

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

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
PURSUANT TO THE
FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

CAVANAUGH'S AT KALISPELL CENTER
20 NORTH MAIN STREET - BALLROOM B
KALISPELL, MONTANA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2000
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2000
THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2000
8:00 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATORS:

3 Mary Ansotegui Glacier National Park
 4 Debbie Hervol Glacier National Park
 4 Dayna Hudson Glacier National Park

5 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

6 Linda Anderson Executive Director Glacier Country
 Regional Tourism Commission - Bigfork, MT
 7 Brian Baker Waterton Lakes National Park
 tourism operator - Alberta, Canada
 8 Will Brook President Glacier-Waterton Visitors
 Association - Bozeman, MT
 9 Susie Burch Owner Glacier Park Boat Company -
 Kalispell, MT
 10 Bill Dakin Realtor - Columbia Falls, MT
 David Jackson Economist - University of Montana
 11 School of Forestry - Missoula, MT
 Tony Jewett Regional Director for National
 12 Parks Conservation Association - Helena, MT
 Jayne Kremenik Alberta Community Development -
 13 Alberta, Canada
 Tom McDonald Salish Kootenai Tribes - Pablo, MT
 14 Lowell Meznarch Glacier County Commissioner - Cut
 Bank, MT
 15 Anna Marie Moe State of Montana - Economic Policy
 Advisor to Governor Marc Racicot - Helena, MT
 16 Randy Ogle (Committee Chairman)
 Attorney - OGLE & WORM - Kalispell, MT
 17 Barney O'Quinn Engineer - ARCADIS, Geraghty &
 Miller - Fuquay-Varina, North Carolina
 18 Barbara Pahl Regional Director Mountain/Plains
 Office of National Trust for Preservation - Denver, CO
 19 Mary Sexton Teton County Commissioner -
 Choteau, MT
 20 Paul Sliter Legislative
 Representative/businessman - Somers, MT
 21 Don White Blackfeet Tribe - Browning, MT

22 COURT REPORTERS:

23 Connie Costanza, RPR Ace Court Reporting,
 Polson, MT
 24 Bambi Goodman, CSR, RPR, CRR Goodman Reporting,
 Whitefish, MT

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 MK CENTENNIAL PERSONNEL:

3 Dick Bauman Executive Vice-President - Project
 Manager - Denver, CO
 4 Jay Brasher Deputy Project Manager -
 Transportation Engineering - Denver, CO
 5 Craig Gaskill (Meeting Facilitator) Deputy
 Project Manager - Transportation Planning - Denver, CO
 6 Norma Nickerson University of Montana School of
 Forestry - Missoula, MT
 7 Jean Townsend Socioeconomic Expert - Denver, CO

8 FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL:

9 Dick Gatten Design Operations Engineer
 10 Al Killian Senior Geotechnical Engineer

11 GLACIER NATIONAL PARK PERSONNEL:

12 Suzann Lewis Incoming Superintendent
 13 Rick Shireman Acting Superintendent
 Fred Babb Project Manager
 14 Larry Frederick Chief of Interpretation
 Steve Frye Chief Ranger
 15 Jack Gordon Landscape Architect
 John Kilpatrick Chief Park Facility Management
 16 Officer
 Mary Riddle Compliance Officer - Office of
 Planning, Design and Construction - Denver, CO

17 --o0o--

18 Ethan Carr Historical Landscape Architect,
 National Park Service - Denver, CO

19 --o0o--

20 Miriam Chapman Attorney, Office of Solicitor -
 21 Washington, D.C.

22 --o0o--

23 PUBLIC COMMENT:

24 David Hadden Montana Wilderness Association
 Sharlon Willows Coalition for Canyon Preservation
 25 Cesar Hernandez Montana Wilderness Association

1	MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Tuesday, February 29, 2000 -	Page
3	Opening Comments and Introductions	6
4	Karen Wade - National Park Service	
	Intermountain Regional Director	10
5	Congressman Rick Hill (Video greeting)	14
6	Advisory Committee Member Introductions	18
7	Miriam Chapman - FACA Orientation	61
8	Park Panel Discussion	79
9	Ethan Carr - National Historic Landmark	107
10	Park Road Panel Discussion	119
11	Public Comment -	
	David Hadden	143
12	Wednesday, March 1, 2000 -	
13	MK Centennial Team - Scope of Work	151
14	Mary Riddle - Public Law	175
	Open Discussion	179
15	Fred Babb - Vision Statement Presentation	195
16	Open Discussion	209
17	Committee General Session	231
18	Public Comment -	
	Don White	338
19	Thursday, March 2, 2000 -	
20	Committee General Session	340
21	Jean Townsend - Socioeconomic Impacts/Issues	503
22	Committee General Session	508
23	Public Comment -	
24	Sharlon Willows	526
	Cesar Hernandez	533
25		

1	Table of Contents	
2		
3	Tuesday, February 29, 2000 -	Page
4	Opening Comments and Introductions	6
5	Karen Wade - National Park Service	
6	Intermountain Regional Director	10
7	Congressman Rick Hill (Video greeting)	14
8	Advisory Committee Member Introductions	18
9	Miriam Chapman - FACA Orientation	61
10	Park Panel Discussion	79
11	Ethan Carr - National Historic Landmark	107
12	Park Road Panel Discussion	119
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	Public Comment -	
19	David Hadden	143
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 The first day of the first meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 8:00 a.m., February 29, 2000, by Rick Shireman, Acting
4 Superintendent at Glacier National Park, here on temporary
5 detail for 120 days between the previous administration,
6 Dave Mihalic as Superintendent, and the establishment of the
7 new administration, Suzann Lewis, Superintendent.

8 Mr. Shireman introduced those who will be meeting
9 together with the Advisory Committee, working to some
10 decisions for rehabilitating the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
11 John Kilpatrick, facility manager at Glacier National Park;
12 Craig Gaskill, deputy program manager for this project from
13 MK Centennial. Craig will also act as the facilitator for
14 these three days. Jay Brasher, deputy project manager from
15 MK Centennial; Dick Gatten, also project manager and design
16 engineer from Federal Highways; Fred Babb, project manager
17 on this project for National Park Service, stationed at
18 Glacier National Park; Dick Bauman, project manager from
19 MK Centennial; Suzann Lewis, newly appointed Superintendent
20 of Glacier National Park; Karen Wade, Regional Director for
21 the Intermountain Region.

22 Introduction was made of the 17 members of the
23 Advisory Committee selected and approved by the Secretary of
24 the Interior to serve on this very important committee.
25 Mr. Paul Sliter, Montana State Representative, representing

1 local governments within the area immediately west of
2 Glacier National Park; Linda Anderson, for Glacier Country
3 Regional Tourism Commission, representative from
4 recommendations of a state and national tourism and
5 marketing organizations; William Brooke, Glacier/Waterton
6 Visitors Association, represents the local businesses within
7 the multiple county area immediately east of Glacier
8 National Park; Tom McDonald represents the Confederated
9 Salish and Kootenai Tribe, an affiliated tribe with Glacier
10 National Park; Susie Burch represents Glacier Park Boat
11 Company and local businesses within multiple-county area
12 immediately west of Glacier National Park; Tony Jewitt, an
13 employee of National Parks and Conservation Association and
14 comes from the recommendations of the national environmental
15 organizations; Jayne Kremenik represents Alberta Community
16 Development, representing Canada and the international
17 aspects of the Going-to-the-Sun Road; Bill Dakin is a member
18 of the Columbia Falls Chamber of Commerce and represents the
19 local businesses within the multiple-county area west of
20 Glacier National Park; Randy Ogle, attorney in Kalispell and
21 is the representative at large, serving the local community
22 members as an at-large representative; Anna Marie Moe is not
23 present yet but will represent the state government of
24 Montana; Brian Baker, Waterton Visitors Services
25 Corporation, Canada, representing the international aspects

1 of the road; Barney O'Quinn, civil engineer from the
2 recommendations of national engineering community and
3 provides expertise in highway operations and engineering;
4 David Jackson, professor at University of Montana School of
5 Forestry, represents economic understanding and is from
6 recommendations of national economic organizations; Mary
7 Sexton, East Side Chamber of Commerce, represents the local
8 businesses within the multiple-county area immediately east
9 of Glacier National Park; Don White represents the Blackfeet
10 Nation, an affiliated tribe with Glacier National Park;
11 Barbara Pahl, Regional Director for the National Trust for
12 Historic Preservation, represents the interests of national
13 preservation organizations; Lowell Meznarch, Glacier County
14 Commissioner representing the local governments from within
15 the area immediately east of Glacier National Park.

16 Getting to know folks in last few weeks has been a
17 pleasure in terms of phone calls, conversations, and
18 letters. This group of 17 people represents a very wide and
19 diverse representation of all of the partners and friends of
20 Glacier National Park. They bring to the meeting ideas and
21 understandings to make significant contributions to the
22 rehabilitation of the road.

23 The three coordinators who have been very
24 important to the establishment of this program and project
25 and will be a resource to stay on track. Debbie Hervol from

1 Glacier National Park; Mary Ansotegui, executive assistant
2 for Glacier National Park; Dayna Hudson from Glacier
3 National Park. Here to provide support, information, carry
4 messages, and provide any other necessary activities.

5 (Applause for the three coordinators.)

6 Because this Committee was established under the
7 Federal Advisory Committee Act, there are requirements and
8 regulations that must be followed, including a full set of
9 minutes, provided by Bambi Goodman, court reporter.

10 Notes of security and safety are discussed, noting
11 proper exits, in case of emergencies, along with 911
12 procedures and restroom facilities. Messages will be posted
13 on wall behind Debbie and Mary. Also a cell phone is
14 available.

15 The reason for being here is to begin the process,
16 collectively and collegially, in figuring out the best way
17 of rehabilitating the Going-to-the-Sun Road at Glacier
18 National Park. This is a project that has evolved from the
19 mid 20s, when the idea was conceived, through the early 30s
20 when the road was under construction and finally completed
21 in 1932, and has been ongoing for the National Park Service
22 and for the visitors of Glacier National Park for many
23 years. The road is seen as being a vital part of Glacier
24 National Park and of the experience for visitors coming to
25 that great natural and cultural resource. The road is in

1 serious need of repair. It has served well for many years,
2 but needs to be able to continue to serve visitors.

3 The mission of this Committee is to help the Park
4 Service, the Federal Highways and the others involved in
5 this process in coming to the best decisions on how to
6 rehabilitate the road; the best decisions in terms of
7 protection of the cultural resources of the road itself and
8 minimizing the impacts upon the natural resources within
9 Glacier National Park; to minimize and to mitigate the
10 effects on visitors that are coming to the Park; to protect
11 and mitigate the impacts on the economies of the local and
12 regional areas around the Park, and to provide that
13 additional level of information and study that's needed in
14 order to move forward on determining how to reconstruct.

15 Karen Wade, Regional Director of the National Park
16 Service Intermountain Region is reintroduced as the first
17 speaker on today's agenda. Ms. Wade speaks to the scope of
18 this project and requirements of the Advisory Committee, the
19 National Park Service and other associates in working toward
20 the Going-to-the-Sun Road.

21 Ms. Wade stresses what a special and important
22 occasion she believes this project is. She gives a brief,
23 personal reflection on what the Committee is here to do.

24 "We are here to represent the public interests at
25 the national and local level in an extremely important

1 natural resource decision. This natural resource decision
2 is in the context of the history of this region and the
3 history of the creation of a great national park. So what
4 we have is a cultural artifact, basically, which has
5 provided access to one of the great experiences in the
6 world. And those of you who have grown up with this great
7 road and this great national park, know it better than
8 anybody."

9 Ms. Wade speaks to seeing an evolution in decision
10 making within agencies of government that has evolved from
11 what was originally an internal process to a very complex
12 and exciting external process. Over the next few days an
13 exercise in democracy is being exercised.

14 In the case of this particular project, it was
15 started a couple of years ago as the General Management
16 Planning process began in this Park. Out of that dialogue,
17 issues were defined. One issue involved was the
18 Going-to-the-Sun Road. Relating to how to care for and
19 provide stewardship for the visitorship in Glacier National
20 Park and how to take care of the facility that provides for
21 that experience, and that's the Going-to-the-Sun Road.

22 Once the Committee is through with their work and
23 have consulted with each other, a decision will need to be
24 made. That decision will need to be made between the
25 National Park Service and the public after presentation with

1 the environmental documents associated with impact of the
2 alternatives that are looked at. Ms. Wade stressed the
3 importance of the process and the responsibility of the
4 group in the room, which is the will of the people.

5 This meeting is intended to foster relationships
6 between all Committee members and a better understanding of
7 who they are, where they come from, what they represent and
8 their relationship to Going-to-the-Sun Road and Glacier
9 National Park. She hopes all can understand the context of
10 the issue, the world views related to it and range of
11 possible solutions in going about this particular project.
12 She mentions the partnership/cooperative relationship
13 between the Federal Highways Administration, the public,
14 represented through the Committee, and the National Park
15 Service and how it will be greatly facilitated.

16 Ms. Wade mentions the authority for this
17 particular body is the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and
18 all are going to hear about and understand it thoroughly.
19 A similar situation is going on in Everglades National Park.

20 This Committee will be assisting the National Park
21 Service in providing recommendations on how to accomplish
22 the goals that have been set forth in the materials
23 received. Final decision will be the decision of the
24 National Park Service in concert with the environmental
25 documentation that's required to make the final public

1 decision.

2 Ms. Wade states: The outcomes for the Advisory
3 Committee are to reconstruct the Going-to-the-Sun Road while
4 retaining its historic character and maintaining sensitivity
5 to the resources surrounding the road, before, during and
6 after reconstruction. Minimize disruption to Park visitors
7 and helping Park visitors have the joy and pleasure of
8 understanding the great engineering feats that are required
9 in order to maintain this facility for the public. Minimize
10 disruption to businesses and economics dependent on
11 Going-to-the-Sun Road. Be financially responsible in
12 accomplishing this task, because the world will be watching.

13 She describes the designated federal official
14 role. The Federal Advisory Committee was instituted by the
15 Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt. He has delegated that
16 authority to Ms. Wade and she, in turn, as of today, is
17 delegating that authority to the Superintendent of Glacier
18 National Park. The Acting Superintendent, Rick Shireman,
19 will assume those responsibilities this week. But very
20 shortly, this designated role will be entrusted to Suzann
21 Lewis, the new Superintendent of Glacier National Park.

22 Ms. Wade thanks all for having her here and
23 spending the day and will be looking for reports.

24 Mr. Shireman comments that one of the primary
25 reasons for the ability to meet stems from great interest of

1 the congressional delegation and, particularly, Congressman
2 Rick Hill, the congressman at-large for the State of
3 Montana. Congressman Hill has been instrumental in
4 assisting the Federal Highways in earmarking funding for
5 this Advisory Committee and the establishment of funds for
6 the special studies that were needed to continue on the
7 process in rehabilitating the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Peggy
8 Trenk, deputy chief of staff to Congressman Hill, is present
9 on his behalf to present a statement via videotape.

10 (Whereupon a 5-minute videotaped greeting and
11 statement by Congressman Rick Hill was played.)

