would interpret it --

23 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, that we're --
24 yeah.

25 SALLY GIBERT: They would think

1 that these were designated routes. I was
2 really worried about that.

3 CHARLIE SASSARA: Except that is
4 the subject.

5 TOM GEORGE: Routes isn't the
6 subject.

7 SALLY GIBERT: There was another
8 graphic --

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: Because the
10 Web sites of the air taxis have routes on them.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, they're
12 there.

13 Correct me if I'm wrong, but
14 there was a graphic somewhere that was a -- it
15 was in color and it showed ranges. It was like
16 a -- there were no lines. It was just like
17 rare little lines fading to yellow into green
18 kind of thing that show areas where --

19 CHARLIE SASSARA: The intensity.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, the
21 intensity. It was like an intensity of
22 aircraft use.

23 MIKE YORKE: We got that.

24 SALLY GIBERT: And I had no --
25 but that was something that would work because

1 that's not a -- it's not routes.

2 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, but that is
3 not a intuitive thing that you pick up and look
4 at and understand. I mean, I remember this
5 group puzzling over that for some time before
6 we got it. So I think the kind of things you
7 got in here for this purpose and at the level
8 of detail, two pages are better than something
9 like which I think would be confusing. What
10 are those guys doing making new surfaces? And
11 we couldn't even quantify what the surfaces
12 really were as you recall when we asked. I'm
13 very interested in that as a tool to
14 understand. But I think that's pretty abstract
15 for communicating to the public.

16 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I think
17 you're right. Anyway, I was just worried about
18 putting the lines on the map.

19 TOM GEORGE: I think that thing
20 you had as a cover photo, I thought it was
21 great. Of course, maybe that's because I like
22 airplanes.

23 SALLY GIBERT: That was this
24 one.

25 TOM GEORGE: That really seemed

1 to kind of fit and tie both the park and the
2 airplanes. And the concept of overflights. I
3 mean, it's a perspective from an overflight as
4 opposed to on the ground looking up.

5 NANCY BALE: Typically it
6 banners; right? So it's thinner and longer.
7 So this will have to be cropped.

8 TOM GEORGE: Not so much. Look
9 at that one.

10 SALLY GIBERT: It wouldn't need
11 to be cropped.

12 MIKE YORKE: Miriam said it
13 earlier, but I'll repeat. Picture says a
14 thousand words. So let the picture say the
15 thousand words, let's just say a few words.
16 Every time we can pick up a brochure, whether
17 it's Eric's, Tim's or any representative, first
18 thing we pick up is the picture. That's what
19 we see. Little bit of verbiage cover it. Take
20 the Corona commercial; nothing said except the
21 Corona bottles. Message conveyed. I agree
22 with Miriam, maybe the less we say with the
23 picture would get you to go to the reading part
24 of it.

25 SALLY GIBERT: That would be

1 nice to represent -- to have one of the happy
2 glacier landing things close to somebody on the
3 ground enjoying the silence and have those
4 things kind of close together and, you know,
5 kind of side by side and sort of like they're
6 both important. And so that -- and then how do
7 you -- how do you do that?

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So
9 first picture, happy flightseers with the
10 caption something along flightseeing provides
11 access to Denali's spectacular scenery. Second
12 picture, hiker on the ground. The Denali
13 wilderness provides an escape from the sights
14 and sounds of the manmade world. Okay. But we
15 still haven't come up with a problem. Third
16 picture, bird or something like that. Too many
17 flights can prevent visitors from enjoying the
18 sounds of nature. Fourth picture, I'm not sure
19 what it is. The overflights committee works to
20 blah, blah, blah, as kind of a summary.

21 We can tweak that with the
22 pictures, what the wording is. But the kind of
23 valid use visitors -- visitors on the --
24 visitors flightseeing.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that was

1 the one on the last page that was the only
2 caption that sort of tried to tie in. But it
3 isn't -- it isn't just either or. It's not
4 just the backpackers versus the flightseers. I
5 mean, even people that land on the glacier can
6 also appreciate the silence when the plane's
7 not running.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: If they get
9 the opportunity.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Well, yeah.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We can't get
12 every -- I mean, we can just simplify the
13 message.

14 SALLY GIBERT: You're right.

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And I don't
16 know if a bird is a -- because I realize if we
17 just do flightseers enjoying, this is great and
18 people on the ground enjoying the wilderness,
19 this is great, but we got to connect the
20 people's minds.

21 TOM GEORGE: Does that one do
22 that for you or not? That last page, all the
23 people in airplanes in what's obviously a
24 remote wilderness setting.

25 CHARLIE SASSARA: It's the least

1 remote.

2 TOM GEORGE: Well, it isn't a
3 parking lot. Well, it is a parking lot
4 actually.

5 CHARLIE SASSARA: It is a
6 parking lot.

7 TOM GEORGE: And you got the
8 parking lot and impressive scenery all right
9 there in close proximity. Yeah, I'd go with
10 that. I think that gets the essence of the
11 conflict.

12 SALLY GIBERT: I think you do
13 need something else besides this to get the
14 pure backcountry.

15 TOM GEORGE: Well, you still got
16 the enjoying your day hiking picture, whichever
17 one you --

18 NANCY BALE: You gave us a
19 couple.

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Oh, did I?
21 Well, I'll have to look.

22 SALLY GIBERT: I looked on the
23 little -- there was a little Google page that,
24 Tom, you set up. And there were only two
25 pictures posted. You posted one. I think it

1 was a sample. And you posted one I think. It
2 was a -- from an airplane looking south. It
3 was kind of a -- it was a nice picture but was
4 kind of unremarkable in terms of it was just a
5 view from the air.

6 NANCY BALE: Flightseeing but no
7 planes in the picture.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Uh-huh.

9 NANCY BALE: I wanted to be sure
10 that the fact sheet does not create any
11 confusion in a visitor's mind with respect to
12 what ANILCA protects and what it doesn't. And
13 ANILCA is vocal about protecting mountaineering
14 and wilderness recreation but not so much about
15 protecting somebody flying around. Because of
16 course ANILCA refers just refers to what's
17 happening on the ground. And I don't know if
18 the park ever had to make choices with respect
19 to whether they would eliminate the landing of
20 flightseeing versus the landing for
21 mountaineering. I would think they would have
22 to restrict the landing for flightseeing first
23 rather than for mountaineering because
24 mountaineering is a more protected purpose.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Landing and

1 flightseeing are apples and oranges.

2 NANCY BALE: No, landing for
3 flightseeing. The park can't restrict
4 overflights because they don't land. But once
5 something lands inside the park, the park can
6 restrict. So I guess my question is -- Paul,
7 could you answer that question?

8 PAUL ANDERSON: ANILCA deals
9 with aircraft.

10 NANCY BALE: Right. But more in
11 the context of if you had to restrict scenic
12 landings -- if you had to do some restricting
13 of landings and you had to choose between
14 scenic landings and landings for
15 mountaineering, would you tend to restrict the
16 scenic landings first? I mean, would -- I
17 mean, from the standpoint of policy.

18 TOM GEORGE: Why are we --

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Are we going
20 to talk about this in the fact sheet?

21 TOM GEORGE: How does this play
22 into this?

23 NANCY BALE: Because we're
24 showing a picture of people having a good old
25 time on a scenic land. And I just want to be

1 sure that we wouldn't be --

2 SALLY GIBERT: Maybe they're
3 going to go climbing. Maybe they're going to
4 go backpacking. Maybe they're going to go
5 skiing.

6 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, I think we're
7 getting too deep into this.

8 NANCY BALE: I'm just trying to
9 bring a point up about our purpose, we don't
10 want to --

11 SALLY GIBERT: I don't think you
12 want to go there.

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think you're
14 delving in too deep for this purposes of this
15 fact sheet.

16 NANCY BALE: Okay.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I appreciate
18 the point but I think you're getting -- don't
19 want to get into the ANILCA and --

20 NANCY BALE: I know it's a point
21 of discussion in the Backcountry Plan with
22 respect to landing for flightseeing versus
23 landing for access to mountaineering. Just
24 like everything else in the park, some of those
25 original activities are now in the minority

1 with the users. Just like what we were
2 discussing about backpacking. It's in the
3 minority versus people who want to drive and
4 fly. So it's just a park purpose issue because
5 it is a national park. It's not a state park
6 and it's not a rec area.

7 We can go back to -- I guess I
8 don't want to have any pictures of people -- I
9 don't know, there's a certain seriousness when
10 you land in the park I think.

11 PAUL ANDERSON: So you don't
12 want to have any pictures of people having fun?

13 NANCY BALE: Aunt Martha's
14 centennial with the t-shirts. You know, Aunt
15 Martha's birthday. We're on the Ruth Glacier
16 for Aunt Martha's birthday. You know? I don't
17 know. Do I make sense to anybody?

18 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What you're
19 sensing is this: You want a picture that shows
20 more grandeur of the landscape as opposed to an
21 appreciation of the grandeur?

22 NANCY BALE: It's just that --
23 it's --

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Because I'm
25 sure we could find plenty of other photos of

1 people landing on glaciers.

2 NANCY BALE: One of those -- you
3 know, you're landing on a glacier because you
4 want to see the park; right? So you're
5 focusing on the park, not on even a picture of
6 you next to the plane.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's the
8 point. It's sort of Facebook, I've been to a
9 party.

10 NANCY BALE: And so that's all.
11 That's where I'm going.

12 SALLY GIBERT: I got that. I
13 definitely got that. And I thought about that
14 on this picture. And I almost didn't include
15 it for that reason. But I do remember that
16 Suzanne in one of her very first presentations,
17 she showed a picture that was -- captured the
18 same sort of joy but without the Facebook part.

19 TOM GEORGE: And I bet we could
20 get that from her.

21 SALLY GIBERT: And I thought
22 surely there'll be a better picture than this.
23 I agree with that.

24 TOM GEORGE: Okay. Fine.

25 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's a

1 show-offness that --

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: The point
3 you're making is really on track.

4 TOM GEORGE: But the essence
5 we're trying to get here is still the same,
6 that is to show the joy of that dimension of
7 visitor experience along with elsewhere the joy
8 of the -- like on the solitary climber photo or
9 something equivalent.

10 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Would it be
11 better to have a photo in the air of a --
12 without -- I mean, because not everybody lands
13 either.

14 SALLY GIBERT: Well, that's the
15 cover.

16 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. I'm
17 sorry. I didn't read the caption.

18 TOM GEORGE: On the one hand I
19 know we want to move this done and have it all
20 finished so we never have to look at it again.
21 On the other hand, it looks to me like we're
22 going to have to go find a couple other
23 pictures. And once you get those pictures,
24 somebody draft captions. I think we got the
25 essence of what we think the captions ought to

1 say or represent. Is it reasonable rather than
2 to continue to wordsmith this to death in the
3 remaining 30 minutes or 60 minutes of this
4 meeting or thereabouts to --

5 SALLY GIBERT: I think we're
6 good on the narrative. This discussion is
7 really valuable. I mean, wow.

8 TOM GEORGE: I think it's
9 helping really focus on what elements both
10 visually as well as some thoughts about what
11 the captions ought to have, especially since
12 we're talking about dragging pictures in that
13 we don't have before us. There's no way we can
14 actually finalize the captions. So I guess
15 what I'm suggesting is if we -- taking from
16 what you've got so far, trying to find a couple
17 more pictures, weed out some of the pictures
18 that didn't pass the test. And I'd argue,
19 unless Davyd feels strongly otherwise, that
20 probably the pictures of the helicopter going
21 by the two microphones is probably a lot lower
22 priority on the list than these other elements
23 that we've talked about.

24 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I agree.

25 TOM GEORGE: And then draft some

1 captions and then circulate that to the group.
2 Work it on e-mail so we can get this done and
3 moved on before our next meeting.

4 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So what
5 were the -- your proposal I think was have four
6 pictures.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I mean, it
8 doesn't have to be four. So basically the
9 first one about spectacular scenery,
10 flightseeing gets you there. Enjoying the
11 sights and sounds of nature by being in the
12 wilderness. And then something that shows, you
13 know, the conflict. You know, I would probably
14 aim for something from nature. A bird, a wolf
15 howling, something that too many flights can
16 overwhelm the sounds. And then do we want a
17 picture of the Council working? I don't know
18 that that's such a bad idea.

19 NANCY BALE: I have a lot of
20 pictures and a couple of them are really good.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So if the
22 Council were to -- yeah, I think it's easier to
23 --

24 TOM GEORGE: Boring. Picture of
25 people in a meeting? Come on. There's so many

1 richer things. I mean, I put the chunk of this
2 map way higher than a group of people sitting
3 around a meeting.

4 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think it
5 connects.

6 TOM GEORGE: If it's the right
7 picture, okay.

8 JOAN FRANKEVICH: What is the
9 title of the fact sheet?

10 SALLY GIBERT: There isn't --
11 right now. There's no caption to speak for the
12 main picture. And some of these samples,
13 they -- or at least one of them, they do use --
14 not that one. That one has a caption that
15 is -- what does the caption --

16 AMANDA SMITH: It says the sound
17 station of Ruth Glacier is barely visual above
18 the left plane. Well, it says soundscapes and
19 then the caption.

20 TOM GEORGE: We ought to strive
21 to have a caption on every picture just for the
22 reasons we've been talking about of using that
23 as a --

24 SALLY GIBERT: This is the one
25 from the Denali Resource Stewardship Strategy,

1 achieving better conditions for park resources.
2 And the photograph here is sheep. And the
3 little caption says Denali Resource Stewardship
4 Strategy will guide how the park manages its
5 resources including dall sheep. So this uses
6 the picture as a segway to explain the purpose
7 of it. So that would be another place to do
8 that with that main photo.

9 TOM GEORGE: Absolutely.

10 NANCY BALE: Well, you could
11 even use this first full quote.

12 SALLY GIBERT: Oh, and just have
13 that --

14 NANCY BALE: If you wanted that
15 first picture to be -- and then you would have
16 a big margin on the --

17 SALLY GIBERT: Did you see the
18 mock-up?

19 BRIAN OKONEK: Where is the
20 mock-up?

21 TOM GEORGE: The one on
22 cardboard.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Right now the
24 only thing over there on that one side is that
25 quote.

1 TOM GEORGE: And we certainly
2 ought to create a caption though and take
3 advantage. I would leave the quote separate.
4 I'd write a caption to emphasize one of these
5 points.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Okay.
7 Suggestions for that first page caption? You
8 can throw them out now.

9 TOM GEORGE: Yeah.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So any
11 other so-called big picture thoughts here?

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I just have
13 one more comment on this. So as we -- as
14 photos are selected, just keep in mind that the
15 layout will determine -- I mean, unless you
16 guys want to see the layout process as well,
17 we're going to hand this off to the person who
18 does this. And if the pictures are going to be
19 important it's going to be kind of important
20 for those of us who work at the park that
21 people look like they're having a good time.
22 So even your backpacker on the ridge line who's
23 accomplished, that should -- you know, people
24 resinate.

25 I mean, like any good brochure.

1 What do people look at? Faces. So the faces
2 of the people and it showing, like, wow, we're
3 in this really awesome place is going to be
4 important to Park Service who's going to
5 produce it. You know, it can't -- it can't be
6 so sterile in its approach that it doesn't look
7 like, wow, there's a human environment
8 happening here too. Even the picture of the
9 backpacker, it would -- it would resonate more
10 with me if I could see a face there that looked
11 like, yeah, I got to the top.

12 TOM GEORGE: You know the way
13 this game's played, you provide a couple
14 pictures that are better and we'll be happy to
15 substitute them.

16 SALLY GIBERT: First of all,
17 I'll have to say, I got these off the park Web
18 site.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, and
20 that's true. Now we're in a fact sheet. We're
21 in a very -- it's like taking a 30 minute
22 commercial and now you've got three seconds to
23 make a point.

24 SALLY GIBERT: For me if you've
25 got enough -- we're talking small pictures.

1 And if you've got a recognizable face in that
2 picture, to me the context of where that person
3 is, not their face. I mean, we get any old
4 happy face with a backpack on, I mean, to me
5 that doesn't -- I kind of like these because
6 they're -- they show this big space that
7 they're in.

8 TOM GEORGE: The challenge is
9 going to be though that you printed them here
10 pretty big. There's no way they're going to be
11 this big in this amount of space. They'll be
12 thumbnails.

13 SALLY GIBERT: This one was done
14 with thumbnails.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: But it loses
16 then the landscape.

17 Okay. So I'll tell you what,
18 you've done an awesome job on the text. That's
19 far more than I thought you were going to be
20 able to produce at this meeting. We're going
21 to take your suggestions for the photos but I'm
22 not going to promise that those are the ones
23 that either fit or get published. Okay. But I
24 will let you know if the person who lays this
25 out isn't able to make it work. So we're going

1 to produce a fact sheet that goes -- whether it
2 goes to D.C., it goes to the general public,
3 it's going to matter to us that it conveys
4 people come to the park and have a really great
5 time, and with that come a lot of management
6 challenges. That's why we have this group.
7 Okay. Just a comment.

8 SALLY GIBERT: So do you still
9 want --

10 TIM CUDNEY: Do you want another
11 barrage of pictures?

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It was
13 interesting to hear what was important to you
14 in the photographs. And, you know, it sounds
15 like we hear flightseeing, happy flightseers,
16 not too Facebooky. Somebody backpacking who's
17 impacted by people getting in there by
18 flightseeing. You had another. You had a
19 natural sounds one which is going to be -- and
20 if I can get a natural sounds one with sound
21 monitoring equipment, would be awesome. And
22 then you kind of said you wanted this cover
23 photo too that kind of told the story. You're
24 in Denali, you have a plane. Okay. I mean,
25 like, it told the story all in that one shot.

1 Okay. Does that --

2 TIM CUDNEY: If you allowed us
3 to fly lower we could take pictures of those
4 happy people. Have firsthand information.

5 PAUL ANDERSON: Take a picture
6 when -- you mean the people that are
7 backpacking?

8 SALLY GIBERT: So do you want
9 some --

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I would like
11 you to --

12 SALLY GIBERT: Do you want some
13 sample captions even if you change them? Or do
14 you want some of the narratives that they're --
15 that Joan was just playing around with?

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think you
17 should send that to me along with what you've
18 kind of finalized with text. And I would like
19 to work with the person who's really going to
20 lay this out and for them to say we'll need a
21 landscape photo here and a portrait size here.
22 I mean, it's kind of like PowerPoint. It kind
23 of determines what you get to put there. And
24 then we'll kind of go from there. And then for
25 me to get a draft put out and shoot it back out

1 to people and say, okay, what do you think?

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So once
3 we see it all together we can --

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. Great.

6 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, if we could
7 see a draft, that's fine.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Great.

9 TOM GEORGE: Sold.

10 MIRIAM VALENTINE: There we go.
11 Right on.

12 SALLY GIBERT: So I'll send you
13 the narrative that we discussed today. And
14 Joan can send her language.

15 NANCY BALE: I have a couple
16 caption ideas but we don't have to talk about
17 them here.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Caption ideas
19 send to her. Send them to her and then copy to
20 everybody. Just use our mailing list because
21 she's on it. Just send it out there.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Caption ideas
23 to everyone?

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You know, the
25 thing to think about is when you start doing

1 this layout space becomes critical. So you
2 might have the really awesome caption that flat
3 out won't fit. So don't be so connected to
4 something that you can't let it go.

5 TOM GEORGE: I think your
6 strategy's right. You got the intent. Work on
7 it and just circulate a draft. I mean, for us
8 to otherwise try and -- is counter productive.

9 SALLY GIBERT: This is minimal
10 formatting I was doing with no pictures and
11 just trying to kind of pour something out of
12 three columns. Even that was hard trying to
13 figure out where -- like, where to float these
14 little things. And, you know, so I totally get
15 that. So definitely bring some artistic
16 expression.