12 Mr. Shireman reintroduces Superintendent Suzann
13 Lewis. She will be attending the entire deliberations of
14 the Advisory Committee meetings as one of her first aspects
15 of getting to know Glacier National Park better.

16 Ms. Lewis has 22 years' experience with NPS
17 (National Park Service). She began her career as a seasonal
18 park ranger at Gulf Islands off the coast of Florida and
19 Mississippi. She later received her first permanent
20 position at that park and became the park historian. She
21 has had international experience in establishing national
22 parks, primarily on the island of Haiti. She attained her
23 first superintendency at Christiansted National Historic
24 site in the Virgin Islands. Later became the first
25 superintendent at Timucuan Ecological and Historical

1 Preserve in Florida. Later she transferred to Chattahoochee
2 River National Recreational Area, a large urban park in the
3 outskirts of Atlanta, Georgia, where she has served as
4 superintendent for the last three years. She comes to
5 Glacier Park as a fresh graduate of the senior executive
6 service for federal managers.

7 Ms. Lewis greets everyone and looks forward to
8 getting to know each Committee member individually. She
9 states her role this week is to be an observer. She
10 expresses her honor to be a part of this group, a part of
11 the Advisory Committee, as well as to serve as the
12 Superintendent of Glacier National Park. She is happy and
13 pleased to be here. Her statement was brief.

14 Mr. Shireman explains one aspect of developing the
15 program for putting together the rehabilitation of
16 Going-to-the-Sun Road was to find an engineering and
17 economics development firm that could provide the technical
18 expertise that was needed to move forward on determining the
19 alternatives for consideration by the National Park Service,
20 the Federal Highways and the Advisory Committee. Through a
21 process of contract selection, the National Park Service, a
22 couple of months ago, brought forward the name of
23 MK Centennial as the engineering firm to work as a
24 consultant.

25 MK Centennial is a subsidiary of Morrison Knudsen.

1 They have international reputation in design consulting and
2 project engineering for mountainous and alpine roadways
3 internationally. They have recently put together projects
4 internationally and in the U.S. The Committee will be
5 meeting the project managers and technical experts later on.

6 Mr. Shireman introduces Craig Gaskill, MK
7 Centennial, deputy project manager of Going-to-the-Sun Road
8 project. Mr. Gaskill will be the facilitator for the rest
9 of the week.

10 Mr. Gaskill reports that the timeline so far is
11 running according to the agenda schedule. He confirms that
12 the agenda is appropriate for all, and discusses aspects of
13 the agenda in detail. He explains what the agenda for this
14 first day is designed to address: the facilitation process
15 and Federal Advisory Committee rules and what must be gone
16 through for that and how it's set up with specific
17 procedures; background information, history of this project,
18 what the visions and goals of the Park are, and previous
19 projects that have been done; a lot of technical information
20 that's been gathered with experts from the Park and from
21 other consultants that have worked on it who will present
22 some of the information, key points, salient facts; the
23 recommended or proposed scope of how to go forward.

24 He then explains there will be a whole series of
25 general sessions. The reason for set up as general sessions

1 rather than having specific items set down is the Park and
2 consultants want the Committee's input as to what direction
3 to go. The Park and consultants will give some ideas of
4 thoughts, ideas to discuss, to learn, to go forward on.

5 Mr. Gaskill talks about the facilitation process.
6 His background is engineering and planning. His primary
7 role on this project for the MK Centennial team is as deputy
8 project manager for the transportation planning,
9 environmental documentation, public involvement. Jay
10 Brasher is more involved with the engineering side, the
11 technical construction side, construction, maintenance,
12 cultural resources.

13 The reason for Mr. Gaskill being the facilitator
14 in this arena, rather than using a professional facilitator,
15 is so the Advisory Committee could work with the consulting
16 team members directly, thus allowing the Committee and the
17 team to get to know each other firsthand; no distance
18 between them. He then sets some basic ground rules for
19 following the agenda.

20 As this is a public meeting, there will be a half
21 hour public comment session allowed.

22 Mr. Gaskill then continues on with the agenda,
23 which is introduction of Committee members. Each Committee
24 member is asked to introduce themselves, who they represent,
25 why they're on the Committee, their vision and/or goals,

1 what their expectations are and their role and the
2 Committee's role.

3 (While each Committee member is speaking, Jay
4 Brasher and Mary Ansotegui highlight their comments for
5 public view, commencing with Lowell Meznarch.)

6 MR. LOWELL MEZNARCH: I'm Lowell Meznarch. I
7 reside in Cut Bank. I'm a Glacier County Commissioner
8 completing my sixth year of my one and only term,
9 representing the local government just east of Glacier
10 National Park. I'm on the Committee for a variety of
11 reasons. I'm involved in business as the chairman of a
12 company, Vacation Travel Adventures, that provides a booking
13 service to businesses in and around Glacier National Park.

14 As most east siders, I wear many hats to make a
15 living and be able to enjoy the quality of life that this
16 area of the world provides. My family has been very much
17 involved in Glacier National Park. My daughter's worked two
18 summers in the Park. She's a sophomore in college now. My
19 niece and nephew were introduced and married, one of those
20 fabled romances, employees of the Many Glacier Lodge area
21 several years ago.

22 I would expect that we keep an open mind in regard
23 to this process. Many on the east side feel that the Park
24 is identified mostly with the west side, considered an
25 extension of the Flathead Valley and this area. I do not

1 personally believe that that's really the attitude. So we
2 do need to break through that perception.

3 My role would be to try to provide as much
4 information as possible. The east side's very in tune with
5 the upcoming bicentennial celebration of the Lewis and Clark
6 core of discovery, and would like to see some correlation
7 between that event and the event regarding this construction
8 and the process we're undertaking today. Thank you.

9 MS. BARBARA PAHL: My name is Barbara Pahl,
10 and I am the regional director for the Mountains/Plains
11 Office of the National Trust for Preservation. Our office
12 is in Denver, Colorado. And we provide preservation
13 assistance and service in eight mountains/plains states
14 including the state of Montana. The National Trust has
15 taken a keen interest in the protection of historic places
16 in all of our national parks. Because of our concern about
17 some of these historic places in Glacier, we
18 listed -- included Glacier National Park on our annual
19 listing of America's most endangered places in 1997. At
20 that time we had particular concerns about the historic
21 hotels and chalets. We continue to have those concerns,
22 particularly with the Many Glacier Hotel.

23 The Going-to-the-Sun highway, as was noted here,
24 is a national historic landmark. It's one of five national
25 historic landmarks in Glacier National Park. I feel that I

1 am professionally here today as an advocate for that
2 historic designation of that road. I liked it very much
3 when Rick, this morning, announced that we were here to
4 consider the rehabilitation/restoration of the
5 Going-to-the-Sun Road as opposed to the reconstruction,
6 which is a word that is used in a lot of our materials
7 today. I'm here to try to ensure that the work will,
8 indeed, end up rehabilitating and restoring the road so it
9 retains its historic character.

10 On a personal note, Glacier National Park has a
11 great deal of meaning to my family. My husband's family is
12 from Great Falls. They do believe the Park was a great
13 resource to the east side. My husband's grandfather was an
14 early guide in the Park. He spent most of his summers in
15 Glacier National Park. So I also have a personal family
16 reason for wanting to see the protection of that very
17 important highway.

18 MR. DON WHITE: Good morning everybody. My
19 name is Don White. I'm a member of the Blackfeet tribe.
20 I'm also a transportation planner for the Blackfeet tribe
21 and former Tribal Employment Rights Officer. I'm
22 representing the Blackfeet tribe and am on the Committee as
23 the tribe is a neighbor to Glacier National Park. We share
24 a common border. And we look at the Park as being part of
25 our homeland. We'd like to become involved in the planning,

1 design, development, and the management of the Park since it
2 is part of our heritage and part of what we consider our
3 land.

4 When we see things like this happening -- we all
5 know that the reservations are depressed areas. And when we
6 see things coming along in Park development, we're looking
7 at 80 to a hundred million dollars' worth of work, the
8 Blackfeet tribe would like to share in some of that money
9 that's available. Local hiring. One of the things that --
10 since we're adjacent to the Park, an Indian preference is a
11 federally recognized allowable preference. We'd like to see
12 this looked at. When you look at the building of this road,
13 we see a lot of jobs. We see a need for materials, storage
14 space. The Blackfeet tribe presently is a gravel-rich area.
15 We have a lot of fill dirt, riprap material, natural
16 resources that we look to possibly work with the contractors
17 and getting a lot of the contracts here.

18 We all know that Glacier National Park is a final
19 destination for tourists. A lot of the tourists in there,
20 when they're coming to or leaving, they go through the
21 reservation. We're looking for those tourists spending a
22 lot of dollars. And anything that affects travel within the
23 Park also affects the Blackfeet reservation.

24 So just to make things short, we look at this
25 project as an opportunity for employment. We look at it as

1 an opportunity to sell raw materials too. We look at the
2 area of developing tourism and providing services. And
3 that's pretty -- I guess, the nutshell. We were -- one more
4 primary interest is probably the Indian preference in hiring
5 since, under the federal law, work on or near Indian
6 reservation, Indian preference is an allowable thing. And
7 the Blackfeet tribe, they have unemployment around the 70
8 percent figure. So anything like this would promote the
9 local economies.

10 My role in this is to work with the Committee,
11 hopefully, that we can work utilizing local resources. When
12 we talk about historic preservations, the national
13 environment, we believe that the Blackfeet tribe is a part
14 of the natural environment, since this our homeland. Our
15 backyard. And with that we'd like to participate in the
16 development of this road; thank you.

17 MARY SEXTON: I'm Mary Sexton. I'm from
18 Choteau, Montana, Teton County east of the Divide. I'm
19 representing the local businesses and Chamber of Commerce.
20 I am part owner of a motel there, been involved in tourism.
21 I've also been a guide in the Bob Marshall and have been
22 outdoor educator and am presently a Teton County
23 Commissioner.

24 My interest in being on this Committee is, I
25 guess, a broader interest in the effect that Glacier and the

1 Going-to-the-Sun highway have on the larger area, the
2 northern Continental Divide ecosystem. What happens in
3 Glacier and Going-to-the-Sun does affect the wildlife, the
4 land and the people in a very large area.

5 Along the east side we are not as developed, in a
6 commercial sense. However, we're becoming increasingly
7 dependent upon tourism, more dispersed tourism, as folks
8 travel along the Rocky Mountain front and stop in the
9 communities there and participate in recreational
10 opportunities there. My hope is that we will look at what
11 effect the road and Glacier, in general, have on the larger
12 area.

13 Also, our infrastructure in our area has not
14 perhaps been attended to as well as might be. And I think
15 that part of our process, or I would hope it would be, that
16 the long-term vision of what Glacier -- what effect it has
17 on the land, the people and the larger area.

18 Particularly, the goals for the committee would
19 be, again, not specifically the highway itself only, but
20 what effect it has in the surrounding area in a larger
21 sense; that how it's developed, the project, the process
22 that it goes through, what short-term and long-term effects
23 it has in the community and the landscape, not just right
24 next to the Park but, again, in the larger continental
25 divide ecosystem.

1 DAVID JACKSON: I'm David Jackson from the
2 University of Montana Forestry School. I'm an economist,
3 and I presume that's why I'm here.

4 In terms of my own professional life, I've been in
5 Montana 24 years this year, and taught at the University of
6 Alberta, actually, before that so, I have some sensitivity
7 to the Canadian content.

8 In terms of my own work, I used to do a lot of
9 timber economics in the old days. Don't do so much of that
10 anymore. Most recently was hooked up with the United
11 Nations in Rome doing work in redesigning national income
12 accounting for environmental accounts. And that would
13 include everything from tourism to trying to deal with
14 wildlife and other contexts.

15 While an economist, I would hope that construction
16 be a light-impact construction while it's going on and that
17 it lasts for another 70 years, which is rather remarkable.
18 I mean, I think everyone would like to avoid frequent kind
19 of intersections of this type into the Park, and so that it
20 be well done. And that -- I presume the cost is a factor,
21 but I don't want to be too parsimonious, frankly, because of
22 the nature of the Park. I should say that our Christmas
23 card this year was a family reunion just up by Grinnell
24 Glacier. And I remember my first trip to the Park in 1967
25 as if it was yesterday. My role is an economist, but as a

1 Montanan, I am concerned with the way the work is done. As
2 far as a Committee member, I've done a lot of committee
3 work. I negotiated for six years, which was intense
4 committee work and actually did a lot of collaborative
5 negotiation, so I have some experience.

6 BARNEY O'QUINN: Barney O'Quinn. I guess you
7 could say I'm the older and shorter version of Craig. I'm
8 the engineering representative on this Committee. I also
9 remember my first trip to Glacier as if it was yesterday,
10 because it was yesterday. If you haven't figured out by now
11 by my talking, I'm not from around here, I'm from North
12 Carolina. I've got a Bachelor of Science Degree in civil
13 engineering and a master's degree in transportation.

14 I spent 31 years with the North Carolina
15 Department of Transportation. I started our
16 interdisciplinary planning team, environmental planning team
17 a number of years ago. And when I retired a little over
18 three years ago, I was head of the transportation
19 environmental planning group. And for the last three-plus
20 years I have been with ARCADIS Geraghty & Miller, a
21 consulting engineering firm, where I am vice-president for
22 project development in environmental analysis.

23 Through my career I've had the opportunity to work
24 on a number of projects involving Park Service lands, in the
25 Great Smoky Mountains National Park early on. More recently

1 with the Blue Ridge Parkway, with DOT's crossings on several
2 places working on that and a number of projects involving
3 the Kate Patterson National Seashore. In fact, I think our
4 firm is involved in a project down there at present.

5 I've had a good bit of experience working through
6 the whole interdisciplinary process, with the historic
7 properties including traditional cultural properties,
8 endangered species, wetlands and you name it. I suppose my
9 goal is, by using this formalized process, is to try to
10 reach some consensus as to what needs to be done to the road
11 such that the project, which is obviously needed, so that it
12 can move forward. And my role is, hopefully, on the
13 Committee with my background in this area, I'll be able to
14 help y'all reach some kind of consensus in this matter.
15 We're here to get the job done.

16 MR. GASKILL: I might add one of your roles
17 and one of the services you bring to this committee is to
18 kind of -- even though this is an Advisory Committee, I
19 think you can also serve as another role of being watchdog
20 for us, to make sure that we're doing everything we need to
21 be doing. I think that goes for everyone on the Committee
22 as well. If you see us doing something that you don't feel
23 is probably the right direction or that there's another way
24 of doing it, please let us know or the Park Service.

25 MR. O'QUINN: I will comment on questions

1 raised earlier this morning about the NEPA (National
2 Environmental Protection Agency) process. Many of you may
3 have been involved with NEPA on different federal agencies.
4 But as I understand this, the Park Service working with the
5 Federal Highway Administration, you will be following the
6 Federal Highway Administration process through the NEPA
7 document.

8 This is a tiered document, as I understand it.
9 I've read the Master Plan. We're currently working on a
10 tiered document -- not many of them done, actually. Most of
11 them are done just straight out environmental documents.
12 I'm currently working on an environmental document for a
13 high-speed railway between Charlotte, North Carolina and
14 Washington, D.C., which is also a tiered document. But the
15 important thing about the FHWA (Federal Highway
16 Administration) project development, NEPA process, is that
17 it's not that you reach your conclusion and reach a solution
18 and then write a document justifying that. It's an integral
19 part of the planning process in which alternatives are
20 identified and evaluated, and it's all part of that
21 decision-making process. And the environment, in that case,
22 is not just the natural environment. It's social, economic
23 and environmental -- or ecological. And that's certainly
24 why this Committee is here. The community impacts are very
25 important. Whereas ten or 15 years ago I would have said

1 that the most attention would have been brought to the
2 natural environment, I think in the last five to six years,
3 particularly, we're finding and that's probably one reason
4 this Committee has been formed, is the community impacts are
5 as much of importance as the ecological impacts in reaching
6 that decision making.

7 BRIAN BAKER: My name is Brian Baker. My
8 background is not professional or technical, it is, quite
9 simply, visitors. I'm a fourth-generation resident and
10 tourism operator in Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada.
11 My family has been in the visitor service business for 78
12 years in Waterton. We have very deep historical roots with
13 Glacier National Park. We worked with them for 40 years in
14 the Goat Haunt area, providing services to the Park Service.

15 We're long-term advocates of Glacier National
16 Park. We have seen visitors coming across the border for
17 many years. We've heard their details on their trip
18 experiences; what they liked, what they didn't like.

19 I've had the opportunity of serving on many
20 committees in Glacier National Park on tourism. I'm a
21 long-term advocate and supporter of the International Peace
22 Park and the world heritage site designation. I sat on
23 various committees on the formation of that, particularly
24 the world heritage site years back.

25 Two reasons that I'm on this Committee. The first

1 one is a personal concern for the preservation of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road as it is; how the visitor will see it,
3 their expectations from it, and what they will tell people
4 when they get home. The Going-to-the-Sun Road, in my
5 opinion, is one of the premier visitor experiences in
6 western north America. I've traveled to a lot of different
7 national parks, both in Canada and the U.S. A recent trip,
8 a couple days ago I was in Hawaii and I was at Haleakala
9 National Park and was driving the Crater Road. And it was
10 very, very busy. Visitor use was very high. And in my
11 analytical aspect of visiting, I'm going to be bringing some
12 of my shared experiences from that to this Committee. The
13 other reason is socioeconomic impacts that may result in
14 however we decide that we're going to deal with massive
15 undertaking of the road rebuild or reconstruct,
16 rehabilitate, which I totally agree with you.

17 The business and tourism industry in southern
18 Alberta also includes, to some extent, the visitors coming
19 through Waterton on their way to Banff, Jasper that is
20 growing. There is also now a major trend in visitors from
21 international sites coming to Alberta to, particularly, the
22 Calgary International Airport, in-bound tourism using the
23 Trail of the Great Bear traveling corridor, Banff, Jasper,
24 Waterton, Glacier, and Yellowstone. And I think it's going
25 to grow over the years. And I think what we need to do here

1 is to make sure that what we're going to be showing the
2 people is nothing short of an amazing feat of how you can
3 rebuild a road in a high mountain area in an international
4 peace park and world heritage site designation. And I think
5 that's what our goal should be here. Is we have something
6 to really prove to the international visitor; how you can do
7 this, preserve it in an ecologically sound way, and show the
8 people from our international destinations, as well as our
9 local groups, just how it can be done here in a proper and
10 sustainable way. Thank you. We can create a model. This
11 definitely will be a model to look at.

12 I just had one more thing I just noticed, to
13 comment on. My other goal is I want to ensure that the
14 public relations and media aspect before, during and after
15 the process is handled in a very professional and up-front
16 manner. I do believe this is going to be one of the most
17 important aspects of this project. What we say and do and
18 how we handled it has very far-reaching aspects to the
19 socioeconomic.

20 RANDY OGLE: My name is Randy Ogle. I do not
21 bring any technical expertise to this process either. I'm a
22 practicing attorney and have practiced here in Kalispell for
23 the last 24 years. Privately, my practice relates,
24 primarily, to real estate, commercial business matters,
25 litigation relating to those fields.

1 My practice increasingly, in the last ten years or
2 so, has involved more and more mediation work. I do a lot
3 of mediating and arbitrating. And I guess maybe that leads
4 to one of my primary goals for this committee. I am an
5 at-large, only at-large representative on this Committee,
6 which is appropriate. I don't have any constituencies, I
7 don't come with any preconceived notions, and I am hoping
8 for this Committee that they can work together, come up with
9 as many creative ideas as possible with the assistance of
10 the staff and input from the public to come up with a
11 consensus for how best to rebuild, rehabilitate the
12 Going-to-the-Sun Road with the least impact on the
13 businesses on the east and west side of the Park and in the
14 entire area.

15 And I am going to do my level best to try to come
16 up with as many ideas, with your assistance, and hope that
17 we can reach a consensus on that. Because I do agree with
18 Karen, it's going to take all of us pulling together to get
19 the resources to rebuild the road and get the job
20 accomplished in an efficient fashion. So that's what my
21 greatest goal is for this Committee.

22 BILL DAKIN: It's Bill, don't call me
23 William. And it's Dakin, not bacon. Dealt with that all my
24 life. I'm a realtor in Columbia Falls and own my own little
25 real estate brokerage. I was nominated to be on the

1 Committee by the Columbia Falls Chamber of Commerce. I
2 sought that nomination because I used to work for the Park
3 Service. I used to work on the road crew in Glacier Park.
4 My business focus is certainly Columbia Falls, Canyon, West
5 Glacier area, so I'm certainly concerned with the stability
6 and economic vitality of that area.

7 My roots here are deep. I was a child when my
8 family came here from Great Falls. The dam had been built
9 and the aluminum refinery was under construction. It was a
10 boom time, 1953. I had a physical last week and realized
11 that in 1953, according to my doctor's chart, is the last
12 year I was underweight too. But, anyway, I've loved Glacier
13 Park ever since I was a little boy. We'd go up every
14 weekend and camp. I went on -- I've lived here, like I
15 said, almost all my life, except for college years. I have
16 degrees in history, cultural anthropology. I came back and
17 worked seasonally in the Park. Loved it so much that I left
18 that kind of academic life behind.

19 From 1979 to 1988 I was the road crew seasonal,
20 and later permanent crew leader in charge of maintaining
21 what we called the Hill section, which, in the official
22 documents, is called the Alpine section from the foot of the
23 hill over the top to Siyeh Bennett. I loved that job.
24 There was unlimited work. You never had a shortage of
25 things to do. You had to balance weather and staging and

1 materials and crew talent, and it was a wonderful thing to
2 do when a person's in his twenties and thirties.

3 The spring opening was probably one of the most
4 memorable things that anybody could be involved with, and I
5 plowed the road, or assisted with the plowing of the road
6 for ten years. In 1981, the winter or '81-'82, the then
7 Superintendent Haraden looked down amongst his blue collar
8 staff and found a couple of college boys whom he decided
9 should be put to work in the winter not plowing but
10 researching the history of the construction so that we would
11 be ready for a rededication in 1982. And I was lucky enough
12 to be one of those people with Dennis Holden. We explored
13 the records. Dennis even went to the National Archives, dug
14 up about the collection of the route, the incredible story
15 about the 1918 survey, the debates that went on over whether
16 or not a road should be there, what kind of a road, and why
17 the hell were we building for cars because cars were just a
18 fad; budgeting appropriations, finally the construction.
19 And that culminated in '82 with the rededication of the
20 road. That was, I think, the highlight of my Park career,
21 because we assembled, from many different areas of the
22 country, the actual surviving people who had done the
23 construction. And it was an emotional thing to take these
24 old men up on that hill and listen to their reminiscences
25 and their experiences; their life in the work camp, the

1 bears eating their food, the incredible technology that they
2 had to work with. For some of these men, it was the high
3 point of their lives as construction workers. Some of them
4 had tears in their eyes as they recalled the experience they
5 had and what an impression that made on me. And it's really
6 made me feel that the road is something more than just an
7 engineering landmark. It's a monument to the kind of human
8 interaction with natural resources that is also important in
9 national parks.

10 I really liked the comment about reconstruction,
11 or perhaps I think we're talking about restoration and
12 rehabilitation. That suits me very well. I believe there
13 are areas that really don't need to be touched. There are
14 areas where the same stones are still right there, set by
15 the construction crew for the Williams and Douglas masons in
16 1927. And we should leave those alone, I hope. I hope we
17 don't touch them. Today, I'm heartbroken at the road's
18 condition. I worked with wonderful people in the Park.
19 Unfortunately, a couple of the ones who I shared most of the
20 historic stuff with are now dead. I know that the Park has
21 a real gap in its institutional memory. And it's very
22 important that maybe I could help with a little bit of that.

23 My motivation is to get stuff done. When I got
24 the letter from Secretary Babbitt that said I was appointed
25 for four years, I almost fell over. I really thought we'd

1 be pouring cement up there in four years. Then I have to go
2 back and remembered why didn't I stay with the Park Service?
3 That's kind of the way things get done can kind of drive you
4 nuts.

5 My motive is to expedite things as much as
6 possible. I share with many of the previous commentators that
7 I think there are certainly consequences and perhaps threats
8 to those of us in a commercial way which have become
9 dependent on the Park. But I also see a tremendous amount
10 of short-term and immeasurable long-term benefit from
11 getting this job done. I really want to help be the
12 pragmatist. My experience there might be of some use to
13 this Committee in terms of understanding the limitations on
14 getting work done at that elevation in that traffic. If I
15 exhibit brain damage, it's because of all the clutch and
16 brake fumes that I inhaled up there for 12 years as those
17 people from Kansas would ease their way down the hill. Oh,
18 I'm sorry; Nebraska.

19 I really think that somewhere out there I'm
20 fascinated with the idea of dovetailing this with the Lewis
21 and Clark bicentennial. I really think somewhere there's
22 going to be a tremendous amount of silver lining in the
23 cloud that some people see. I'm going to try and keep my
24 colleagues in the chamber updated, but I've had nothing but
25 good feedback from them about seeing both positive as well

1 as some negative effects on this project. I really feel we
2 all have an obligation to be as fiscally responsible as
3 possible.

4 JAYNE KREMENIK: He's a tough act to follow,
5 isn't he? I'm Jayne Kremenik. I work for Alberta Community
6 Development up in Canada. For my day job, I work with doing
7 the marketing for our provincial historic site up there, our
8 UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural
9 Organization) heritage site, which Glacier shares in the
10 heritage site with Waterton. That's one of the reasons I'm
11 here today is to take information back to Waterton as we
12 work on collective marketing with Waterton and Glacier.

13 I'm representing the provincial government of
14 Alberta and will be taking information back to the
15 government so we can make planning decisions with various
16 activities that go on around the Park. Economic development
17 has the Information Center at West Glacier. You're probably
18 quite familiar with our wonderful, large visitor information
19 center on that side of the Park. Also taking information
20 back to community development which works on the Alberta
21 Montana heritage partnership, which is involved in
22 activities across Montana and Alberta. I also work with the
23 Glacier-Waterton Visitors Association, so I'll be taking
24 information back to that group and hopefully representing
25 them a little bit on the Committee too.

1 A have a couple of things that I'd like to see
2 what I think are my roles on this Committee. One of them
3 is -- we've come up with one word that we don't want to have
4 used and that's the word "reconstruction." I have another
5 word I'd like to see not used and that's the word "closed."
6 We are already seeing in Alberta a lot of consumer interest
7 in this area. People thinking that the road is already
8 closed and not coming down into Waterton and Glacier because
9 they think that the road's already under construction. So
10 I'm very interested in the process that we'll go through to
11 get the word out about the process of rehabilitating the
12 word without using that word "closed." I think that's going
13 to be far reaching into tourism implications.

14 I'd also like to serve on this Committee as a
15 constant reminder that the implications of this road are
16 international and not just to the state of Montana. Brian
17 mentioned earlier that Calgary is an international gateway
18 to Glacier National Park. A lot of the traffic that comes
19 into southern Alberta and Glacier is actually using Calgary
20 as their international gateway. So we see a lot of traffic
21 through southern Alberta, especially to our historic sites,
22 our UNESCO world heritage sites in southern Alberta. People
23 are en route to Glacier and use Calgary as their gateway.
24 So we want to make sure that we're reminding our friends
25 here that we are going to feel some economic impact, no

1 matter what decision's made here with the Committee.

2 I also want to make sure that our economic impact
3 assessment, I notice that's part of the Committee's role, is
4 to include Canada and make sure that we're looking north of
5 the border when we're figuring out how far reaching the
6 effects will be from this process. And judging from what
7 else I've heard, I think I'm going to learn a lot from the
8 Committee members too.

9 On a personal note, you can't keep me out of
10 Glacier National Park on a weekend in the summer. I just
11 love it down here. And I'm pretty much no stranger to a lot
12 of the people in the Park. So I'm really looking forward to
13 learning more about the road and learning more from our
14 Committee members.

15 TONY JEWETT: I'm Tony Jewett. I'm the
16 Regional Director for an organization called National Parks
17 Conservation Association. The National Parks Conservation
18 Association is a membership nonprofit that works on national
19 park issues throughout the country. They were started in
20 early 1900s, have about 500,000 members. We have an office
21 in D.C. and eleven regional offices around the country. The
22 office that I'm in is based in Helena. We opened it about
23 three months ago. And previously, the western regional
24 office had encompassed six states. And we split that
25 regional office up and encompassed one that encompasses

1 Montana, Idaho and Wyoming. So I'm fairly new to this
2 position, actually. I had spent the last eight years
3 working as the executive director of the Montana Wildlife
4 Federation.

5 And even though I worked for a national
6 organization, I'm a Montana graduate of the University
7 University of Montana back in the late '70s and have spent
8 most of my life working on Montana conservation issues. So
9 this new position in which I get to work in the National
10 Parks is actually not only a personally exiting one but
11 professionally demanding one also.

12 The National Parks Conservation Association has a
13 mission which is to protect and enhance America's national
14 park system for present and for future generations. And
15 it's actually a fairly large mission in its scope. It's not
16 just about -- not only about protecting the ecology and
17 biology of national parks, but we also look at the cultural
18 and historic values within our national park system. So
19 this particular project, which is the rehabilitation of the
20 road in Glacier Park, is congruent and parallel with our
21 mission as an organization.

22 Why I'm on the Committee is an interesting
23 question. I was actually nominated to be on this Committee
24 before I even started the job. So in some ways I resisted
25 it simply because starting a new position, I wanted to spend

1 more time traveling the region as opposed as investing in
2 one particular project. However, over the last month or
3 two, as I've gotten to know more and more about what this
4 issue is all about and how it is ratcheted down so deeply
5 into the future of the Park, I've become very enthusiastic
6 about being on the Committee for a number of reasons. And I
7 think those reasons are very connected to what I see as my
8 role on this Committee. Which is that I see my role as
9 being very much a long-term Park vision; that the role of
10 NPCA is really to protect and enhance the Park for future
11 generations. And I'd like to take a long-term view of that.