17 Okay. So ideas go to Miriam.
18 Copy everybody. And then you'll get back with
19 a final --

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I'll try to
21 get back with you in the month of November when
22 it's on the schedule for the person in the park
23 to lay it out. So you kind of have an idea. I
24 mean, we're not the highest priority anymore.
25 We were. But we kind of bumped off the list

1 for a while. And so now we'll try to get back.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So what do
3 we have left? We've got the long-term -- I do
4 think -- so we'll do that next and last. And
5 we have time to still schedule our next
6 meeting.

7 I did look at the Web site in
8 part to -- I was looking for pictures. And so
9 I was using the Web site. And I know that we
10 gave you guys some recommendations a year or
11 two ago for how to improve it. And most of
12 those changes haven't been made.

13 TIM CUDNEY: Yeah, membership
14 still is not updated.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Membership's not
16 updated.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

18 SALLY GIBERT: I can just hand
19 you this.

20 NANCY BALE: And the biggest
21 change I would suggest is that it needs to be
22 easier to get to.

23 SALLY GIBERT: I know how to do
24 it.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Oh, okay.

1 You have a suggestion. Right on.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Under -- when you
3 go to the home page you get -- your first
4 choices are: Plan your visit, photos, history,
5 culture, science, teachers, kids, park
6 management. Okay. So intuitively I thought if
7 it was going to be anywhere it would be under
8 park management. Bingo, we are. But when you
9 click park management you get partners you
10 still don't see us. You get partners,
11 statistics, laws and policies, your tax dollars
12 at work, park planning and fire management.

13 So I've done this several times
14 when I didn't know where it was. And I've gone
15 to that, I'm going now I know it ought to be
16 here but, you know, I don't see it, it's not
17 here. And then none of these categories are
18 going to do it. So then I go to my --
19 somewhere I've got a link to it. So I go back
20 to my link and then I see where did it take me.
21 I worked backwards. So even if you figure out
22 that it's in park planning, which is pretty
23 much a stretch, then you have your choices of
24 plans and projects open for review, active
25 plans and project, learn about planning,

1 newsletters and updates, staying involved,
2 contact us, Denali Park road capacity. Again,
3 you are like -- well, it turns out that we're
4 under plans and projects open for review.
5 That's just not good.

6 So my suggestion is to take us
7 and stick us right under park management, so
8 when you open up park management in addition to
9 park statistics, laws and policies, dollars at
10 work. And I would suggest that they go right
11 under partners because that's the other
12 place -- when people can't find it that's the
13 place they look is under partners. But you
14 open up partners and it's all -- there's, like,
15 two or three nonprofits and there's nothing
16 there either. So if you put it right under
17 partners, not underneath but next to partners
18 in fairly close to the top then people will be
19 able to find it.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So there's a
21 -- there's --

22 PAUL ANDERSON: So the answer is
23 we'll see what we can do. And while that seems
24 really logical to you, there's a format that we
25 use. And so I can't promise. What you

1 suggested is a really good idea. But because
2 we don't -- we have to stay within the
3 structure provided for Park Service Web sites.
4 I can't promise.

5 Do you have another suggestion if
6 your first one doesn't work? Like I always tell
7 people, go in the search box --

8 SALLY GIBERT: I tried to find
9 any comments about overflights on the pilot
10 page and there wasn't. There's no links from
11 the pilot page to the overflight page.

12 ERIKA BENNETT: Somewhere on the
13 pilot page there are all these links and not a
14 single thing about overflights advisory.

15 PAUL ANDERSON: So you know how
16 the pilot page came to be findable? Suzanne
17 Rust couldn't find it so she came to the park
18 and said, give me two hours with your Web team,
19 I'll show you how to fix your Web site. And
20 when she walked away after two hours they were
21 going, wow.

22 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Really? So
23 she's the whiz at that stuff?

24 PAUL ANDERSON: Compared to
25 them.

1 SALLY GIBERT: And I think there
2 needs to be a new link on our site for
3 recommendations because there isn't one.
4 There's one for Best Practices that you can
5 find, but there isn't one for recommendations.
6 There should be one place where all the
7 recommendations are compiled.

8 Yeah, council membership is out
9 of date. I mean, Jim Edwards is even still on
10 there.

11 Under future meetings you can
12 find out about future meetings by visiting the
13 staying involved page. I went to the staying
14 involved page, there's no information about the
15 meeting and it's not on the calendar. I
16 suggest taking that link out of there. Park
17 news releases, that worked. Or subscribing to
18 the RSS feed, and the last RSS feed about this
19 council was May, 2010. So I suggest either
20 dumping the RSS feed or making it current or
21 getting it off of the -- not using the RSS feed
22 to get information.

23 PAUL ANDERSON: So do you think
24 we could take the minutes of this meeting and
25 take a tape of your last five minutes and play

1 it for our webmaster?

2 SALLY GIBERT: Sure.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: We have ten
4 people in the park that are dedicated to
5 keeping that Web site up-to-date. And you've
6 just decimated the whole Web site. I mean,
7 it's really -- I hear comments that are
8 absolutely right on, they're absolutely
9 critical. We need to go back there and get
10 those things all fixed. And there's some great
11 ideas as to how we ought to do that. I'd love
12 to have the webmaster here. And I went to this
13 page and this said to go to that page which
14 said go to this page. And when I got there
15 there wasn't anything there. To talk to a live
16 person dial 0; right? We're not here right
17 now. But anyway, I apologize. It's very
18 embarrassing when that happens and we'll pay
19 attention to it.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I mean, I
21 know it's hard because the State and local Web
22 page that updates -- you know, we're supposed
23 to be posting all of our State letters. There
24 hasn't been a letter posted since January
25 because we lost our webmaster all together.

1 And there was one more
2 suggestion, and that is on the Denali
3 Overflights page, our main page. Down at the
4 bottom there's some meetings and some
5 transcripts and things that are available.
6 They're kind of spotty and not all the meetings
7 are there. But then when you click on a
8 meeting or documents and you go to that page it
9 has other things that aren't on the first page.
10 And they really ought to be in one place and
11 it's incomplete. So if you could just take
12 that stuff on the bottom of the first page, put
13 it on the meetings -- meeting documents page so
14 it's all in one place and then make sure it's
15 more complete.

16 Anyway that was my -- pass it
17 over.

18 NANCY BALE: The picture on the
19 overflights page is really nice.

20 SALLY GIBERT: Yes.

21 NANCY BALE: It shows the wings.

22 SALLY GIBERT: It's a nice
23 picture.

24 MIKE YORKE: And to give Paul's
25 folks some credit, right there at the top it

1 does say update, that there's a meeting on the
2 28th at the Marriott Residence Inn.

3 SALLY GIBERT: Wasn't there.

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Did you hit a
5 link for an RSS feed on this page?

6 MIKE YORKE: No. I just -- Tom,
7 did it. Google search overflight Denali. Came
8 up with this.

9 TOM GEORGE: A Google search did
10 bring us right to this page. I mean, that's
11 the one good thing going is that there's enough
12 indexing or tagging or whatever the hell goes
13 on underneath that a Google search at least
14 with those terms got us there in one step.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So the search
16 box on the Web -- on the home page itself, if
17 you put in overflights --

18 SALLY GIBERT: I did get there.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So you
20 were just trying to, like, really do it the
21 right way and were unable.

22 TOM GEORGE: But I guess my take
23 would be over things she said, because it's
24 searchable and can be found even from outside
25 the park page, that focusing on those details

1 within and around it is -- I realize you're
2 kind of trapped in some structure nationally
3 about your -- that may be difficult to change
4 to actually make it easier to navigate in a
5 logical way. But certainly to focus on
6 cleaning up the elements on the page itself I
7 think would have the most benefit for time
8 spent if you can't do everything all at once.

9 PAUL ANDERSON: We'll get on it.
10 It's winter, must have plenty of time; right?

11 SALLY GIBERT: Anyway, I'm done
12 with my little rant on the Web site.

13 PAUL ANDERSON: I do appreciate
14 that, the questions and comments, because
15 we've -- over the last ten years one of the
16 things that we've tried to do is force
17 technology as a means of communicating more
18 effectively. And in a traditional organization
19 that's very, very difficult to do. We are a
20 group of interpreters, we give programs, we
21 give walks and talks and campfire programs.
22 And if you're not here then it's out of the
23 realm. And so this whole thing has been sort
24 of challenging.

25 And it wasn't until maybe two

1 years ago that a group of communicators was
2 able to sit down and say, you know, we really
3 need to rethink how we are staffing our
4 communication program in the park. Because
5 70 percent of the initial contact with our park
6 comes through the Internet. And there's nobody
7 assigned to it. I mean, that needs to be --
8 when you go to the park and you get your park
9 brochure you don't expect there to be errors on
10 it. You expect it to be consistent and
11 correct. And the Web site needs to be exactly
12 the same way. So I'll keep after it.

13 TIM CUDNEY: Another question,
14 same thing I asked Mike. I know you guys had
15 the Eielson camp for a while. Is that now
16 going to be part of the FAA webcams? Is that
17 what I understand?

18 ERIC DENKEWALTER: I got notice
19 that they were planning to do that.

20 TIM CUDNEY: We flew out there a
21 couple weeks ago I knew that was part of the
22 plan but I don't know whether --

23 PAUL ANDERSON: It just went in
24 last -- two weeks ago. And it's part of -- I
25 don't know what that program is but it's a

1 full-time webcam and it's supposed to be a
2 fairly wide-range view.

3 TIM CUDNEY: That's one of
4 the --

5 MIKE YORKE: We do have weather
6 cams. You can go there, the weather cam's Web
7 site. And I'm not trying to push you off, Tim,
8 but you can go there and find out what's
9 commissioned, what's on the -- to be
10 commissioned, I'm sorry.

11 TIM CUDNEY: Is it up, Eric?

12 ERIC DENKEWALTER: No, not
13 quite. I talked to her last spring and said,
14 hey, we were scheduled for 2010. And she said,
15 working on it.

16 MIKE YORKE: Pat Showmer?

17 ERIC DENKEWALTER: What's her
18 name?

19 MIKE YORKE: Showmer.

20 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah.