12 This particular project and what the Committee is
13 set up to basically do is to rehabilitate a road that runs
14 right through the middle of the Park. But that road has
15 enormous implications on a whole raft of aspects of Glacier
16 Park and its use and its future. So when I look at the
17 vision and goals of this particular work and what we're
18 doing as a Committee, I'm interested in what this particular
19 reconstruction does in the long-term management of this Park
20 and where the intersections are of the interests that are
21 gathered around this table, which are incredibly diverse. I
22 want to make sure that when this road is reconstructed that
23 it maintains its historic character. But also that as we go
24 through the process, that we talk about how this Park and
25 what this road does for visitor services; what it does for

1 visitor experience; how the road can serve as a source of
2 getting people out into the back country; how it can serve
3 as an interpretive area for people coming through the Park;
4 how we can do, as many people have mentioned, the job in a
5 very light-on-the-land methodologies; and how to link this
6 particular reconstruction into what the Park's going to look
7 like in 50 years, with an eye at maintaining the long-term
8 biological and ecological, as well as historic, values that
9 the Park has.

10 Lastly, I think one of my roles is going to be to
11 make sure that this Committee understands that this is not
12 a, frankly, a Kalispell park or a Cut Bank park or a Montana
13 park. It's a national park. It's a public park. It's a
14 public land. It belongs to every citizen in this nation and
15 that we have an obligation as we go through this process to
16 keep that in mind. Visitation to national parks has
17 skyrocketed. As it skyrockets those national parks across
18 the country are beginning to lose their integrity, in terms
19 of their ability to maintain the values that they were
20 formed for. I think our role in the Committee -- my role is
21 to make sure that my kids and children, people all across
22 the country, are able to go to Glacier 50 years from now and
23 see it as it is seen today and have the experience that
24 everybody around the table has shared. I hope that our
25 deliberations will be driven by not personal considerations

1 but on long-term preservation of the Park.

2 SUSIE BURCH: I'm Susie Burch, and I live
3 here in Kalispell. I represent local businesses to the west
4 of Glacier Park. And I'm actually one of the owners of
5 Glacier Park Boat Company. We're park concessionaires. We
6 operate the tour boats and small boat rentals in the Park
7 for visitors.

8 My goals -- it's interesting that I follow on the
9 heels of Tony. My goals are quite specifically tied to
10 making sure that our decisions are not overly disruptive to
11 businesses. I think we're going to be able to innovatively
12 come up with solutions, suggestions, recommendations to the
13 Park Service that will accomplish all of our goals.

14 My company has been family owned since 1938. In
15 fact, I represent the third generation of family ownership.
16 I'm a relative newcomer, actually, to the Park. In a few
17 months I'll start my 15th summer at the Park. I grew up in
18 Florida, went to school in Houston, and I worked in
19 New Orleans before I came here. I'd surely seen no
20 mountains. When I first got here to the Park, I was aghast
21 that the Going-to-the-Sun Road was actually going to be part
22 of my commute. I was afraid and some of you might want to
23 be afraid, too, because some of my family members think I'm
24 a very bad driver. Nobody's ever actually demanded that I
25 give up my car though.

1 But that brings up another consideration and,
2 again, I think it's a very personal one. But I think it can
3 be worked into the goals that will benefit a whole
4 nation -- or actually all the travelers of the Park, and
5 that is personal safety. I've crossed Going-to-the-Sun Road
6 between four and 500 times now. And I want to make sure
7 this is as safe a road as it can be. So as we rehabilitate
8 it, I'm sure that's one of the things that we'll be
9 considering, how to address that. So those are really my
10 two very specific, very personal goals, but I think they'll
11 benefit everybody is small economic impact to businesses as
12 we rehabilitate the road, make it safe.

13 And one other thing that Jayne mentioned that I
14 thought was very important, and that is that let's not use
15 the word "close." I've already heard tour operators in the
16 Park last year say they thought the road was closed. And I
17 think that's critical that the media attention emphasizes
18 the fact that this road is still open.

19 My goals as far as what I bring to the Committee I
20 plan to -- I, actually, over the last three weeks since I
21 found out I was going to be on the Committee, I've worked
22 real hard to not make any decisions about how -- or
23 expectations about exactly how we will solve these problems.
24 Right now my intention is to keep an open mind. I'm very
25 pleased to hear there are so many great ideas out there, and

1 I think that we can come up with something that will be a
2 benefit to all of us, currently and in the future too.

3 TOM MCDONALD: My name is Tom McDonald. I'm
4 representing the Salish Kootenai tribes of the Flathead
5 Nation. Our reservation lies just south of here. All
6 western Montana, Glacier National Park is part of our
7 original territory. It's interesting that I'm here. First
8 of all, I'd like to thank the Park Service and Department of
9 Interior for inviting the Salish Kootenai tribes. We
10 appreciate the opportunity to be face to face with any
11 decisions that are on federal lands that are under our
12 influence. It's very important to us, and we certainly
13 thank you for this opportunity.

14 My background is I work for the National Resource
15 Department. I'm a wilderness manager, parks manager, roads
16 manager, land use planner, jack of all trades but not
17 necessarily the master of any. I participate in a lot of
18 things. I have a degree in natural resource management from
19 Evergreen State College in Washington. I've been working
20 for the tribes for the last 16 years. Before that, I worked
21 for the Bureau of Land Management in Alaska and U.S. Forest
22 Service here in Montana.

23 I'm currently serving on other committees. One
24 that a lot of people in this room might be interested in is
25 the Flathead Lake Fisheries and Management Plan Advisory

1 Committee, which is a state/tribal committee devising a new
2 strategy to manage the aquatic system of Flathead Lake,
3 another very valued treasurer of western Montana and the
4 nation in large. I'm also on the Lake County Task Force to
5 come up with a new growth management plan or land use
6 management plan for Lake County. I sit on the Salish
7 Kootenai tribe's economic development board, which handles
8 quite a bit of local business, small business loans for
9 tribal members within the Flathead Reservation.

10 I'm on Committee as an employee and representative
11 of the tribes. My goals here are to learn as much as I can
12 and communicate back to the tribal council and the other
13 decision makers and managers in the tribes about what's
14 going on and the best information that I can provide them
15 and get the best information from everybody here.

16 I hope to participate and bring forward many
17 things. As I was driving here this morning -- I was talking
18 to some elders yesterday, in fact. And we were talking
19 about the dedication of the Going-to-the-Sun highway back in
20 the early 1930s. The Park Service had invited
21 representatives from the Salish and Kootenai tribe, as with
22 our great neighbors to the north, the Blackfeet, to open up
23 and dedicate this highway. The Park Service came down with
24 two Army transport trucks, and they came down to the
25 reservation and picked up a lot of our very traditional

1 people, elders. And on their way up, one of the transport
2 trucks crashed, and they lost two of our very valuable
3 people in our community. The Salish Kootenai tribes paid a
4 real high price to the opening of this Going-to-the-Sun
5 highway. And in respect to that, I really want to
6 participate as best as I can in this.

7 The other things that tie to this, and maybe -- I
8 forget your name, William, I have a great uncle that worked
9 on the Going-to-the-Sun highway. His name was Cub Smith.
10 He's retired many years ago. I used to listen to his
11 stories about clearing the Going-to-the-Sun highway. And I
12 was always deeply interested in the roadway personally. My
13 namesake is, of course, scattered throughout the Park from
14 ancestors, of course both sides, the Indian and Hudson Bay
15 traders. So I have a real sincere interest.

16 One of the things, on the lighter side, I hope we
17 can expect as an outcome is a way that I can get my wife to
18 drive this road because she's scared of heights.

19 I share a lot of issues that Tony brought up. The
20 carrying capacity of this Park is of interest to him, the
21 zone of influence. When this Park was created and the other
22 park, the first highway going through our reservation, it
23 was called the Park-to-Park Highway. It caused major
24 changes to the Flathead Reservation and the town people. It
25 continues -- the Park, with the draw that it has, it has a

1 positive and negative; growth management, battle with the
2 expansion of Highway 93 and what to do with it right now.
3 You know, a million visitors travel through our reservation.
4 That's good on one way, we can maybe get some tourism and
5 economic pursuits from that. But on the other hand, we're
6 worried about the destruction of our local community and
7 preserving our people and everything we have.

8 WILL BROOKE: Thank you. I'm Will Brooke.
9 I'm president of the Glacier-Waterton Visitors Association,
10 which is an association of businesses in and around the
11 Park, both the east side and the west side and up into our
12 neighbors to the north in Canada. And I might say, on that
13 point, that I'm really pleased and excited that this group
14 is expansive enough and we had enough forethought to include
15 our neighbors to the north. I'm really pleased that they're
16 here because I know they'll contribute a lot of work with
17 both of them. They're capable people.

18 I guess in life I've learned that things go in
19 circles more often than not. It was two years ago that many
20 of us were here at the governor's conference. And the Park
21 Superintendent there, then, invited us to a coffee before
22 his speech to advise us that he was going to announce that
23 the Master Plan for the Park was probably going to include
24 an alternative which talked about closing the road on each
25 side for at least two years and maybe more than that,

1 depending on how things went. And, of course, all of us in
2 that group were business people who had made long-term
3 commitments, had made investments of a substantial nature,
4 and it left us pretty cold, as you can imagine. And it was
5 not very shortly after that he made the speech, there was
6 lots of press, that reverberated from that speech. And
7 people that are in businesses around the Park that take
8 reservations, immediately noticed the effect of that speech
9 and of that statement and the possibility of the road being
10 closed, on either side. The key word there as we've heard
11 before is that it would be closed. And it had an immediate
12 impact on our reservation systems.

13 The other impact that it had was something that
14 was a little bit -- something I didn't think about
15 immediately but when I got back to my residence -- during
16 the winter I lived down in Bozeman because I'm not tough
17 enough to live on the east side during the winter -- my
18 banker contacted me and said Your business plan didn't say
19 anything about the road being closed for possibly four
20 years, what's up with that? How are you going to service
21 this debt? It had an immediate chilling effect in terms of
22 new investment because no banker, in his right mind, is
23 going to make substantial investments, and no business
24 person is going to make substantial investments when they
25 know that there is this huge bump in the road, no pun

1 intended, out there. And it's an unknown quantity. After
2 that announcement and the Master Plan came out, and, in
3 fact, it was in there before that kind of publicity and had
4 to confront squarely this issue, which needs to be
5 confronted. None of us disagreed that you could bury your
6 head in the sand and not deal with this issue. So I am
7 really pleased that because of public involvement, because
8 of the congressional delegations involved in it, that we're
9 here today in this kind of open and public process that's
10 going to provide much needed information and, hopefully,
11 some much needed new alternatives other than talking about
12 closing the road on one side or the other.

13 I think you heard me raise the issue of NEPA. And
14 Tony Jewitt and I have been on opposite sides of some public
15 policy issues where the governmental agency failed to
16 adequately consider the environmental impacts and effects.
17 And when I heard today that we want to do this as
18 efficiently and economically as possible. And I think that
19 was one of the original intents in the Master Plan, was to
20 get in there and do it quickly and get out, because when it
21 comes to the guys who count the beans back in Washington,
22 D.C. wouldn't tolerate it, plans other than that. But I can
23 tell you, that from experience, failure to consider
24 environmental impacts can result in a huge waste of dollars
25 and time, because the projects get stopped, have to be

1 redone, it creates chaos, it creates hard feelings, and I
2 have a real concern that we appropriately consider the kind
3 of environmental mitigations that we're going to have to do
4 and face up to, and we're going to have to spend more money
5 as a result of that. And I think we have to be realistic
6 about that.

7 I'm thrilled to see that the draft project
8 agreement that was included in our project, seems to be
9 extremely well done and has considered a lot of the things
10 that we at the Glacier-Waterton Visitor Association were
11 pounding on early on in the Master Plan, that you need to
12 consider social and economic impacts. NEPA says
13 environment. You have to consider the environment and
14 environmental impacts. And it also says social and economic
15 impacts. And I see a lot of those kinds of things included
16 in this draft project agreement.

17 So we have come so far since the governor's
18 conference in 1998, but I recognize the community has a
19 long, long way to go.

20 If I squirm and walk around more than you'd like
21 and interrupt it's because I have a blown out disc. And I
22 asked my doctor, What's the worst thing I can do? And he
23 said, Whatever you do, don't go into some kind of a court
24 case or meeting and sit for three days. So here I am.

25 LINDA ANDERSON: My name is Linda Anderson,

1 and I'm the executive director for the Glacier Country
2 Regional Tourism Commission. And we're one of the six
3 tourism regions in the state of Montana that is funded by
4 the bed tax. I represent eight counties: Flathead County,
5 Glacier County, Missoula and Mineral Counties, Ravalli
6 County, Sanders County, and Lake County, as well as three
7 convention and visitors bureaus, ten chambers of commerces,
8 and both Blackfeet and Salish Kootenai reservations are in
9 Glacier Country.

10 It's an honor and privilege to be here.

11 I see myself almost as a -- almost as a funnel of
12 bringing in information from this Committee down to our
13 constituents and bringing their information back up to this
14 Committee and on to the Park.

15 Tourism is a ten billion dollar industry to the
16 state of Montana. And Glacier Country contributes over a
17 quarter of the bed tax that is used to market this state.
18 So Glacier Park and this area is extremely important
19 financially and economically to the state.

20 One of the things that we're hearing a lot about
21 right now is a key word in tourism is cultural and
22 historical tourism. And I think the Going-to-the-Sun Road
23 and what it means to the state of Montana, to the United
24 States and also to Canada falls right into that category.
25 We are concerned about the word "closed." On Monday we

1 received 141 calls in our call center of people that didn't
2 want to come on vacation because they thought the Park is
3 closed. So it's a daily concern for us and one of the
4 things that is our goal is to make sure that we get the word
5 out that the Park is not closed. We feel so strongly about
6 this that we have taken our own money and started our own
7 marketing campaign that includes the state and the region to
8 let people know that the Park is open and that business is
9 as usual, right now. So we're very anxious to find out and
10 be part of this process.

11 We feel that the economics are not only important
12 to both sides of Going-to-the-Sun highway, both sides of the
13 state, but also regionally. We have people that we work
14 with in Spokane that know the minute that the Park opens
15 people stop and ask for information. The Butte Chamber of
16 Commerce asked me to please remember that the minute the
17 Park -- the road is open, that they start to see tourists
18 coming through that area. So it is very, very important to
19 all of us.

20 One of my goals is to communicate with the public,
21 stop the general publicity that the Park is closed. And I
22 feel that we are in a partnership with the Park, the public,
23 the tourism industry and especially the press. That we need
24 to make sure the right information is getting out.

25 I do not have any kind of an engineering degree.

1 Her family laughs because its hard for me to make the
2 toaster work. So I'm here to learn about the engineering
3 aspects of this. I would like to see a minimal effect of
4 the economy. I would like to educate myself on the
5 engineering aspect of this.

6 And probably my claim to fame is I was born and
7 raised in Montana. I have 22 years' worth of hospitality
8 and tourism industry experience in both Montana and the
9 state of Washington. But my mother and father are very
10 proud to say that I was conceived on a camping trip in
11 Glacier National Park.