21 TOM GEORGE: Nancy.

22 MIKE YORKE: Nancy.

23 ERIC DENKEWALTER: So then I
24 heard -- either I got an e-mail or I got some
25 notification that they were getting ready to do

1 it and that they were talking about doing it
2 this fall.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: It was installed
4 two weeks on the visitor center at Eielson.

5 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Okay. Then I
6 haven't -- I guess --

7 TOM GEORGE: Well, it's often a
8 while before it's commissioned even after it's
9 installed. So it may not be --

10 MIKE YORKE: They run a test.

11 TOM GEORGE: They're the FAA
12 after all.

13 PAUL ANDERSON: So we're going
14 to run a link to it from our home page.
15 Because you want to see whether the mountain's
16 out, go to the FAA webcam.

17 MIKE YORKE: You know the app
18 that's available commercially, don't you? I'll
19 get it to you at the break. It's a good one.
20 Real good.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So it's
22 now ten to 4:00. Before 4:30 we need to make
23 sure we've scheduled our next meeting. Do you
24 want to do that first and then we can talk
25 about --

1 One consideration about the next
2 meeting is I think I'm still going to be a
3 State employee through the middle of February.
4 And I don't think Claire's appointment's going
5 to be able to get through before that. But
6 after that, like, by the spring meeting I may
7 not be able to be chair anymore. So if you
8 want me to stay at chair for the time being
9 then it would be good to do it, you know, like,
10 by the middle or -- I guess even if I'm here
11 and I'm not -- how long do you think it --

12 CLAIRE LECLAIR: About six
13 months. Maybe a little more depending upon how
14 timely we put in the request.

15 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I guess
16 it's not going to make any difference when it
17 is because even if I'm not a State employee or
18 the appointment doesn't come through I guess
19 I'm still a member.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: If you're
21 still okay -- if it's still okay with the State
22 of Alaska that you're representing them.
23 That's what the question would be.

24 SALLY GIBERT: I think the --
25 Claire, do you know if that's the intent?

1 CLAIRE LECLAIR: Maybe we should
2 make that clear when Ben writes up the letter
3 that you would remain until I received approval
4 from the secretary.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that was my
6 recommendation in the summer that he set it up
7 that way. That way there's no gaps. Otherwise
8 there could be a time period where there's no
9 State representation and that wouldn't be good.
10 So in that case it doesn't -- if that's in
11 there it really doesn't -- I think if there's
12 that intent that's written into the State's
13 letter --

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

15 SALLY GIBERT: -- then there
16 shouldn't be any problem.

17 BRIAN OKONEK: The intent that
18 Sally would remain the chair until Claire's
19 appointment is --

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Right.

21 TOM GEORGE: Confirmed.

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So let's plan
23 that you will chair the spring meeting. And
24 all I would ask is that we hold a meeting that
25 not only can everyone attend but that there's

1 substance to discuss. So, like, we'll look at
2 the fact sheet. But that will -- there has
3 been time to talk with the north side
4 operators.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Well, I think the
6 intention is to pass recommendations for north
7 side --

8 BRIAN OKONEK: Best Practices.

9 SALLY GIBERT: -- regardless
10 of --

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Whether
12 they're -- okay.

13 SALLY GIBERT: So that's in some
14 ways putting pressure on the interest in
15 stakeholders to participate.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

17 SALLY GIBERT: That's kind of
18 how I'm seeing it anyway. And so we have that.

19 And we certainly will want to
20 continue our discussions on our/your collective
21 future. And we'll be -- actually be done by
22 then.

23 NANCY BALE: I was hoping Davyd
24 would have an analysis of summer data.

25 DAVYD BECTHKAL: By that point I

1 definitely should.

2 NANCY BALE: And also have the
3 opportunity to suggest with plenty of time any
4 sound station placement we might have an idea
5 of one to do. So would we need to meet before
6 a certain date in order to make that
7 suggestion?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Davyd, when
9 is that? When are you --

10 DAVYD BECTHKAL: I do most of
11 the planning and permitting for that actually
12 starting in late February and March. I even
13 got it done a little bit sooner than that. I
14 was good working on it in February this year.
15 So suggestions are relevant any time up pretty
16 much up to I would say probably the end of
17 February, where after that point I can still
18 plan out stations but it's harder to get them
19 through the compliance process and all the
20 permitting, that type of stuff.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So is it
22 sounding like a February meeting then? And are
23 you thinking about if there's one in February
24 trying to get another one in before?

25 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I think

1 that -- I don't think we can just get by with a
2 February meeting. I think if we just have two
3 meetings it's going to have to be later.

4 TOM GEORGE: March-ish.

5 SALLY GIBERT: Would you rather
6 we just have one more formal meeting before
7 next summer? Are there problems?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think
9 what's hard -- what I've seen with the dynamic
10 of the group is that we kind of get all
11 crunched. And I was almost going to suggest
12 the Council has the ability to have a working
13 meeting as a council or a closed meeting where
14 you kind of just sit and talk. And then the
15 following day have the public meeting part of
16 it. I mean, like, if you're trying to really
17 maximize your time together, it makes more
18 sense to spend two days together and get it all
19 hashed out. I don't want to meet just for the
20 sake of meeting. I want you to meet and you
21 feel like it was a valuable use of your time.
22 So, I mean, whenever that makes sense to you.
23 I mean, we can run two more meetings.

24 I mean, one of the things we
25 really are looking at now is travel

1 restrictions. Your travel counts towards our
2 ceiling. So, like, meeting in Anchorage
3 actually works better than meeting throughout
4 the state.

5 NANCY BALE: This is a great
6 venue. Thank you.

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So that's
8 also logistics to think about.

9 MIKE YORKE: To backstep a
10 little here, Suzanne had to leave and she asked
11 me to bring this up. She would like to get the
12 working group Jan. 10 or Feb. 10. So first
13 week in Jan., first week after, if that makes
14 any impact.

15 BRIAN OKONEK: Is that -- if we
16 could -- that meeting could be, you know, done
17 with and we could have a meeting in the end of
18 February sometime.

19 MIKE YORKE: And I think that's
20 --

21 BRIAN OKONEK: And that would
22 give us enough lead time for some of these
23 things to actually maybe be implemented by this
24 coming summer.

25 MIKE YORKE: And then if the

1 working group choose Jan., no harm, or if they
2 choose Feb., no harm because we're at the end
3 of Feb.

4 TOM GEORGE: End of Feb., early
5 March, something in that time frame.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So just one
7 meeting before?

8 TOM GEORGE: I think so. I
9 mean, do we have other things we're trying
10 to --

11 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The next
12 steps of the Council for these next two years
13 is -- could be a working day in itself; right?
14 So are you kind of considering the February
15 meeting as a two-day meeting? One to do this,
16 like, visioning, brainstorming as a group and
17 then one to do the work of the Council? Or do
18 you want to break it apart?

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I'd be more
20 inclined to break it apart, but people have to
21 come from out of town. So it's easier for them
22 to come from out of town for a two-day meeting.

23 BRIAN OKONEK: And that first
24 part of it, the first day might be able to be
25 more of an afternoon type of meeting. Start at

1 1:00 and go hard for four hours.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I mean, that
3 whole visioning, let's figure out our future
4 piece usually takes more time than people kind
5 of give it.

6 SALLY GIBERT: And I think it
7 also might take more than one meeting
8 ultimately, too. And if we can't -- let's see,
9 the next -- two meetings before the end of
10 September. So we could do, like, one in late
11 winter, one -- then focus maybe more on -- I
12 think the easier thing to do is going to be
13 north side.

14 I see two things that are really
15 important this year before summer. And one is
16 to, you know, make sure that there's something
17 moving forward for north side to test. And
18 then the other thing is to, you know, seriously
19 start trying to get a handle on what it is that
20 the Council or some other thing, mechanism,
21 would be doing in the future.

22 And in terms of the order, like,
23 if we tried to do it all in one meeting, like,
24 a day-and-a-half meeting, it would probably be
25 better to do the north side one, take that

1 afternoon and do that. And then have the next
2 day be a -- get the hard concrete work out of
3 the way and then have kind of the brainstorming
4 of what's next. Whether that's one meeting or
5 two and whether we would want to have more than
6 one discussion --

7 BRIAN OKONEK: I was just
8 thinking the north side of stuff I think is
9 more of a meeting we want to have as a public
10 meeting. The brainstorming for the next two
11 years of what this Council's going to do, we
12 could probably have in a more informal
13 closed-door sort of meeting. I mean, if we're
14 going to have -- that first meeting wasn't
15 going to be, you know, the open public meeting.

16 SALLY GIBERT: So can we
17 actually have a closed-door meeting where all
18 of us are here as opposed to a meeting where we
19 don't entertain public comment?

20 MIKE YORKE: You can? Wow.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: We can sit
22 closer together and not in a U?

23 I have a suggestion. The first
24 step in my mind to figure out whether we want
25 to sunset in two years or not is to figure out

1 what do we have yet to accomplish? Like, maybe
2 going back to that brainstorming list from the
3 first year and going through. Try to create a
4 list of things is it we'd like to -- you know,
5 and then can we accomplish that in two years?
6 If we can't then how do -- you know, so to me
7 that's a pretty big move in and of itself. And
8 it's a pretty big decision.

9 So I almost see that as a two
10 part process. So it might be good to have a
11 whole day meeting in January to just talk about
12 that and nothing else, and spend the whole day
13 talking about what else would we like to
14 accomplish, how can we do that, can we do that
15 in two years, what would it look like after;
16 that would be the focus of that meeting. Then
17 after the work group has met, sometime later,
18 late February, maybe early March, we finalize
19 the Best Practices for the north side and
20 continue that conversation. Because I think
21 that's -- I need time to process. I can't talk
22 about it one meeting and make a decision. So I
23 would like to talk about it, have some time to
24 process it, and talk about it again to
25 finalize. Does that make sense? It makes two

1 meetings.