12 PAUL SLITER: The best part about this is
13 when you sit and listen to everybody else talk and you're
14 the last one, you don't have to say all the things that
15 everybody already said. It makes it very short.

16 My name is Paul Sliter. And while all of the
17 information in the packets says that I represent the local
18 government, I like to think more that I represent the local
19 people. I think the government is represented a good plenty
20 in this project. And that is intended to be no dig at
21 present company, I have to say.

22 The reason, I guess, that I'm on the Committee is
23 that I bring a broad perspective of business background,
24 tourism background. I operated a tour boat on Flathead Lake
25 for the Averill family for about six years, and so the

1 comings and goings of people from all over the world and how
2 the Park affects everybody, not just the canyon area or the
3 Whitefish area but everybody all the way through -- I think
4 even through Missoula and all of western Montana and up into
5 Canada, how all those businesses can be affected. And
6 businesses are kind of what people need around here to
7 survive.

8 We've heard a lot of different perspectives today.
9 But I think we need to meet this project as an opportunity
10 and a challenge rather than a hindrance on our local
11 economy. Because I think that if we propose this project to
12 the people of the world as a spectacle to be beheld, I think
13 that inviting people to come and see what kind of a
14 monumental and historic task this really is, genuinely helps
15 the economy in the Flathead and Canada and eastern Montana,
16 all of the areas that are affected.

17 To add to that, in a perspective of another area
18 that often needs some maintenance, we look at Mount Rushmore
19 and the fear that one of those fellows' faces will fall off
20 or the nose will drop off of the thing. It needs
21 maintenance. And people don't say, Oh, they're working on
22 Lincoln's nose today, we're not going to go and see Mount
23 Rushmore. It's actually something to watch and be
24 interested in that draws people to that area. And I think
25 we can use that same type of philosophy for bringing people

1 Craig Gaskill suggested if there's anything
2 additional a committee member would like to add, to make a
3 comment.

4 MR. O'QUINN: I'd like to comment on
5 something that was said right after I finished, that Brian
6 said and then Paul added to it that I think is very
7 important here, is the concept of model. If you think about
8 it, most of our parks, the infrastructure were developed
9 about the same time, back in the early '30s, with the WPA
10 program, the CCC work. And the infrastructures, not only
11 the highways but the buildings and other parts of
12 infrastructure, are all reaching a very similar situation
13 that we're looking here at Glacier. And I know you
14 mentioned a committee down in the Everglades. The problem
15 in the Everglades is quite different. It's a water problem.
16 As far as an infrastructure problem -- and I don't know,
17 there may be other committees that's working on something
18 like this. But I can assure you that what we do is going to
19 be watched.

20 Now, the Park Service took the lead in developing
21 the words "light on the land," was used a lot. The whole
22 concept of "sustainable" or words like that, might not have
23 been used, but the way the infrastructure was built in the
24 parks in the '30s was the environmental sensitive. That's
25 what it was all about. And we in the transportation

1 business, in the last 25 years, have tried to take some
2 lessons from that.

3 So I do think we need to go back and be very aware
4 of what the intent was in the first place. And to give you
5 an example of what I was talking about, this is the unique
6 problem, here's an article from the February 8th, Raleigh
7 News Observer saying Traffic jams choking Smokies. And just
8 pulling right out of that, "Visitor traffic in the Smokies"
9 which is about a half a million acres, about half the size
10 of Glacier, "reached 4.3 million vehicles in 1999, roughly
11 2,500 cars to every black bear in the half-million-acre
12 preserve. That's one million plus more cars than were
13 counted in 1989, a 34 percent increase in the decade." So
14 this is not just a Glacier National Park problem. This is a
15 National Park problem throughout the states. And I think
16 what we do is going to be watched very closely.

17 MR. JACKSON: As the designated economist, I
18 think one of the biggest issues that comes up is fairness.
19 And I think the fairness issue should be probably defined
20 not only in terms of impact of services but workers as well.
21 And I don't see too much of that so I just add that as an
22 issue.

23 MR. BAKER: Hearing what Paul said at the end
24 was very important. And I don't think it was on his sheet.
25 We have this incredible media opportunity, as you have just

1 mentioned also, to put forth an international attraction of
2 how to renew a very special resource in a national park, in
3 an international peace park and world heritage site.
4 Standing alone is enough for most people to come. But when
5 you start talking about how they -- there seems to be a
6 great interest now on the feedback that I'm getting from
7 visitors, and I'm right on the front line. How are the
8 parks managed? That seems to be a very, very -- people are
9 asking that question all the time now. They want to know
10 how it's managed, how the environmental concerns, how the
11 public process goes.

12 I think this is a very amazing opportunity, if we
13 handle it properly, to create an attraction -- a very
14 positive, but we have to do it right. And I think that's
15 going to be very important here. Included in that is -- I
16 have not heard anything and I think it should be discussed
17 along the goals, is what's happening with Highway 2? What's
18 happening with some of the roadways on the east side? These
19 are going to be major conduits that are going to have to be
20 handled. The visitors are going to have to go somewhere,
21 and we must insure in our thought processes that we have
22 looked at this. Maybe we need some renewal of certain
23 areas, different roadside pull-outs, attractions,
24 interpretive sites, et cetera. We have to look at that.
25 And I think that's just as important as the other roads as

1 the Going-to-the-Sun.

2 MR. MEZNARCH: Often we're guilty of
3 perpetuating this misnomer that the Park is the
4 Going-to-the-Sun Road. My business, as well, gets those
5 calls on a regular basis when word gets out that the road is
6 closed because of a snow storm in summer, everyone assumes
7 the Park is closed. Of course we all know that Old Faithful
8 isn't quite so faithful anymore, but Yellowstone is still
9 open, nonetheless. And I think we have the media
10 opportunity to let the world know that and to discover
11 places like the Many Glacier Valley that sometimes go
12 unnoticed by our visitors who are maybe focusing so much on
13 the Sun road that they don't recognize the rest of the
14 natural beauty. Susie talked about traveling in excess of
15 400 times over the road. I've probably done 3,000 times on
16 Highway 2, too many of them towing a trailer over to the
17 west side where we would camp. We would not take the Sun
18 road because we couldn't do that. But there are an awful
19 lot of opportunities outside the road and we need to keep
20 them in mind and use this as an opportunity to let the
21 public be aware of that and not perpetuate this misnomer
22 that the Park is merely the Sun road.

23 MS. PAHL: I think the comment that I heard
24 Paul say that I'm not sure was recorded, which I think is
25 worth repeating, is the idea that people are as interested

1 in the process of this rehabilitation and restoration. That
2 that, itself, could be an attraction. I think we've let the
3 negative closure kind of control the communication as
4 opposed to the positive, as opposed to what you can do. As
5 opposed to what you can't do, we should be talking about
6 what you can do; that you might never have the opportunity
7 to do at any other time, which would be to witness this
8 phenomenal revisiting of the original engineering feat, now
9 in the process to restore and rehabilitate this road. That
10 that may be a reason why people come, just like they came to
11 Yellowstone after the fire, to see the impacts that the fire
12 brought. So I think that that was a really important point
13 that Paul made that we should all be thinking about, which
14 is, what this process may actually add to the visitor
15 experience in Glacier as opposed to the negative information
16 going on about closure.

17 --o0o--

18 Craig Gaskill closes the Committee member comments
19 to take a 15-minute break before proceeding with the agenda.

20 (Proceedings in recess from 10:30 a.m. to
21 10:45 a.m.)

22 Craig Gaskill summarizes what was gleaned from the
23 member presentations that were given before the break.

24 Goals: To rehabilitate, not reconstruct; not close the road
25 and the perception that can give; be light on the land, the

1 environmental perspective; this is an opportunity and
2 challenge to see this as a positive thing for the
3 environment and for the socioeconomic aspects of the region;
4 this is not a road for just the local area but national and
5 regional importance; tourism, real economic impact, consider
6 workers as part of economic impact, historic aspect, visitor
7 aspect; a lot of information still to be gathered;
8 communication with the public and media is important in
9 terms of direction we're going; locals are the stewards of
10 the road; important to learn what's been learned from the
11 past projects or other related projects, lessons learned.

12 Moving on with the agenda, Craig Gaskill
13 introduces Miriam Chapman from the Federal Advisory
14 Committee. Miriam is an attorney with the Office of
15 Solicitor in Washington, D.C. This office actually advises
16 the Department of Interior on many matters, including this
17 particular one. Ms. Chapman's been with the solicitor's
18 office since 1994. She provides advice to the department's
19 bureaus and agencies such as appropriations, ethics and
20 freedom of information. She is known as the FACA (Federal
21 Advisory Committee Act) guru. She will speak to the
22 background and purpose of FACA.

23 Ms. Chapman is honored to be here. Often lawyers
24 aren't called in until after a problem arises. There is a
25 copy of the Federal Advisory Committee Act statute provided

1 in the Committee members' notebooks. This statute is one of
2 the better statutes that people get to work with. It is the
3 process that Congress has set up that, in her opinion,
4 really works. FACA is directly designed to impact the
5 interactions between the connective branch of the government
6 and the people who advise the executive branch of the
7 government. Congress enacted the statute in 1972 with the
8 purpose of looking at who was talking to the executive
9 branch, who had the executive branch's ear. They wanted to
10 put some checks on that so there are no biased, unchecked
11 people advising the executive branch.

12 FACA found its origins in an appropriation bill
13 for the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Congress decided it was time
14 to look at the needs of the road. Among various studies
15 that the statute set up, it also made room for a Citizen
16 Advisory Committee. But Congress did use the word
17 "reconstruction." She explains the Committee has the power
18 to define "reconstruction" and what it should and should not
19 include.

20 An advisory committee is a group that is
21 established or utilized by a federal agency. "Established"
22 means that the agency puts a group together with the purpose
23 and intent to see some product or process come from the
24 group. "Utilized" means that the agency is using the group
25 and relying on the group. And the group is established or

1 utilized to advise or recommend; again, getting back to who
2 is talking to the executive branch. The President talks to
3 each of the executive agencies and the executives talk to
4 the executive agencies. So in many instances, the people
5 that talk to the agencies talk to the President.

6 Ms. Chapman encourages questions during her
7 presentation.

8 FACA establishes a charter requirement under the
9 statute. Basically informs everybody in the public,
10 including the remaining members of the government, what the
11 Committee is going to do. The charter is part of the
12 notebook and is a public document. It lays out the
13 responsibilities of the Committee. It is to advise the
14 National Park Service in the development of alternatives of
15 reconstruction of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier
16 National Park, focusing on road condition and reconstruction
17 strategies, including scheduling costs and measures to
18 mitigate impacts on visitors and local economies. These
19 alternatives will then be analyzed in an environmental
20 document that will provide the basis for the agency
21 decision. There must be a consensus advice to present.
22 Under the statute and charter, the advice goes to the
23 Director of the Park Service who will then share it with the
24 Secretary of the Interior, and that is the process.

25 The Committee cannot meet without the charter.

1 The public is paying for the Committee to meet. This is a
2 public resource, and the Committee is accountable to the
3 public.

4 She sets out the parameters of the charter of
5 FACA. Each charter has a two-year life span. The Committee
6 members were appointed for four years.

7 Section 10 of the Act speaks to meeting
8 procedures. It lays out several duties and responsibilities
9 on the Committee; how they operate, what they do. And
10 those, again, are for the benefit of the process, the
11 benefit of the public. She goes through those briefly.
12 Section 10(a), each Advisory Committee shall be open to the
13 public. This is a public process. They want input from the
14 public. She encourages absorbing information and wrestling
15 with it. The Committee is encouraged to read all public
16 oral comments and public written input. A public record is
17 being made which is available to the public.

18 A meeting may be closed, however that is an
19 expensive and unlikely process. It must be urgent and
20 compelling, but that flies in the face of the statute. A
21 DFO (Designated Federal Official) must be present. How do
22 all these statutory requirements impact the Committee? The
23 Committee is accountable to the public. The Committee must
24 reflect balance.

25 Breaking out into work groups is allowable under

1 the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Subcommittees, task
2 forces may be used. The subcommittee must report what they
3 do to the full committee, and that issue is then debated as
4 a whole and then presented to the executive.

5 Throughout, she encouraged the Committee members
6 to express their views and feelings, not to be ashamed of
7 them, keep their passion up.

8 The Freedom of Information Act applies to FACA.
9 There are open government issues that surround the
10 Committee. The documents produced as a committee, reports,
11 those are all subject to being inspected by the public, a
12 reminder that their role is subject to many rules of the
13 Department of Interior.

14 Concerning personal liabilities. Again, this is
15 an Advisory Committee, not the final decision maker. Though
16 what is advised is going to be relied on and accepted and
17 followed. Because it's the result of long, hard work that
18 is considered the viewpoint, the actual final decision maker
19 of what proceeds is the Secretary, so liability attaches to
20 the Secretary. There is no liability to the Committee
21 members.

22 Another issue is ethical considerations,
23 specifically conflict of interest. Conflict of interest may
24 arise if a Committee member becomes part of a committee
25 discussion that may have some conflict of interest problems.

1 Not generally a problem because FACA wants personal
2 viewpoints. Should it become a problem, a Committee member
3 is allowed to recuse him or herself from voting.

4 Interactions with the media. FACA does not have
5 any specific requirements about contact with the media. She
6 cautions each member, however, to be cautious with their
7 interactions with the media. If they speak to them, she
8 suggests a member not represent the Committee speaking to
9 the media. Each individual has hopes and dreams of where
10 the Committee is going to go and should feel free of where
11 they go. But it would be advisable to allow the chair to
12 speak on behalf of the Committee. That way they know
13 comments are unified. It is too easy to be misstated,
14 misquoted, misunderstood, especially with multiple voices
15 being heard. Involvement with the media is a cautious
16 subject. Advises to tread lightly and tread in one step.

17 Fund raising is an issue that has come up. What
18 capacity can committee members engage in fund raising
19 projects? They can do what they want when they want in
20 their own personal capacity, not as a Committee member.
21 Speak and do for yourself when necessary. Do not do it on
22 behalf of the Committee.

23 If these guidelines are not followed by each
24 Committee member, the entire process may be thrown out and
25 must be started over again.

1 Ms. Chapman thanks and acknowledges her privilege
2 to be here with this Committee, and opens the floor to
3 questions.

4 Bill Dakin asks if the Committee members will be
5 given a copy of the minutes or a transcript. Miriam is not
6 going to have a verbatim transcript but a pretty thorough
7 synopsis of all conversations.

8 Craig Gaskill summarized Miriam Chapman's
9 presentation; to work together to represent the interests
10 and come up with the best possible solution.

11 Pursuant to the agenda, Mr. Gaskill then discusses
12 some of the key topics the Committee needs to consider to
13 move forward:

14 1. Understanding the vision, objectives and issues.
15 It would be good for everybody to start on the same basis of
16 what the overall vision is for the national park. He made
17 mention of the two vision statements presented by the Park;
18 might want to discuss the criteria. The general sessions
19 will be starting on Wednesday. These are ideas of what to
20 talk about in the general sessions.

21 2. Understanding and identifying general information
22 issues. Do the Committee members understand all the
23 information that's out there, where they can get it? Do the
24 members have particular insight that would be good for
25 everyone to know, i.e., natural resource conditions,

1 socioeconomic conditions?

2 3. Establish communication protocols. Important for
3 everyone to understand how is MK going to communicate with
4 the Committee. There will be two meetings a year in the
5 actual charter. But is that enough to keep the project
6 going forward? Does the Committee want updated newsletters
7 or by e-mail? What are the best ways to communicate back
8 and forth? And not only with the Committee but also with
9 the public so they have the information they need to provide
10 the input the Committee members need for the
11 recommendations.

12 4. Develop public participation techniques. There are
13 other ways to communicate with the public and media as well.
14 For example, open-house meetings, one-on-one discussions
15 with interested citizens. Put a web page on the world wide
16 web; radio spots, TV spots, if information is to be provided
17 that way. Other techniques possible.

18 5. Identify process and schedule. The task of the
19 Committee is to let the project team know how to move
20 forward so information can be gleaned; how the information
21 is to be presented. Need to have a work scope so the team
22 can prepare the information, prepare the necessary studies,
23 look at the issues that are to be looked at and back to the
24 Committee to be looked at. Work out a schedule and process
25 that ties into developing the scope and the project

1 agreement with a reference in the notebook. Right above
2 that is identifying project priorities. So there might be a
3 number of issues that are to be identified and addressed,
4 but which ones are the most important and which ones need to
5 be done first?

6 This is presented as the Committee's thought and
7 input. By Wednesday morning this process needs to be made,
8 as the general sessions will then start.

9 Questions are floored.

10 MR. JACKSON: In what form do the Committee
11 members make advice? Do we all agree that you propose a
12 certain kind of analysis, or what do we do?

13 MR. BABB: That's how all members are going
14 to interface and provide those; how is the general public
15 going to be involved? But hopefully that's all going to be
16 incorporated -- referred to in the project agreement so the
17 Committee has direction on how to move together and clearly
18 understand one another in different groups and roles and
19 responsibilities.

20 --o0o--

21 Mr. Gaskill wants the Committee to know what they
22 need to make that decision. The charter actually calls for
23 an engineering study, a socioeconomic study and also the
24 formation of the Advisory Committee. But what is an
25 engineering study? What constitutes the information that

1 you would need in the engineering study to make that
2 decision? Is it an evaluation of different alternatives?
3 And if so, what needs to be known to decide what those
4 alternatives should be to look at?

5 In terms of socioeconomic studies, what issues and
6 answers need to be given to make that recommendation? And
7 are there other areas, besides that, that the Committee
8 would need besides those two areas?

9 As a committee, who do you talk to when you have
10 questions or who, actually, are you working with? Rick
11 Shireman is the designated federal officer. And he should
12 be someone the members could talk to directly for this. The
13 project manager is Fred Babb for the Park Service on this.

14 Mr. Jackson wants clarification. He's not sure of
15 the procedure of filtering information.

16 Mr. Shireman talked about any decision and any
17 process to go through the Committee to be truly a part of
18 the Advisory Committee process. That means that the advice
19 that the Committee provides needs to come with the informed
20 consent and consensus of the entire Committee. That does
21 not mean the Committee cannot determine exactly how they
22 come to consensus and perhaps, as an example, it will
23 identify those folks who speak with expertise in a
24 particular area to speak for the Committee. But the
25 Committee needs to make that decision and the decision needs

1 to be made in total.

2 In terms of the Committee member responses or
3 advice back to the Park Service and to other partners, the
4 Park Service would want something that ratifies or affirms
5 that the Committee has come to a consensus or, if they have
6 not come to a consensus, that there is a majority and
7 minority opinion on a particular proposal. And that would
8 need to be in some format that can be captured and referred
9 back to in the future.

10 Mr. Kilpatrick comments on the ability to form
11 subcommittees. Those subcommittees can be drawn, in part or
12 in whole, from the Committee itself. The Committee can go
13 outside of itself to gain advice. But that subcommittee's
14 information has to come back to the Committee as a whole and
15 go through the process for consensus. That would be on
16 option to be discussed in the general meetings.

17 Mr. Sliter comments that before a recommendation
18 can be made, does the Committee need to have a decision for
19 a recommendation placed before it? Can a member of the
20 Committee simply say to the group, I think that we should
21 recommend to the Park Service and the Secretary that this
22 route be taken, then have discussion on it, basically, in
23 the form of a motion? Does the Committee have to wait until
24 the question is posed or can the Committee create their own
25 question?

1 Mr. Shireman comments that that's the procedure
2 the Committee can decide themselves and either one would be
3 appropriate, as long as the Committee comes to consensus on
4 the procedure and also on the actual act of the
5 recommendation. The Committee has the capacity and meeting,
6 in their general sessions, as to how they want to proceed.

7 Mr. Sliter reiterates the meaning of consensus
8 meaning 100 percent. But the charter says if the Committee
9 can't meet consensus, then minority and majority opinions
10 must be stated and that a vote was taken. That meaning is
11 confirmed by Miriam Chapman. Ms. Chapman gives the example
12 that the majority agreed to X, however, there was strong
13 opposition for the minority opinion, which was Y. The
14 Committee has the flexibility to do what it takes to get the
15 job done.

16 Mr. O'Quinn states he has never worked with a
17 federal committee but with steering committees. His
18 impression of the steering committee is that the Committee
19 makes recommendations. The National Park Service is the
20 lead federal agency here and all the decisions, really, rest
21 with them. And the direction to the agency comes from the
22 Park Service, not from the Committee; that this Committee's
23 really not hard-core decisions as much as they are
24 recommendations to the Park Service. And they can take and
25 leave from that pretty much as they choose but, at the same

1 time, have got to operate within the framework of NEPA, as
2 far as alternatives and those sorts of things. He questions
3 if his interpretation is correct.

4 Mr. Gaskill confirms that the Committee is making
5 a recommendation to the Park Service and formally with the
6 Secretary of the Department of Interior itself. But from
7 experience, if the decision doesn't match what comes out of
8 this Committee or public process, then there will be
9 problems.

10 Mr. Shireman says there are a series of decisions
11 that need to be made in coming to the final alternative that
12 will be identified for the rehabilitation of
13 Going-to-the-Sun Road. The Park Service expects to work
14 collaboratively with the Advisory Committee. The decision
15 process rests with the National Park Service as the federal
16 agency that the Advisory Committee is advising. And that
17 means that those interim or intermediary decisions also rest
18 with the Park Service in their responsibility as the federal
19 agency and as the agency that has provided the resources to
20 the Committee for its operation. However, because they will
21 be building this process over the next couple of years and
22 they will be sitting in the same room, that the process of
23 the Committee's crafting those requests for information that
24 are going to require decisions on the part of the Park
25 Service, the Park Service will be doing that in the same

1 place. And certainly the Park Service is going to provide
2 information to the Committee on what can and cannot be
3 provided. And that may help the Committee to craft its
4 request for information in a way that the decisions can be
5 moved forward right away. The decision and set of decisions
6 that the Park Service will be making they'll be making as
7 they are sitting and listening to the Committee and taking
8 into account all of the needs and the interests of the
9 various people on the Committee.

10 Mr. O'Quinn agrees that's true for the
11 strategic-type decisions but that there are day-to-day
12 decisions that will have to be made on the ongoing studies.
13 And if the Committee isn't going to be meeting but twice a
14 year, it's going to be difficult, as far as gathering data
15 and analyzing.

16 Mr. Shireman suggests that one of the things Craig
17 mentioned to the Committee was to determine a method of
18 communication, and that's what Mr. O'Quinn is speaking to,
19 between the official meetings. How the committee members
20 are receiving information and preparing information back to
21 the Park Service and MK Centennial. And that's a concern
22 that the Committee needs to determine, what level of
23 communication they want to develop in between the official
24 meetings.

25 Mr. Ogle asks if all of the Committee

1 communication must be filtered through the Park Service and
2 staff or if can they communicate between each other.

3 Mr. Gaskill says that they want to make sure that
4 everyone gets it, no matter how formal or structured it is.

5 Mr. Shireman states that if there are requests
6 from MK Centennial, those must be funneled through the Park
7 Service and Glacier National Park, in terms of making sure
8 that they fall within their contractual obligation with
9 MK Centennial. That being said, there's probably some
10 information and activities that can be established as part
11 of the project scope of work that identify the kinds of
12 communication that can be directly and would be encouraged
13 to have directly with MK Centennial that are bound by the
14 existing contract. And the Park Service would expect that
15 there will be a lot of communication that flows among all
16 the Committee members and the Park Service, Federal
17 Highways, MK Centennial and the Advisory Committee.

18 Ms. Chapman suggests that the Committee consider,
19 just for consistency purpose and to get to some of the
20 concerns of how communication actually happens, that it
21 might be a good idea to funnel most, if not all, requests
22 through the Park Service, so that as they're the people who
23 are going to be implementing and working on what is wanted,
24 they have an idea of what's going on. Because of geographic
25 distance, because of e-mail blips, of voice mail blips, you

1 really want to have the notion that there's at least one
2 person who has a good idea of what's going on with the
3 communication flow at all times, and that Committee members
4 can know, no matter what else is going on, they can give
5 that person a call regarding the issue. That's a practical
6 basis to have one consistent basis.

7 Mr. McDonald suggests that being familiar with
8 NEPA and trying to maximize the opportunity of this
9 Committee, is the Committee expected to come up with one
10 recommendation or more than recommendation, a range of
11 recommendations to comply with NEPA?

12 Mr. Babb responds with the answer of a range.

13 The engineering study will come out with a range
14 of alternatives that then will be analyzed, both from an
15 economic standpoint as well as environmental standpoint and
16 the beginning of NEPA. And it's a catch 22 because there's
17 going to be playoffs between economics as well as
18 engineering as well as environment. But it will be a range
19 of alternatives that will then be the decision document
20 which will be whatever level compliance document that is
21 ultimately done for an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement),
22 the way the scope reads.

23 Mr. Ogle referred back to the communication issue.
24 He understands filtering all the requests through the Park
25 Service. But if a report is presented by MK Centennial,

1 Randy won't understand the report but Barney might. Does
2 Randy have to say, Rick, can you ask him the questions, or
3 can he call up Barney?

4 Mr. O'Quinn states the Committee members don't
5 need to be dealing directly with the consultant. The
6 Committee members ought to be dealing with the project
7 managers.

8 Mr. Jewett has a question with a starting point,
9 where the Committee is going. When he read the draft
10 project agreement, which was the scope of the project, he
11 believed that the Park Service has already completed an EIS.
12 He wonders if that's correct.

13 Mr. Babb answers no. The EIS was done on the
14 General Management Plan, and this is part of the referred
15 option that comes from that.

16 Mr. Jewett wants to know where the starting point
17 is. Is the Committee's task to pick a range of alternatives
18 on the best methods to achieve it?

19 Mr. Babb answers yes. There will probably be
20 other things that relate to that, but yes.

21 Mr. Jewett wants to ground the Committee on where
22 the Park Service has identified where it wants the road to
23 be after rehabilitation. The Committee should look at the
24 GMP (General Management Plan), if that's accurate.

25 Mr. Babb says it's fairly general also, so there's

1 a lot of latitude to add to that desired outcome or
2 condition.

3 Ms. Burch wondered, from a practical point of
4 view, talking about making a request to MK Centennial, and
5 she presumes that some of these requests would have price
6 tags, if you had every Committee member calling up and
7 saying, I'd like to see this and that. She's curious about
8 the funding. She sees there's a budget amount for the
9 Committee annually and presumes the balance of that will go
10 to the engineering company. Is MK in it for the duration of
11 the amount, or is there the opportunity to go over the
12 budget? Perhaps that should be addressed.

13 Mr. Gaskill then thanks everyone for their
14 thoughts and adjourns the morning session of the agenda for
15 lunch.

16 (Proceedings in recess from 12:10 p.m. to
17 1:15 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 The meeting is called to order by Craig Gaskill
2 after the lunch break. Questions about the EIS compliance
3 process came up during the lunch break. Those will be
4 addressed later this afternoon, if possible.

5 Continuing on with the agenda, introduction of the
6 Park panel discussion includes Chairman Steve Frye, chief
7 ranger; Larry Frederick, chief of interpretation; Norma
8 Nickerson, University of Montana; and Rick Shireman, Acting
9 Superintendent.

10 Steve Frye introduces the Park panel and its
11 purpose. Its purpose is to begin to build the framework
12 within which the Committee will be conducting their
13 deliberations. This session will begin to focus more on the
14 direct issues and opportunities and constraints that the
15 Committee will have to contend with during their meetings.

16 The panel is arranged in a way that Rick Shireman
17 will lead off with a discussion of the General Management
18 Plan, the vision, the commercial services plan and the
19 transportation planning efforts. Begin to prepare a picture
20 of the management framework within which the Park operates
21 on a day-to-day basis. Larry Frederick will talk about
22 visitation along Going-to-the-Sun Road, challenges that
23 exist with managing that visitation. Then Norma Nickerson
24 will discuss the economic aspects of the visitation that Mr.
25 Frederick talked about. Mr. Frye will close with a

1 discussion of the natural and environmental issues that the
2 Park will be addressing along Going-to-the-Sun Road.

3 Rick Shireman is introduced. He described the
4 panel. Has worked with the panel members for two-and-a-half
5 months and are a fine group of people to work with. The
6 staff of the Park truly feel they are stewards of the Park.

7 He has worked in eight national parks, and this is
8 the first national park he's worked in that has a brand new
9 General Management Plan.

10 The General Management Plan is a very broad-based,
11 very general perception and direction and guide for the next
12 15, 20 years in a park's life. It gives some level of
13 constraint but a great degree of freedom in determining
14 exactly how the staff is going to move forward to meet the
15 mission of the particular national park.

16 All Committee members received in their materials
17 a copy of the General Management Plan. And it is in several
18 parts. It is quite an extensive document. There is a short
19 version, a long version, the EIS, and a document that
20 contains the abbreviated comments of all of the people that
21 were part of the process of working towards the development
22 of the General Management Plan. The five-year period of the
23 GMP the Park Service received almost 7,000 comments,
24 replies, ideas, requests from concerned citizen groups,
25 individuals, constituencies across the United States and,

1 most particularly, from the region around Glacier and the
2 local communities.

3 The plan was begun in 1995. It was a five-year
4 period of development. The final GMP and record of
5 decision; there was an EIS that was prepared in terms of
6 looking at the impacts that could possibly come from the
7 implementation of the GMP. The final was published on
8 December 2nd of 1999. The document is completed and a
9 Record of Decision, and the Park is moving forward to taking
10 the steps that were implemented within the General
11 Management Plan.

12 The GMP contains broad management determinations
13 for Glacier National Park which include the identification
14 of six geographic areas within the national park. Those
15 included the North Fork area, Goat Haunt, Belly River, Many
16 Glacier, Going-to-the-Sun, the Two Medicine area and the
17 Middle Fork area.