2 SALLY GIBERT: And the other
3 thing is that I'm not sure that there's any
4 value in having a closed meeting.

5 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Yeah, it could
6 be open. And actually to discuss what the
7 format might be if it's different after two
8 years having these other stakeholders actually
9 is pretty key. But if we could maybe have a
10 meeting pretty much -- so do that soon. I
11 mean, earlier have two meetings. Do the
12 earlier meeting just kind of think about the
13 future.

14 SALLY GIBERT: So starting with
15 maybe the brainstorming list and then seeing
16 what comes of that.

17 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And then --

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: If I hear the
19 word M-E-E-T-I-N-G again I'm going to --

20 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. What
21 would you like, Charlie?

22 TOM GEORGE: Miriam, is there
23 significant difference in costs between holding
24 two independent meetings versus one -- a
25 two-day meeting?

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Well, like,
2 it's --

3 TOM GEORGE: I mean, certainly
4 if people are traveling that's two trips rather
5 than one.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Like, you
7 know, so --

8 TOM GEORGE: Well, I guess you
9 guys are all traveling too, aren't you? So I
10 guess from that standpoint actually to try and
11 have a two-day meeting to allow more time
12 including an overnight as time to process,
13 absolutely right, we need time to process. On
14 the other hand, rather than having two separate
15 meetings, actually try a two-day meeting,
16 again, with some well defined objectives up
17 front.

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: See how far
19 you get.

20 TOM GEORGE: See how far we get.
21 And it gives the evening which is also time to
22 interact outside the room which always has been
23 a good thing in the past. Who knows what
24 skeletons will come out of the closet. So I
25 guess I think we should try that just even from

1 the cost perspective.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And maybe aim
3 for late February.

4 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, late
5 February.

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: And it also
7 gives us time to have another meeting should we
8 determine at that point we need it. Does that
9 work better?

10 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Is two days
12 better?

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah.

14 MIKE YORKE: The Council will
15 meet two to four times a year upon call or
16 advance of the DFO. All meetings of the
17 Council are subject to provision of the FACA.
18 All meetings are open to the public.

19 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Okay. So no
20 closed meetings.

21 MIKE YORKE: Then it says the
22 subcommittees at the option of DFO -- we can
23 have subcommittees. So I think maybe you could
24 do what you're saying.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So in the big

1 FACA book of rules on how to run the meeting --
2 you're absolutely right, why would you close a
3 meeting that you want public input? You
4 wouldn't. If you -- if the public wants to sit
5 and hear you guys kibitz about the -- I mean,
6 I'm also thinking of the value to the public.
7 So is there a value to the public to sit and
8 watch the group process eight hours of where's
9 our future going? If you think there is, right
10 on. I mean, I just want them to know up front
11 that's what that meeting's going to be like
12 that day. And it may or may not be worth their
13 time. The second day where you're certainly
14 coming up with the Best Practices for the north
15 side, absolutely. Yeah, you know? So it
16 doesn't matter. I mean, you know, it -- we
17 would probably have it a little more informally
18 for visioning session.

19 SALLY GIBERT: I would rather do
20 north side first.

21 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Same thing
22 too. Let's kind of finish with what we're
23 doing and then think future.

24 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yes.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So a

1 two-day meeting in late February to discuss
2 those two topics. Okay.

3 TOM GEORGE: Sounds good.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: -- the reports
5 back from John and how last year went? Somehow
6 we got to get the feedback coming back to us.

7 NANCY BALE: And then too --

8 TOM GEORGE: Which can happen
9 over e-mail.

10 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah,
11 whatever. We want that sooner. Doesn't have
12 to be a report. We want it as part of our --

13 JOAN FRANKEVICH: So the first
14 page like a typical meeting with numerous
15 agenda items. And the second day just future
16 planning.

17 CHARLIE SASSARA: Actually on
18 this one which is their reports, I would push
19 us to have reports to come to us not in this
20 format. I think it's a waste of our time
21 unless there's discussion and decision making.
22 If there's decision making that's where our --
23 that's where we're best -- most highest value
24 is when we're together. But just getting
25 information, it's not that good a deal because

1 it wastes the opportunity of us being together.

2 SALLY GIBERT: Sometimes
3 especially if there's visuals or complicated
4 science.

5 TOM GEORGE: It depends I think
6 on the topic. But certainly I think the point
7 is we shouldn't have to wait for another
8 meeting to get the information.

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: That's a good
10 way of putting it. Like, for example, John's
11 information. We should have that now so we can
12 digest it.

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So
14 Paul is suggesting that it just get sent to the
15 council members.

16 TOM GEORGE: Yes.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Maybe it's
18 something we include on the Web site of other
19 documents for members of the public who are
20 also interested in that.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Is there any
22 other informational reporting that we could get
23 to us that we're looking forward to?

24 TOM GEORGE: Well, Nancy was
25 interested in a summary of last summer's sound

1 inventory; right? So, I mean, that's if
2 there's a document that can come up sooner
3 rather than later. And, again, the thing there
4 is if we looked it over and people have
5 questions or there's significant discussion now
6 we can make an agenda item out of that.

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Exactly.

8 TOM GEORGE: But we don't have
9 to wait for the meeting to get it.

10 CHARLIE SASSARA: Right. There
11 you go.

12 TOM GEORGE: And in fact if
13 people don't have questions that really warrant
14 a separate discussion about it then we don't
15 necessarily have to chew up meeting time. So
16 we'll have those questions hopefully in advance
17 so that whoever comes to talk about that
18 subject can hopefully bring answers rather than
19 hearing about it for the first time then and
20 having to go back and get it and three more
21 months goes by.

22 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, that's
23 good.

24 NANCY BALE: I for instance
25 really enjoyed the presentation on the sound on

1 the listening session. And I had received it
2 in e-mail. But because a lot of people had
3 different questions and we used it to relate
4 back to some other topics that weren't in the
5 presentation. I felt that was quite useful.

6 TOM GEORGE: And I think that
7 kind of thing -- yeah, I mean, we had it as an
8 agenda item. Davyd and I tried to but weren't
9 successful in getting out a bunch earlier yet
10 to give you even more time to absorb it. But
11 we were at least trying to get it to you so you
12 could look at it before you came to the meeting
13 so it wasn't being revealed to you for the
14 first time at the meeting. And I think we'll
15 try and do better with anything like that in
16 the future to get it out quicker.

17 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So
18 looking at the 28th and 29th of February as the
19 dates.

20 NANCY BALE: I have three days
21 off in a row. The 15th, 16th and 17th. I
22 don't know if that's too early for people.

23 MIKE YORKE: You guys are
24 getting right into Iditarod.

25 NANCY BALE: It may be less

1 convenient for you.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: It's not as
3 much a problem for me as I think it's a problem
4 for Suzanne. But she's probably the only one
5 with young children. It doesn't matter that
6 much to me.

7 TOM GEORGE: Is that spring
8 break?

9 MIKE YORKE: No, March -- March
10 is spring break. Kind of the first week in
11 March along with the Iditarod.

12 NANCY BALE: March 12th through
13 the 16th.

14 TOM GEORGE: So we need to avoid
15 that.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: With a show
17 of hands, does February 15th, 16th, 17th work
18 for the majority of you folks?

19 AMANDA SMITH: 17th, I'll be
20 gone. 16th I'll be gone.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. How
22 does the -- we think it's also going to effect
23 Suzanne. Does the 28th and 29th effect
24 anybody?

25 TOM GEORGE: I think I'm going

1 to be out of state but I can't swear to it.

2 NANCY BALE: It's a Tuesday,
3 Wednesday. Not our typical configuration. But
4 it wouldn't be any harder for me any other day
5 of the week.

6 MIKE YORKE: Would you look at
7 Anchorage also, Miriam?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Look
9 at the first week in March.

10 MIKE YORKE: You're in the
11 Iditarod there.

12 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, and I think
13 I'm out of state that day.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So Nancy,
15 you'd be okay in asking for two days off the
16 28th and 29th?

17 NANCY BALE: That's Tuesday,
18 Wednesday?

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Or it could
20 be Monday, Tuesday but Tom is gone.

21 TOM GEORGE: Well, I may be gone
22 that -- if I'm gone I'm gone probably from that
23 weekend which is a conference in Seattle
24 through the following week over to a Montana
25 conference and back.

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So look at
2 the calendar starting March 5th.

3 MIKE YORKE: Iditarod.

4 NANCY BALE: I have a day off on
5 the 9th prior to break. And I don't know if
6 some people are trying to jump-start their
7 vacations on that day.

8 TOM GEORGE: Earlier in the
9 week?

10 MIKE YORKE: Nope. March starts
11 on a Thursday. 2nd and 3rd is Iditarod.

12 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, but what
13 about that following Monday, Tuesday?

14 MIKE YORKE: We're back into
15 Feb.

16 TOM GEORGE: What about these
17 days?

18 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think March
19 is going to be dangerous. Push it back in
20 March. So the week -- we were looking at the
21 week -- February, excuse me. So the week prior
22 to that starts the week of February the 6th.

23 TOM GEORGE: Well, that's still
24 in the window of the user group meeting.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. 23rd,

1 24th.

2 TOM GEORGE: Well, what about --
3 did we dismiss that week of the 13th? I
4 thought there was one day that Amanda was out
5 but earlier in the week?

6 MIKE YORKE: She said 15th, 16th
7 she could do.

8 TOM GEORGE: 15, 16?

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Who did that
10 not work for?

11 NANCY BALE: Tim was going to be
12 gone; right Tim?

13 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tim is gone.
14 What about the last week of
15 March?

16 BRIAN OKONEK: Well, I'm just
17 thinking that we've had other meetings that
18 late and nothing -- anything we do doesn't
19 include that coming summer. It's, like, we've
20 lost a whole year.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So what's the
22 last week of January look like?

23 SALLY GIBERT: If you do the
24 last week of January you're forcing us into
25 another meeting later after the aviation --

1 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So let's stay
2 in the month of February. And you guys -- so
3 let's look at this again. The week of
4 February 6th, who is missing? Who can't come?
5 Amanda. Okay. The week of February 13th, Tim;
6 right?