18 In addition to the six geographic areas, the
19 General Management Plan identified four types of management
20 zones that would be contained within each of those
21 geographic areas. Those included visitor service areas, day
22 use zones, rustic zones, and back country zones.

23 The visitor service zones are those areas where
24 the public has the services that they need to enjoy and
25 fully understand the resources of the Park. This is where

1 the hotels, the visitor centers, the access to information
2 and transportation systems for motorized vehicles occur. It
3 is, generally speaking, the platform upon which most
4 visitors see and enjoy the rest of the Park. It provides a
5 safe and convenient way of interacting and dealing with both
6 the natural and cultural resources, but takes care in
7 limiting the effects of those visitor zones and those
8 facilities that are constructed within those zones on the
9 resources that they touch.

10 The second level are day use zones. Those are
11 areas that visitors that are intent on getting a little
12 closer to the resource, and particularly the natural
13 resource, can get away from some of the developed areas and
14 some of the hotels and take day trips. These areas are
15 generalized by trails, front country trails by some limited
16 visitor access sites. It includes the back country chalets
17 where many visitors get a taste of being in a great national
18 park but still have some comforts in overnight
19 accommodations.

20 The third level are rustic zones. These reflect
21 back to the great history of Glacier National Park and the
22 history of great western parks in the United States. Rustic
23 zones, while limited in size and location within Glacier
24 National Park, give visitors the opportunity to see what the
25 Park really was like in its early days; to get back to a

1 time where life was slower, where there was less congestion,
2 where there are fewer contacts with other visitors to the
3 Park and closer to what an early visit to Glacier was like.

4 The back country zone is where nature runs its
5 course. Visitors experience a very limited contact with
6 other human interactions. Where it has limited, very
7 strictly, the use of facilities and resources and
8 concentrate on the interaction of the natural resources that
9 are available. This is epitomized by over 700 miles of
10 hiking trails; the ability of visitors to interact directly
11 with the natural world and to get a clear understanding of
12 what a wilderness area, or an area that's managed as a
13 wilderness, is really like.

14 In addition to general categories of management
15 areas, the General Management Plan identified eight major
16 critical issues and action areas that the Park Service and
17 the partners who worked on the General Management Plan
18 believed were going to be critical to the management of
19 Glacier in the next 20 years. Those include the visitor use
20 on Going-to-the-Sun Road, preservation of Going-to-the-Sun
21 Road, preservation of historic hotels and visitor services
22 within the Park, scenic air towers, personal watercraft use,
23 winter use in the Park, and two particular areas in the
24 Park, the Divide Creek area on the east side of the Park and
25 the developed area that's currently in a flood plain and the

1 recommendation that that be moved out of the flood plain,
2 and then on the west side, the establishment of a west side
3 discovery center and museum somewhere near the West Glacier
4 entrance inside the Park.

5 Three of these eight areas are discussed, as they
6 deal with the Going-to-the-Sun Road. The visitor use and
7 the preservation of the road itself deal directly with the
8 Going-to-the-Sun Road, and the historic hotels and the
9 visitor services deal indirectly, as they are tied closely
10 to the transportation system that the Going-to-the-Sun Road
11 provides a backbone for.

12 The general intent of the General Management Plan
13 and the interests of every person who commented in some way,
14 shape or form on the GMP during the public comment periods
15 indicated that the National Park Service should continue to
16 protect and manage Glacier National Park and the natural and
17 cultural resources within the Park as a traditional large
18 western park area with visitor services and activities that
19 continue the flavor and the history of the Park. Beneath
20 that, and throughout the GMP, is the concept that a first
21 importance is to protect the resources that all of the
22 visitors hold dear to their hearts, in terms of the reasons
23 that the Park was first established. So cultural and
24 natural resources underline the concept of continuing the
25 Park in a format and in a flavor that reflects its great

1 heritage and history.

2 In terms of visitor use on the Going-to-the-Sun
3 Road, the preferred alternative that's been established in
4 the General Management Plan states that the National Park
5 Service will continue to protect the Going-to-the-Sun Road
6 as a national historic landmark, retaining its historic
7 character and maintaining its traditional use. Allowing the
8 use of personal vehicles along the road will continue.
9 Establishing a public transport system will be sought and
10 determined. Also a comprehensive use plan is encouraged to
11 be developed for increased use of the road corridor.

12 In terms of preservation of the Going-to-the-Sun
13 Road, the National Park Service will continue to protect and
14 preserve the road's historic character and significance.
15 Needed repairs will be completed before the road fails. And
16 that's a very clear statement out of the General Management
17 Plan. Needed repairs will be completed before the road
18 fails.

19 With minimum impacts on visitor resources, natural
20 resources, visitor use and mitigation will be provided. The
21 cost will be minimized and additional studies will be
22 completed before the determination of best alternatives for
23 the full rehabilitation or reconstruction. The National
24 Park Service will continue to use existing levels of
25 resources to continue the ongoing maintenance and operation

1 of the Park roads. Recently, road maintenance costs have
2 been running in the range of two to two-and-a-half million
3 dollars a year. The GMP also noted that a Citizens Advisory
4 Committee would be established, thus this Committee.

5 The GMP noted the historic value to a period of
6 development in the west and Glacier National Park and
7 identified the importance of those structures as being
8 unparalleled in the Park Service. It also identified that
9 there was a great need for rehabilitation for those
10 structures. In current estimates, the cost of
11 rehabilitation of the historic landmarks and associated
12 structures are somewhere in the range of a hundred to 135
13 million dollars.

14 Commercial services plans would include condition
15 assessment of the current structures operated, structural
16 and engineering surveys of those structures, historic
17 structure reports on the buildings that are on the list of
18 classified structures or are already national landmarks,
19 determination of the concessionaires' possessory interest in
20 those properties, the development of a transportation study
21 that looked at the flow of transportation. Here's the
22 connection with the Going-to-the-Sun Road and transportation
23 systems, both inside and outside the Park, to look at how
24 the Park moves visitors and guests through the Park. An
25 economic feasibility study on those concession services that

1 are currently provided or future services and changes in
2 those services, and appropriate environmental compliant
3 studies and documentation.

4 Larry Frederick summarized visitor use and
5 concession activities and transportation issues as it
6 relates to the road. He used overhead visuals, remarks and
7 maps.

8 Visitor use to the Park has been on a general up
9 swing, with some peaks and valleys. Most declines are
10 followed by a less of a decline, and the peaks are usually
11 followed by a higher peak than the previous one. Busiest
12 months of the year in Glacier are July and August, but
13 concessionaires and businesses refer to a hundred-day
14 season, starting sometime in May and ending sometime in
15 September. A short season, from a business perspective.

16 In 1999, the Park had just under 1.7 million
17 visitors, down eight percent from the year before. In 1998,
18 1.8 million, which was up seven percent from the year
19 before. The five-year average is 1.76 million. It's
20 informative to know the traffic levels the Park is dealing
21 with in the Going-to-the-Sun Road. In July, comparison
22 between the west entrance and St. Mary. Those refer to
23 either end of the 52-mile drive and refer to the businesses
24 and Park development that are found on either boundary of
25 the Park at either end of the road. The west entrance

1 receives 45 percent of traffic coming in through the west
2 entrance of the Park. That is significant. That equates to
3 about 2,600 vehicles a day. This is actual recreation use.
4 It does not count concession employees, delivery trucks,
5 Park vehicles entering the Park. St. Mary, during July, 17
6 percent of the traffic entering at that point and a thousand
7 vehicles a day. So recreational traffic of about 3,600 and
8 add in other recreational use, probably around 4,500 to
9 5,000 vehicles a day entering the Park in July.

10 In August the figures are similar. St. Mary is
11 higher with 18 percent of traffic coming through the
12 entrance and probably 500 vehicles less per day. This is
13 related to possibly school calendars.

14 Total visitation coming in the two major entrances
15 along the road show 50 percent of the total traffic for the
16 year through the west entrance and 18 percent through St.
17 Mary. There is more fall, winter and spring use through the
18 west entrance than St. Mary. A visitor survey conducted in
19 1990 showed that around 80 percent of the visitors travel to
20 and take in Logan Pass as part of their experience in the
21 Park.

22 A year in the life of the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
23 January, the road is closed due to snow in the upper
24 sections. The road is closed at the head of Lake McDonald.
25 In January, people can access the road at that point for

1 snowshoing and cross-country skiing. On the other side near
2 St. Mary, near the visitor center is where the road is
3 closed generally in winter months. Again, snowshoeing and
4 cross-country skiing takes place. The message is the Park
5 is open year round, portions of the Going-to-the-Sun Road is
6 open year round, and the Logan Pass portion is closed.

7 First week of April, the road crew starts plowing
8 the road. The road is gradually opened up behind the road
9 crew to visiting public. The road is used extensively by
10 hikers and bicyclists which has created a new recreational
11 opportunity for visitors. The Logan Pass area of the road
12 is reached between late May and June. Largely dependent on
13 the weather that is received in late April and May. Couple
14 days are taken to have the visitor center and water system
15 tested, and the visitor center is open to the public and the
16 road is open to the public.

17 If a vehicle is over 21 feet in length or is wider
18 than eight feet, it is restricted from traveling the upper
19 portions of the road. Bicycle use is allowed on the road
20 but only during certain times of the day. Certain areas
21 along the road where there is much visitor use and
22 congestion. The West Glacier area is almost a full-service
23 community; campground, gas stations, post office,
24 restaurants, overnight accommodations, rafting. Quite a
25 number of facilities are available outside the Park. Into

1 the Park along the Going-to-the-Sun Road, the entrance
2 station and not far into the Park at the base of the lake,
3 is the Apgar Village. There is a variety of places to stop
4 and pull over along the Lake McDonald area. The Avalanche
5 area is very popular for hiking, camping, picnicking. It
6 tends to be crowded a good portion of the day. At the loop
7 area is another area of congestion. Small limited parking
8 but is a major trailhead for folks who are coming out from
9 or going into the Granite Park Chalet, which is a
10 back-country overnight facility. Continuing up the road
11 there's a variety of overlooks, pullouts, interpretive
12 signs. Big Bend area is extremely popular with adequate
13 parking. Overland Bend is very popular with tremendous
14 views and oftentimes a chance to see wildlife.

15 Logan Pass parking lot is usually full from 10:00
16 in the morning to 4:00 in the afternoon. There is a visitor
17 center, restroom facilities, boardwalk, major destination
18 for a lot of visitors. Siyeh Bend area is growing in
19 popularity. Restroom facilities are located there in a
20 pullout and trailhead and is a place where people stop and
21 get out to stretch. From Siyeh Bend all the way through
22 Logan Pass and towards the Big Bend area, the highest
23 section of the road can see snow well into August.

24 The road on the east side is not as steep as the
25 road on the west side, so people tend to spread out fairly

1 well down along the St. Mary Lake area. At Rising Sun,
2 there's overnight accommodations, campground. It's one of
3 five places in the Park where there are scenic boat tours
4 are available. And anchoring the other end of the road is
5 the St. Mary visitor center, largest visitor center in the
6 Park with the St. Mary community, which is also a
7 full-service community outside the Park.

8 The Park means many things to many people.

9 Steve Frye speaks of one of the more daunting
10 challenges facing the Committee is to bring all the
11 Committee members up to some equal level of understanding,
12 some parody, in terms of understanding the context within
13 which the Going-to-the-Sun Road exists.

14 Norma Nickerson directs the Institute for Tourism
15 and Recreation Research at the University of Montana. Part
16 of the funding for the Institute is state bed tax dollars.
17 As of 1998 there had been an economic study done. There are
18 two economic studies; Bioeconomics and Institute on the
19 impact of the Going-to-the-Sun Road rehabilitation. Three
20 different scenarios were studied; a ten-year rehabilitation,
21 a four-year rehabilitation and a six-year rehabilitation.
22 What is the economic loss based on that.

23 The Bioeconimical study ten-year time frame showed
24 the economic loss each individual year is less but
25 cumulatively the loss was greater because it takes longer.

1 The four-year time frame showed the initial economic loss
2 was harder but cumulatively the loss was less on the
3 businesses in the area.

4 The Institute study results showed that once you
5 do something, unless there's some form of a marketing
6 campaign to offset it, there will be an economic impact.
7 The study exists and is readily available to all Committee
8 members through the Internet, as it was not printed for the
9 panel discussion today. She did mention that the economic
10 loss range is from 65 million to 250 million, mostly in the
11 tourism sectors.

12 Steve Frye, with the use of visual aid slides,
13 spoke of the fact that natural and cultural resources define
14 Glacier National Park. They are the foundation upon which
15 visitor experiences are built and the inspiration for a
16 lifetime of memories. It holds special historical, cultural
17 and spiritual significance for Indians. Wildlife, go a long
18 way to defining what Glacier National Park is all about.
19 National historic landmark hotels, spiritual locations such
20 as Chief Mountain and Native American neighbors are all part
21 of Glacier's rich cultural history. Not often thought of is
22 the geology and climate of Glacier which has to do with the
23 natural and cultural context.

24 One word to summarize the myriad of attributes
25 that characterize the natural and cultural resources of

1 Glacier and that's "diversity." No more apparent than
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road corridor.

3 It is essential that the Committee does not lose
4 sight of the human relationship between Glacier and the
5 species. There are over 300 known terrestrial species of
6 trees, over 1200 vascular plants. Bald eagles, wolves,
7 grizzly bears, badgers, snails, amphibians all exist and use
8 the Going-to-the-Sun corridor. All these species can be
9 impacted by the efforts and activities along
10 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

11 Learned recently that during the construction of
12 Going-to-the-Sun Road a great deal of sediment was
13 discharged into the streams on both sides of the Continental
14 Divide. That sediment found its way into Lake McDonald and
15 St. Mary Lake. Today, that issue would be one of great
16 concern for those working on the road, as it impacts the
17 water quality. Engineering challenges will pale to the
18 natural and cultural resources.

19 Questions were flooded.

20 MR. O'QUINN: If I understood you correctly,
21 you said of the total traffic, 50 percent came in from the
22 west entrance and 18 percent came in from the east?

23 MR. FREDERICK: That's correct.

24 MR. O'QUINN: Where are the rest entering?

25 MR. FREDERICK: They're entering at Many

1 Glacier, Two Medicine, Walton, Polebridge, Goat Haunt.
2 There's a variety of entrance points around the Park. But
3 that's where we get our heaviest traffic, along those roads.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Of those that are using this
5 road, what would be the percentage of through trips from
6 west to east or east to west?

7 MR. FREDERICK: You're talking about people
8 who start at one end and would drive all the way --

9 MR. O'QUINN: People driving all the way
10 through.

11 MR. FREDERICK: I'm not sure. A majority,
12 Steve, are going all the way through. We probably get more
13 traffic on the west side going into the Park and coming back
14 out again, than we do from the east side. But I would have
15 to agree that a majority of the people are driving all the
16 way through.

17 MR. FRYE: We know, for instance, that over
18 80 percent of the people who visit Glacier visit Logan Pass
19 at some time during their stay in the Park.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Okay, if I were coming in from
21 here, going in through the west entrance and going all the
22 way through and coming out at St. Mary, what would I likely
23 do at that point? Would I come around and come back through
24 the road or would I come around 2?