7 TIM CUDNEY: Yep. Right now.
8 Yep.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. The
10 week of February 20th.

11 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Joan.

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Joan. Okay.
13 And the week of the 27th?

14 TOM GEORGE: I think I'm gone
15 that week.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

17 TOM GEORGE: But I'll try and
18 find out the answer to that promptly.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Tom, if
20 you're gone you're gone the whole week?

21 TOM GEORGE: I'm gone the whole
22 week. Yeah, there's conferences on both
23 weekends. The weekend 25, 26 and the weekend
24 of the first weekend of March.

25 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So you

1 guys decide. Let's do it in February.
2 Somebody's not going to be able to come
3 potentially. What do you want to do from a
4 timing perspective; right? So either Amanda
5 can't come or Joan can't come --

6 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Amanda and
7 Tim.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: And Tim can't
9 come. Or Tom can't. I mean, like --

10 MIKE YORKE: Since it's a
11 two-day, if they couldn't make one day -- I
12 realize there's some different things going on
13 but, you know, that might be a consideration.

14 SALLY GIBERT: Is there any
15 two-day combinations that somebody might be
16 able to make it one day?

17 BRIAN OKONEK: Make it half the
18 time?

19 MIKE YORKE: Yeah, there you go.
20 That's what I was trying to --

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Tim, are you
22 out of state?

23 TIM CUDNEY: I'm looking.

24 PAUL ANDERSON: So if it was
25 scheduled on Monday and Tuesday instead of

1 Thursday and Friday would that make a
2 difference on whether people could come?

3 TIM CUDNEY: I'm out from the
4 9th till 18th.

5 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Is there any
6 opportunity for you to call in while you're
7 away?

8 AMANDA SMITH: Possibly on the
9 early side of that week. Possibly.

10 SALLY GIBERT: Boy, trying to
11 phone in on a meeting like this?

12 BRIAN OKONEK: Tom, that'd be
13 torture.

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: How about the
15 2nd and 3rd of February? Did we discuss that?

16 BRIAN OKONEK: Well, what about
17 this? I think we might want to do is part of
18 the thing has been that, oh, the aviation
19 working group might not meet in January. Might
20 be in February. But maybe with the dynamics
21 we've got going here we need to push back the
22 aviation meets in January so that this group
23 can meet in full in February.

24 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Even if
25 that's the case you guys still don't have a

1 time when you're all free.

2 BRIAN OKONEK: What about early
3 February?

4 AMANDA SMITH: Is anybody a no
5 for the 2nd and 3rd?

6 PAUL ANDERSON: Yeah, if you
7 don't want a superintendent here it'll be okay.
8 But we're all tied up in a conference that
9 week.

10 BRIAN OKONEK: Not to downgrade
11 Paul's position, but you've given us a
12 fantastic subject to discuss, you know, and I
13 think we can discuss that.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: Better without
15 me, probably.

16 BRIAN OKONEK: I don't know if
17 it's better, but I think we've got a major goal
18 here to talk about. And maybe we can go ahead
19 and do that and let you enjoy another
20 conference.

21 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So how
22 about -- Paul is the week here in Anchorage and
23 so maybe we could do something where if we do
24 the 1st and the 2nd and then invite Paul to
25 join us for supper.

1 SALLY GIBERT: So you'll be
2 around, you could catch up with us and eat.

3 PAUL ANDERSON: Yes.

4 SALLY GIBERT: That's not
5 actually a bad idea because it would be nice to
6 have you have some communication with us
7 especially as we're looking long-term. Because
8 I think you actually are an important part of
9 the long-term future.

10 PAUL ANDERSON: Feel free to
11 schedule it the first week of February.

12 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So --

13 SALLY GIBERT: Well, if that
14 works.

15 MIRIAM VALENTINE: The 1st and
16 the 2nd or the 2nd and the 3rd of February?

17 NANCY BALE: I'd prefer it be
18 the Thursday, Friday unless that make's Paul's
19 participation -- just because then I can prep
20 my office for three days and then be gone for
21 the last two days. And it's usually quieter
22 the last two days of the week.

23 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So
24 February 2nd and 3rd then? And we'll get in
25 touch with Suzanne and let her know that.

1 TOM GEORGE: You're going to be
2 the one to make that call.

3 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. And so
4 is there any objection to holding it back here
5 in Anchorage? And then if the group feels it
6 wants another meeting we, like, do it out of
7 Anchorage then, a third meeting before the end
8 of the year. Does that kind of work? I mean,
9 then Paul gets to join us because he'll be
10 here.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I think
12 it's good to hold it here.

13 NANCY BALE: Yeah, this is a
14 nice setting.

15 SALLY GIBERT: In fact this room
16 is good. This is one of the first rooms we've
17 been in a long time where we didn't have fan
18 problems.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So we're
20 going to announce this meeting. It's going to
21 go on the federal register. And the agenda
22 that we're going to publish with it will
23 reflect the north side Best Practices first,
24 and the second day kind of like a visioning
25 session for the future of the Council.

1 SALLY GIBERT: Uh-huh.

2 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. Okay.

3 BRIAN OKONEK: Plus the south
4 side sound stuff from John.

5 PAUL ANDERSON: You'll have
6 that.

7 BRIAN OKONEK: But it doesn't
8 need to be on the agenda?

9 SALLY GIBERT: Well, we can add
10 things for questions and discussion if we need
11 to.

12 PAUL ANDERSON: He can get that
13 report out on e-mail within the next couple --

14 NANCY BALE: And that's plenty
15 soon enough for us to talk together about a
16 soundscape station placement, isn't it Davyd?

17 DAVYD BECTHKAL: Yes.

18 SALLY GIBERT: Another thing
19 that effects the cost of this operation are the
20 transcriptions. And Miriam and I have talked a
21 little bit about whether we need the
22 transcriptions. I personally think we need the
23 meeting recorded so that if there's any
24 questions we can go back and, you know, get
25 pieces of it written down. But I'm not sure if

1 we need full, you know, transcribed meeting
2 notes anymore. We still need -- we'll still
3 need some kind of documentation, summary of
4 outcomes. We've been a little bit spotty on
5 doing those. But I think that that -- I think
6 it would be -- we'd save a lot of money. What
7 does it cost?

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: About \$2,500.

9 NANCY BALE: I think that in the
10 interest -- especially if it would enhance our
11 long-term viability by reducing our costs then
12 if we wanted to be around, which I think it
13 would be a good idea to be around at least
14 until the end of the inventory, which is four
15 more years, right, then maybe if a process
16 begins to be in forming that. Maybe -- are
17 there inexpensive recording processes that
18 actually work? We'd have to.

19 MIRIAM VALENTINE: You know, I
20 think we fundamentally need to consider, you
21 know, why we're doing it. So while nobody has
22 told me that they've actually been referencing
23 the transcriptions, the fact that they're
24 readily available for any member of the public
25 to pull off the Web and look at. And, you

1 know, Sally, while I appreciate people's
2 sensitivity to the finances, if you feel any
3 amount of recording or formal documentation,
4 there is nobody that's going to listen to eight
5 hours of this. I mean, I just don't see that
6 happening.

7 SALLY GIBERT: That's true.

8 MIRIAM VALENTINE: So if you
9 feel that you need formal documentation or
10 integrity of the public processing for anybody
11 who hasn't been able to attend to go back then
12 we should still stick with transcription.
13 Because I think that the majority of the
14 public --

15 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Somebody --
16 can't quite come up their name -- mentioned she
17 reads them. And I've read the one meeting I
18 missed.

19 NANCY BALE: And I've done
20 selective reading.

21 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, if you
22 missed a meeting they're real valuable. That's
23 true.

24 TOM GEORGE: Well, I guess I'll
25 argue that our product are these various things

1 we turn out, not the every word that flows out
2 of our mouths in these meetings. And if in
3 fact we're not looking at meeting summaries or
4 other documents and things we produce along the
5 way we're missing the boat. I don't think we
6 need a full transcription and/or even
7 recording. I agree, eight hours of recording
8 would be way too much to paw through. I think
9 if anything we need to pay more attention to
10 the meeting summaries and the various products
11 we turn out and be looking at those. Those are
12 the trail through the years that's going to
13 either show that this effort was worthwhile or
14 not, not a whole bunch of transcriptions done
15 for very few people. So I think as a
16 cost-cutting measure I would support the notion
17 of discontinuing that and putting a little more
18 energy into some -- again, a two-page meeting
19 note summary or something.

20 NANCY BALE: Should we -- if we
21 did do what Tom suggests, should we maybe each
22 meeting nominate a secretary who would be
23 responsible for --

24 MIKE YORKE: No, you want one
25 standard person.

1 CHARLIE SASSARA: You need
2 somebody that's dedicated.

3 MIKE YORKE: Yep. You need a
4 dedicated person.

5 NANCY BALE: A member of the
6 Council or an outside person?

7 CHARLIE SASSARA: Outside.

8 PAUL ANDERSON: Outside person.

9 SALLY GIBERT: To do even a
10 summary?

11 NANCY BALE: Well, it was
12 Miriam.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Well, you know
14 Erika and I both take -- we take notes. And a
15 couple times we've collaborated and had a
16 pretty good summary. You know, it takes time
17 to do it. And I know for me sometimes I'm
18 taking notes and sometimes I'm doing meeting
19 stuff and I'm not taking any notes.

20 MIRIAM VALENTINE: It's 4:29.
21 We're going to continue with transcription
22 until we come up with a better way to do it.
23 How's that?

24 NANCY BALE: You want us to dig
25 into our pockets?

1 TOM GEORGE: I thought we just
2 came up with a better way to do it?

3 SALLY GIBERT: So the financial
4 thing, is that a significant impact on you?
5 Does it effect how many meetings we can have?
6 Would it effect the long-term longevity of the
7 organization?

8 PAUL ANDERSON: It doesn't work
9 like that.

10 NANCY BALE: You know, I would
11 be willing to sacrifice per diem and hotel
12 costs, I would be. Not that everyone else
13 would be. But in the interest of --

14 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I think if
15 people are truly looking at the transcription
16 then it's worth the cost. You know, it's a lot
17 of work. And we just don't seem to have a
18 level of controversy that would immediately
19 warrant that kind of formal documentation. But
20 it's a good record. But I agree with Tom,
21 there's other more tangible products that the
22 Council will be known for, not the
23 transcription. So we shouldn't think that it's
24 all sitting in that.

25 SALLY GIBERT: Well, and also

1 one of the reasons why there isn't as much
2 controversy as there might be is because we do
3 have them.

4 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay.

5 AMANDA SMITH: We could bring on
6 some controversy if you like.

7 MIRIAM VALENTINE: There you go.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. So I guess
9 we're going to keep the transcription. We've
10 got our meeting scheduled for February. And
11 we're going to -- we'll see how it goes to see
12 if we're going to need another meeting after
13 that depending how February goes. So we don't
14 know if there will be a so-called spring
15 meeting or not.

16 MIRIAM VALENTINE: I need 60
17 days for the register and the notes back in
18 D.C. So you'd be looking at, like, the very
19 end of March, early April would be the only
20 opportunity we have. Does that make sense?

21 SALLY GIBERT: Puts even more
22 pressure on the February meeting to deal with
23 the north side because otherwise it gets to be
24 too late.

25 TOM GEORGE: Well, I do have to

1 point out --

2 TIM CUDNEY: Sorry guys, I got
3 to run.

4 TOM GEORGE: Suzanne put out a
5 meeting, you know, a call for meeting dates and
6 stuff for a working group which identified the
7 --

8 MIKE YORKE: Jan. 8 and 9,
9 Feb. 7 and 9.

10 TOM GEORGE: -- January 8, Feb.
11 7, 9 and is waiting for comments back on that
12 right now.

13 BRIAN OKONEK: Just relay to her
14 what's happening here and --

15 TOM GEORGE: Well, we will and
16 see if she can maybe amend that or try and
17 amend that to aim for an earlier day. Just so
18 you know, I mean, that -- she'd already started
19 that ball rolling to try and actually see if we
20 can't get that group together. So we just kind
21 of wiped out the second wrap of dates that she
22 already extended to that group.

23 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Tom, do you
24 want to go ahead and check and see on those
25 later February dates?

1 TOM GEORGE: I'm happy to do
2 that. I'll make a call and see.

3 JOAN FRANKEVICH: To see if
4 those will work out for you?

5 TOM GEORGE: Yeah, sure. You
6 bet.

7 JOAN FRANKEVICH: Because I
8 could help alleviate things.

9 TOM GEORGE: Absolutely.

10 SALLY GIBERT: And if the
11 earlier date doesn't work the next question is
12 do we want to rethink our date.

13 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, if Tom
14 finds out that he doesn't have to go to the --
15 we can -- everybody's available.

16 TOM GEORGE: The last week of
17 February which would be great. I'll go check
18 on that.

19 SALLY GIBERT: So what was that
20 date?

21 TOM GEORGE: Well, the last week
22 of February. We didn't pick dates.

23 SALLY GIBERT: Maybe we should
24 and that could be the first priority if you're
25 not --

1 TOM GEORGE: Okay.

2 JOAN FRANKEVICH: I think Miriam
3 said the 28th and 29th.

4 MIKE YORKE: 28 and 29, Tuesday,
5 Wednesday.

6 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. 27,
7 28 --

8 TOM GEORGE: 27, 28.

9 MIRIAM VALENTINE: -- as the
10 fall back.

11 SALLY GIBERT: Is that the fall
12 back or is that the first priority?

13 MIKE YORKE: First priority is
14 2, 3.

15 TOM GEORGE: Well, actually if
16 we can get this other date then that would
17 leave those other dates available for the
18 working group. So I would say, yeah, the first
19 priority should be that.

20 SALLY GIBERT: 27, 28.

21 TOM GEORGE: 27, 28.

22 SALLY GIBERT: And then if that
23 doesn't work for Tom then we go to the 23.

24 Okay. Since we do have a little
25 bit of time left, and maybe you guys aren't

1 burned out, but since Paul might not be at the
2 next meeting for some of the brainstorming
3 stuff I would like to -- our longer-term
4 future, Paul do you have any ideas or concepts
5 of models short of the inflexible regulatory
6 approach and a flat out just keep doing exactly
7 what we're doing? Have you thought about any
8 other models or changing mission? I know I'm
9 probably putting you on the spot here, but if
10 you have any ideas that we could be thinking
11 about.

12 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, so I put
13 out my idea for what would be nice to achieve
14 in the end. One thing I could suggest would be
15 potential ways to go about it in addition to
16 the thing that you're doing right now would
17 just be that to focus on what are those places
18 that we want to be to follow into those
19 different categories. And what would the
20 criteria, so to speak, be like that would
21 promote the desired conditions?

22 MIRIAM VALENTINE: Okay. So
23 just for clarification the three things we
24 talked about that you suggested were an area
25 that would -- you could expect high aircraft

1 views. And because of the values that are
2 there or the surroundings that are there are
3 best appreciated or can be -- we'll have to
4 work on the -- high aircraft use is one. The
5 second one you talked about low aircraft use,
6 especially over designated wilderness. And the
7 third one was kind of something in between,
8 minimal or moderate. You had high, low and
9 none?

10 SALLY GIBERT: I thought that it
11 was high, none and than the majority of the
12 park would be sort of like what we're doing now
13 to kind of minimize aircraft traffic across the
14 board.

15 NANCY BALE: I think I might
16 have it word for word. I wrote fast. There
17 should be places that are best explored by air
18 that we permit a significant amount of air
19 traffic. That's one. Two: There should be
20 places where there are no overflights or few.
21 That's two. And there should be places where
22 aircraft are seen but not intrusive. We have
23 the transcript to --

24 AMANDA SMITH: Reasonably not to
25 alter someone's experience.

1 PAUL ANDERSON: So given those,
2 I mean, if we do what we're talking about here
3 it won't be like turning the backcountry upside
4 down. It will be a significant change in how
5 we look at managing, if you will, the
6 conditions in the park. And quite frankly,
7 having looked at what we have right now over
8 the past five or six years and where we are and
9 what's possible and what's feasible, it seems
10 to me like that if we could move in that
11 direction our chances of success will be higher
12 than continuing on the road that we're on right
13 now. Over all, not just the overflights but
14 the park soundscape monitoring and, you know,
15 some minor adjustments with the soundscape
16 levels, et cetera, et cetera. And I think in a
17 sense that it's the best win/win solution that
18 we'll get.

19 The people that want to be out
20 of sound and sight of airplanes will have
21 pretty significant opportunity to do so.
22 They'll know where to go. And they'll be
23 pretty much guaranteed that they're going to
24 see -- the people that want to see the park
25 from the air will have a great opportunity to

1 do that. And you'll do what's appropriate and
2 necessary to accommodate them. And then over
3 the rest of the park we can focus on, okay, how
4 do we manage this overflight issue in a way
5 that's compatible with all of the different
6 user interests.

7 That's not the way it looks
8 right now. That's not how the soundscape plan
9 came out. We talked earlier, you know, it's --
10 based on what we have today. You can look back
11 and say, how do you -- I mean, if you had met
12 every one of those soundscape standards how
13 would you continue to provide the kind of
14 aircraft operation in the park that we have
15 today? You can't because we've shown ourselves
16 that.

17 So given if we adopt or accept
18 that sort of concept, then the question is how
19 do we get that in the most effective way. And
20 it seems to me, like, how do you describe what
21 those three areas are? How do you describe
22 what they are, the characteristics of those
23 areas that we have to achieve, and then how
24 would we go -- and then where are they? And
25 then how would we go about achieving them?

1 What kind of tweaks or management actions might
2 we have to take to promote the compliance
3 that's necessary to achieve those conditions?
4 And come up with that list of things that say
5 here's what we think it should look like,
6 here's what we think the standards should look
7 like and here's the things that we should
8 promote as voluntary actions to achieve those
9 desired criteria.

10 Beyond that I don't have a whole
11 lot of wisdom to offer. But I can guarantee
12 you that if we can do something like that
13 everybody in the country would be wanting to
14 know how in the sam hill we did it.

15 CHARLIE SASSARA: What do you
16 think the horizon for that plan is? 10, 15, 50
17 years? What is it? Is that part of our
18 discussion?

19 PAUL ANDERSON: To achieve it?

20 CHARLIE SASSARA: I mean, the
21 target is -- this is the future state that's 20
22 years, 50 years, something like --

23 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, I mean, I
24 don't know what's reasonable. I would say --
25 how long do you want this to go on for? I want

1 it to go on in perpetuity.

2 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, the
3 reason it relates to this conversation is
4 that it underlines a lot of the commercial
5 operation and the aviation. What are you going
6 to fly?

7 PAUL ANDERSON: In terms of
8 aircraft?

9 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, because
10 the aviation manufacturing in the United States
11 and what these guys fly almost doesn't exist.
12 And there's -- you're going to tell me --
13 because I asked Paul --

14 TOM GEORGE: Say that again. I
15 missed that.

16 CHARLIE SASSARA: It was -- I
17 was asking --

18 MIKE YORKE: There's not too
19 many people doing glacier landings in a park I
20 think.

21 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah, there's
22 just not a lot -- it's kind of a big deal
23 because are you going to fly a hundred-year-old
24 Beaver?

25 PAUL ANDERSON: So in terms of

1 technology right there is some new technology
2 being developed and used in the world today.
3 And while we tend to call it quiet technology,
4 it's probably better to call it quieter
5 technology. And this whole issue of soundscape
6 management in the park is going to have some
7 impact. Flying a turbine Otter instead of a
8 Beaver or a 185 is quieter technology, et
9 cetera, et cetera.

10 So what's going to happen is,
11 you know, it may not be so critical to the
12 industry, if you will, in those places where
13 there's a high level of aircraft use just to
14 the industry. But in that middle part of the
15 park where it's moderate to low impact on the
16 ground as well in the air, that's going to say,
17 you know, if you want to have more overflight
18 in this area you need to have quieter
19 technology. So there's still that kind of a
20 model in between. And then the other part is
21 no matter what kind of technology you have, so
22 to speak, the aircraft overflight should be few
23 and far between regardless.

24 So over time will the technology
25 change? Probably. Will it have an impact?

1 Yes, I'm sure it will. But the plan should
2 be -- whatever we adopt should be adaptable to
3 that and should promote and accept that kind of
4 change or technology if and when it occurs.

5 How long does that plan last?

6 Well, I would say you're talking about a 15- to
7 20-year horizon, if you will, for this plan.

8 But let me tell you something, in 1983 Steve
9 Martin and I wrote the Backcountry Plan for the
10 Grand Canyon. We used innovative technology
11 limited which is exactly what we're talking
12 about in adaptable management today. Steve
13 became superintendent two years ago at Grand
14 Canyon. And he said, the first thing I'm going
15 to do is I'm going to rewrite the Backcountry
16 Plan that you and I wrote in 1983 and still in
17 use in the park today. So, you know, if we do
18 our jobs right it's possible that this plan
19 could last. And I think if we do it right,
20 working together and find ways to help the
21 users have a positive experience, the
22 businesses have a viable business opportunity,
23 a viable one, not rip off the people or the
24 government, and the users -- the quiet users of
25 the park have an equitable opportunity as well

1 that we could potentially set the stage, if you
2 will, for what could happen around the country
3 in terms of trying to deal with this issue
4 which is, I mean, almost unsolvable across the
5 country. So if there's a possibility of a
6 solution I guess I'm thinking watching the
7 capability of this group this could be the
8 place where that happens. It's the right
9 people, it's the right place and it's the right
10 time to do that kind of solution that could
11 lead the country in how we solve this problem.
12 So that's my thought.

13 CHARLIE SASSARA: Thanks. I was
14 looking for the horizon. I was looking at that
15 question.

16 PAUL ANDERSON: The 15 to 20
17 years?

18 CHARLIE SASSARA: Yeah. And
19 then the other question really goes back to FAA
20 over here and, you know, it's a longer
21 philosophical question. Do you think they will
22 ever really adapt so that the industry sort of
23 returns, you know, to where you have aviation
24 development? You know, because it's tough for
25 people to build aircraft when you ask them.

1 MIKE YORKE: We do and when
2 they're built they are built to more of a sound
3 spec, a lower DB level as you already know.

4 CHARLIE SASSARA: Well, it's not
5 just a sound thing but it's the whole -- I have
6 a background with you guys through my father's
7 experiences and, you know, just how tough it is
8 to -- well, I'm sorry to take any time.

9 MIKE YORKE: Well, that's okay.
10 China's getting ready to build airplanes too.

11 PAUL ANDERSON: So we can be
12 flying all Chinese airplanes.

13 MIKE YORKE: Got it.

14 ERIC DENKEWALTER: You know,
15 there are quiet airplanes. The problem is you
16 can't get them on skis. That's the biggest
17 single issue is that all the nose draggers are
18 fragile. And the only one that comes close
19 would be a Twin Otter, and you can bury that
20 thing. Break the ski off on it and then you're
21 doomed. Got caravans, they're great. You can
22 make them quiet.

23 NANCY BALE: Do they have to be
24 nose draggers.

25 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, there's

1 no trail draggers that -- those are what you
2 use for ski planes. So that's where we're
3 stuck with piston Beavers and 185's and the
4 noisy airplanes. People have tried skis on
5 other airplanes. The only one that ever worked
6 successfully was Hudson's 206. And that was
7 not ideal. That's the only nose wheel airplane
8 that had skis on it that we worked up there.
9 And it's just a matter of time before you tear
10 the nose off it. So I don't know if the
11 technology's ever -- nobody's going to make a
12 brand new tail dragger. Just not the way
13 they're doing it.

14 MIKE YORKE: Don't we make a
15 Found now and the Bush Hawk?

16 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah, but,
17 yikes.

18 MIKE YORKE: And, I mean, you've
19 come a long way, Eric, the standard Beaver to
20 the turbine Beaver.

21 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Yeah.

22 MIKE YORKE: There's a good
23 example. They are made -- some made.

24 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, they're
25 not quite making them, but, yeah, they're

1 converting 1950 ones to turbines.

2 MIKE YORKE: But I'm saying if
3 you have a Found or a Kodiak there may be some
4 future out there. I don't know if the expense
5 will support it though.

6 ERIC DENKEWALTER: Well, the
7 Found is like a 185. It's noisy.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Thank you.

9 The one other question I think
10 would be interesting to ponder -- obviously
11 don't have time to discuss it right now -- is
12 whether there's any other models for having
13 work groups work together outside of -- other
14 than the FACA model, whether there's any other
15 mechanisms for bringing groups together to talk
16 about issues and solutions. I mean, if they're
17 -- I know that that's -- I mean, the whole
18 reason that FACA designed to deal with multiple
19 stakeholders coming in and creating advice for
20 a federal agency. So that's what it's designed
21 for. But I'm just wondering if there's any
22 with different caveats whether it would be
23 possible to not do with FACA charter. I just
24 sort of fear that maybe even we all are really
25 enthusiastic and have a great idea and

1 everybody wants to move forward that, you know,
2 there's just not enough interest at the D.C.
3 level for renewing it.

4 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, there's
5 other models to do that but they're -- as
6 cumbersome as FACA is, it's the best model that
7 we have today for doing directly what we're
8 trying to do. But, you know, the way that the
9 law reads -- and what controls that is the
10 Federal Advisory Committee Act. And
11 basically -- I'm not an attorney, but the way
12 that I've been taught that the law reads is
13 that the federal government cannot accept --
14 not advice. I guess advice will be okay if you
15 take it a little bit loosely. They can't
16 accept input or advice from a non-FACA group
17 that's outside of the public process.

18 So I can meet with tribes and I
19 can meet with federal, state and local
20 government officials and take input and advice
21 from them and make decisions. But I can't meet
22 with the public, individual -- I can't meet
23 special interest groups and take their advice
24 and make decisions on it without filtering it
25 through the public participation process or

1 through the FACA committee that's chartered by
2 the secretary. So how would you do it if we
3 didn't have FACA? We'd have to figure out some
4 other process. It's not that people couldn't
5 get together and form recommendations and
6 opinions, but the opinions and recommendations
7 would have to be filtered through some other
8 process.

9 So for example, on the vehicle
10 management plan, the industry -- the tourism
11 industry represents a thousand different
12 businesses and they all have a common
13 connection that's not a common interest. They
14 all get together and say, here's what you
15 should do. We want you to do this for these
16 reasons. And then they take that and submit
17 that as their recommendations to the Park
18 Service through the public process just like
19 DCC does for all of their members, et cetera,
20 et cetera. So then it's clean in using that in
21 decision making. We could go that way if we
22 have to. This is a lot -- seems to be this is
23 a more direct and productive way to go about
24 that at the moment. But there are other
25 venues.

1 And I can attend meetings that
2 you call but I can't call a meeting to collect
3 you. So sort of a twist in that. But I cannot
4 call a meeting of the agencies -- a meeting of
5 special interests of the public together to
6 take advice. But I can attend a meeting called
7 by the special interests to answer questions
8 and provide information, et cetera, et cetera.

9 SALLY GIBERT: Separate from
10 FACA.

11 PAUL ANDERSON: Separate from
12 FACA.

13 SALLY GIBERT: Right. Okay.

14 PAUL ANDERSON: So here's my
15 thinking. I'm the eternal optimist. My
16 daughter told me that when I got married the
17 other day. Boy, Dad, you are the eternal
18 optimist. But I am.

19 And, you know, I look at the
20 FACA groups that we have and FACA, you know,
21 from time to time, the federal administration
22 goes through and cleans out all the FACA
23 groups. I mean, we have FACA groups that
24 haven't met in ten years and they get rid of
25 them. But they never get rid of all of them.

1 And in fact when they go through the process,
2 what are the groups chartered for? Are they
3 meeting their charter? Are they being
4 productive? And those groups that we can make
5 a case for are still in existence? And there's
6 a lot of them. Hundreds of them across the
7 country today even though they eliminated
8 several hundred about ten years ago.

9 With this group, if we continue
10 to do what we're doing and we focus on kind of
11 the vision that I just laid out, or something
12 similar to that, then we're making progress.
13 Man, I can't imagine the administration's going
14 to look at this group and say let's get rid of
15 them or let's not renew their charter. If we
16 don't do something and we get sort of tired and
17 say, well, you know, we seem like we're
18 spinning our wheels then maybe the
19 administration will say, you know, we'll just
20 make it easy for you, we'll just not renew the
21 charter. But given the -- if things don't
22 change from where they are, this group
23 continues to make these innovative changes, you
24 guys are setting an example for the rest of
25 National Park Service across the nation. Why

1 would they want to get rid of that? I don't
2 think they would. And I think there's a number
3 of people in Denver and in Washington as well
4 as some of the park people that would advocate
5 keeping it going for an example for other
6 people to follow. I know it's frustrating and
7 slow but we are making progress.

8 SALLY GIBERT: Yeah, I know
9 that. Yeah. I was just -- I was starting to
10 get the impression earlier that maybe we were
11 doing something good, it might not happen.

12 PAUL ANDERSON: Well, like I
13 said, I'm the eternal optimist. I suppose it's
14 always possible that something could happen.
15 It wouldn't seem reasonable to me that that
16 would be.

17 SALLY GIBERT: Okay. Thanks.

18 Okay. Well, I think with that
19 we can adjourn.

20 (Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

1 I, KRISTIN L. O'REILLY, Notary Public for
2 the State of Alaska, and Registered Professional
3 Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
4 proceedings were taken before me at the time and
5 place herein set forth; that the proceedings were
6 reported stenographically by me and later
7 transcribed by computer transcription; that the
8 foregoing is a true record of the proceedings taken
9 at that time; and that I am not a party to, nor do I
10 have any interest in the outcome of the action
11 herein contained.

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
13 my hand and affixed my seal this 29th day of
14 November, 2011.

15

16

17

18

Kristin L. O'Reilly
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 12/18/2014

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