25 MR. FREDERICK: You may turn around and come

1 back. You may very well continue on up to Waterton Lakes
2 National Park, or you might depart and head into eastern
3 Montana. Some drive around U.S. Highway 2 and back to the
4 west side again.

5 MR. O'QUINN: And if I'm coming from the east
6 side, the reverse, would I most likely go south to
7 Yellowstone?

8 MR. FREDERICK: Most likely, or further west.

9 MR. O'QUINN: But still, the majority are
10 coming in from the west.

11 MR. FREDERICK: Yes.

12 MR. BABB: Barney, the only statistics that
13 we have is entrance and exists -- really, entrance. We have
14 some turning movements up at Logan Pass. But that's one of
15 the things that we're probably going to discuss tomorrow in
16 regards to movement of people; Do we need additional
17 information? And if so, what?

18 MR. O'QUINN: You really should do an origin
19 and destination study.

20 MR. BABB: I agree. That's like we don't know
21 where they stop, how many people stop as they go through the
22 Going-to-the-Sun experience also. We don't have any data to
23 back up, you know, our assumptions.

24 MR. JACKSON: I have some economics
25 questions. I see no reference to a demand analysis. Has

1 there ever been any kind of formal analysis with reference
2 to visitors?

3 MR. FREDERICK: No.

4 MS. NICKERSON: In our study, all we did was
5 take a streamline -- I was just looking at what we predicted
6 for year 2001 compared to the -- because this was done a
7 couple years ago, and, you know, that's even too long.
8 Because you'd have to have a good increase in the next year
9 or two to get where we're all ready predicting it would have
10 been, just on a regular increase.

11 MR. JACKSON: The impact analysis so far has
12 ignored the expenditure of a hundred million dollars on
13 construction which would, to some extent, counterbalance the
14 loss of visitation. Is there any intention to do that and
15 to look at what sectors would actually bloom under that
16 compared to the rest?

17 MS. NICKERSON: I think the Bioeconomic study
18 got into more sectors. What we did in our particular one
19 was put some of the monies back into the economy in -- you
20 know, the construction was put back in. But we made an
21 assumption here, and it was based on lots of discussions
22 that about 25 percent of the construction dollars let would
23 go to Montana companies and the rest would be outside of the
24 state because of the special needs. So the money that we
25 were projecting to come back in is not the biggest sum.

1 MR. JACKSON: I had a couple more questions.
2 You had mentioned the 80 percent stuff for out-of-state
3 visitors. Does that mean you used the out of state visitor
4 expenditure studies to look at the total change of
5 visitation, or did you only take 80 percent total change of
6 visitation using out-of-state visitor studies?

7 MS. NICKERSON: Okay; yeah. Our study just
8 looked at -- because 80 percent of the visitors to Glacier
9 National Park, according to the Peccia study, are
10 nonresident to the state, we just took the nonresident
11 piece. So there's 20 percent visitation numbers or
12 expenditures that are not included in this particular study.

13 MR. BROOKE: I have a comment that dovetails
14 on this Peccia study addressed to the Committee members.
15 When we looked at what was coming out and what the Park
16 Service was relying upon in part, we had some real concerns
17 about the economic impacts that they woefully
18 underestimated, that the economic impacts would be much
19 higher. Just by way of example, the Peccia study is
20 interviewing people that are already here. And they see it,
21 they're wowed by it, as people always are. But we wondered
22 what would happen if you started asking those same questions
23 to somebody who was back in Minneapolis, had not come to
24 Montana yet that was planning their trip. And you said If
25 the road is closed, are you still going to come to the Park?

1 We think there would be a much different answer and,
2 consequently, there would be a much higher economic impact.
3 So I think the economic impacts here are numbers that we can
4 kick around, unfortunately, when we level the land and just
5 suspect it's higher. So it's just a comment to reflect
6 upon. Maybe Norma has a response.

7 MS. NICKERSON: That's a real good point.
8 However, nonresidents to the state of Montana -- 75 percent
9 of them have been here before. So a good share of them will
10 have already been wowed and maybe would come back. But
11 there is that 25 percent -- and if they were all going to go
12 to Glacier, then, yeah, that certainly is a concern.

13 MR. BROOKE: Again, the economic impact study
14 suggests that shorter is faster, you take a bigger hit, two
15 years or four years versus slow death over ten years. And
16 there's an assumption in there that after you take the big
17 hit, you're going to be able to get back up and keep going.
18 And that can often be a very big assumption, especially with
19 small businesses and especially with businesses that may
20 have highly leveraged themselves to make capital
21 improvements or are in the middle of capital improvements
22 when they take that.

23 MR. JACKSON: In the scope of step two,
24 there's mitigation strategy, assuming federal assistance. I
25 presume you'd have to know what the people were earning in

1 the tourism sector, for instance, with the road work, as
2 opposed to what they would have earned without it. And that
3 would presuppose that you'd have a pretty good understanding
4 of what kind of level of visits there would be there without
5 it. And right now, we don't have a very good idea of why
6 it's going down, for instance, during the '90s. At least I
7 haven't heard an explanation. So it seems to me that there
8 should be some way of knowing those differences.

9 The other thing is you call socioeconomic analysis
10 and everything has been hard-core economics. There's no
11 discussion of who the workers are and what happens to them.
12 There's no discussion whether they're Canadians or Americans
13 or where they come from and all those different kinds of
14 things, which, I think, are part of the larger picture,
15 whether they're rich or poor and all those things, which I
16 think are all part of the larger context of what the impacts
17 would be.

18 MS. SEXTON: Travel Montana did a study where
19 they had people staked at rest stops and gas stations. It
20 was a conversion study about travelers generally in Montana.
21 Were any of those questions directed at the
22 Glacier-Yellowstone corridor or other opportunities that
23 people participate in outside the Park but maybe perhaps
24 people come to the Park but then they do enjoy other
25 opportunities? Can you refer to those studies?

1 MS. NICKERSON: Those are our studies. We do
2 nonresident visitor summary, and that's where the bulk of
3 this data came from for this report. I think it's 24
4 percent of all the nonresident Montanans who come primarily
5 for Glacier National Park, and then another 10 or 15 percent
6 added on top who have marked it off as one of their pieces
7 within their big puzzle of vacation in the state of Montana.
8 But if you said a quarter of the nonresidents came here
9 because of Glacier, then they're the ones -- and they're the
10 ones who we used a lot of our information to base our data
11 on in here. And then we included the primary ones for those
12 who would probably come to the state anyway but wouldn't
13 come to the Glacier area. So the Glacier area would be
14 affected economically, but the state wouldn't, with that
15 group of people.

16 MS. PAHL: To get to the economic
17 conclusions, in terms of the impact -- and I think -- did
18 you say 25 percent of the nonresidents who say going to
19 Glacier is their reason for going to Montana? Did you ask
20 that 25 percent whether or not if Logan pass were closed
21 they would not plan to come?

22 MS. NICKERSON: No. Our data that we used,
23 it's state-wide data. And at that point, it wasn't even an
24 issue, at that point. The Peccia study did ask all visitors
25 in a sampling time period those questions. And that's the

1 one where --

2 MS. PAHL: Did they differentiate between
3 residents and nonresidents?

4 MS. NICKERSON: Yes.

5 MS. PAHL: And was the answer the same from
6 nonresidents and residents?

7 MS. NICKERSON: I don't know. I could look.

8 MR. FREDERICK: If my recollection is fairly
9 close, I'm getting a little bit out on a limb here, but I
10 also recollect that people said that they would return to
11 the Park if the road was under construction. About 60
12 percent said they would, even if the road was under
13 construction. But it jumped to 80 percent if the question
14 was asked in such a way that Logan Pass would be open and
15 accessible to them from one side or the other.

16 MS. NICKERSON: In our reports, since we
17 didn't do the resident piece of it, I don't have that one
18 page. So I can't answer for sure. But it is in the Peccia
19 report. And they should be able to get it to me.

20 MS. PAHL: Yeah, actually, is that something
21 we can download?

22 MR. SHIREMAN: We do have hard copies of that
23 that could be available later this week.

24 MS. PAHL: Is that the data that both of
25 these two reports use, the same data?

1 out -- you know, we do all nonresidents. So we have a group
2 of people -- and I say this to a lot of groups of travelers
3 just trying to get out of here -- we're in the way. If
4 you're living in Washington, you're going to Minnesota, they
5 have to go through Montana. If you're in Canada and you're
6 going down to Salt Lake or Denver, we're in the way. And so
7 if you take out that group, then I think you're right, that
8 number of what we would call true visitors, vacation
9 visitors, is higher, yes.

10 MR. O'QUINN: The numbers you show as
11 visitation is pretty much up and down, more so than I would
12 expect. In the early '70s I understand the gas shortage.
13 Do you have any explanation for any of the other down trends
14 and then going back up, intuitive or otherwise?

15 MR. FREDERICK: There's so many factors.
16 I've only been here four years. Steve has been here longer
17 than I. But what I've been asked to do with the opening
18 date for Going-to-the-Sun Road -- because it can vary by a
19 month, and that has a major factor on Park visitation. The
20 Canadian exchange rate has a big factor on Canadian
21 visitation to Montana; gasoline prices and availability;
22 travel trends. There are so many factors that you just
23 can't point to.

24 MR. O'QUINN: What about in the last couple
25 of years?

1 MS. NICKERSON: It's all speculation because
2 we haven't gone out and asked those who didn't come, why
3 they didn't come. But what we always say is, when the
4 economy is really good, which it is right now, people are
5 going to more exotic locations. And Montana just doesn't
6 happen to be that. We're seeing more -- nationally, more
7 visitation leaving the country, going to their Europe and
8 their Australian trips that they haven't done. So I think
9 we are just affected by that. And the exchange rate, if you
10 look at the downward trend, fits right in with the Canadian
11 exchange rate and how bad its been. So those are the two
12 bad ones I would say. We're all flocking up to Canada
13 because we get a great deal up there.

14 MR. OGLE: What about weather? Does the
15 weather --

16 MR. FREDERICK: Yes, absolutely.
17 Traditionally, June is a rainy month; we don't get great
18 visitation. Then July and August and suddenly school
19 starts. And in some respects it's almost a six week season
20 in July and half of August.

21 MS. KREMENIK: Hi, Norma, I have a quick
22 question, based on Will's comment. Your dollar numbers
23 you've got associated with a different reconstruction
24 alternatives. Are you assuming that like the four-year
25 completion, that those economic impact numbers would

1 return -- that the levels would return to normal after the
2 end of four years? Are you assuming that's only a four-year
3 impact?

4 MS. NICKERSON: As soon as the construction
5 was done, we stopped our analysis. So, yeah, that's a
6 really big assumption.

7 MS. KREMENIK: You're assuming it's going to
8 shrink back to normal after four years.

9 MS. NICKERSON: You bet. So if there's not
10 an incredible marketing process that goes along with it,
11 then I would say the impact's probably going to be larger.

12 MS. ANDERSON: I really have just a comment.
13 Of course, our name is Glacier Country, and we're one of the
14 regions. But over 63 percent of the inquiries that we get
15 are in regard to Glacier National Park. And that's part of
16 where we are. So you wouldn't think that it would be that
17 high. But anywhere from 63 to 75 percent of the calls are
18 always about Glacier Park. The other 37 percent are usually
19 about the Flathead Valley. So if you add that up, that's
20 over 90 percent of our calls are for this immediate area
21 around the Park.

22 MS. PAHL: Can I ask my fellow Committee
23 member, are 63 percent of those calls about whether or not
24 Logan Pass is open?

25 MS. ANDERSON: Just in the last year has that

1 really become an issue, because of the publicity about
2 Going-to-the-Sun and the whole Glacier Park Management Plan.
3 In the last two years we've seen that significantly in
4 recruiting of employees with the properties in there. And
5 then this year, in particular, the calls are very heavy.
6 Like I said, we got 140 calls on Monday, alone, asking is
7 Glacier Park opening. So the impression is out there,
8 nationally and internationally. I was at a trade show in
9 January and the international tour operators saying We're
10 not coming to your area because Glacier Park is closed. So
11 it's not just here, it's the whole region.

12 MS. PAHL: And is that a communications
13 problem, do you think?

14 MS. ANDERSON: Definitely.

15 MR. BAKER: I just have a comment and
16 suggestion. In the early '90s there was a major visitor
17 study done by the province of Alberta throughout the United
18 States's major markets. And I think they went to something
19 like 20 major markets and did phone surveys of people who
20 were thinking about coming to Alberta. And of the results
21 that they -- and I'm just going by memory. Of the results
22 that they received, I think 90 percent had planned
23 on -- they asked where they were going to stop along the
24 way, because they wanted to find their entry points. I
25 think 90 percent mentioned Glacier National Park. And I

1 think it might be interesting to have some of that past data
2 from the Alberta government. They may have some other
3 interesting deals. Because when they did the U.S. survey,
4 they asked a lot of questions about the major attractions
5 surrounding the province.

6 --o0o--

7 Mr. Gaskill reiterates that there is much
8 information available to the Committee panel, and that the
9 team will try to have the information available to them, or
10 a list of what's available to them, by Wednesday morning.

11 (Proceedings in recess from 2:40 p.m. to
12 2:45 p.m.)

13 Continuing on with the agenda after the recess,
14 Ethan Carr presented a history of the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
15 Mr. Carr is the historical landscape architect for the
16 National Park Service out of Denver. He has written book
17 called Wilderness by Design. He is also responsible for the
18 nomination of the Going-to-the-Sun Road as a national
19 historic landmark in 1997.

20 Mr. Carr asks everyone to shift gears and think
21 about the reason that the Committee is really here, which
22 has to do with the significance of Going-to-the-Sun Road.
23 He will be talking about the historical significance of the
24 Going-to-the-Sun Road. He will be talking about one
25 dimension of the road which has to do with the construction

1 of Going-to-the-Sun Road and the history of the National
2 Park system specifically.

3 The reason the Going-to-the-Sun Road is a national
4 and historic landmark has to do with the fact that it's not
5 just regionally important, it's not just important in the
6 history of Glacier National Park, it's very significant in
7 the history of the entire National Park system and the
8 history of resource conservation in the United States. It's
9 a virtual chapter in the history of development of the
10 National Park system in the United States.

11 Mr. Carr uses visual aids to make his presentation
12 and refers to it throughout. He gave the history of how the
13 park system was presented in 1901 by John Muir. There was
14 no true management. Conditions were bad in national parks
15 in terms of resource preservation or resource management.
16 Between 1910 and 1915, Lewis Hill of the Great Northern
17 Railroad spent approximately one and a half million dollars
18 developing Glacier National Park. None of that money went
19 to roads or sewers or park administration. In 1915 Stephen
20 Mather, who was the first director of the Park Service,
21 began advocating the concept of a National Park system.
22 This system is connected by highways.

23 In 1916, the National Park Service is created and
24 the administration of the national parks shifts from a
25 haphazard arrangement to a federal bureaucracy. That same

1 year, Congress passed legislation for the Federal Aids to
2 Highways Act. Thus, heavy federal subsidies to the county
3 and state governments for the constructive of automotive
4 highways and the creation of the National Park system were
5 not unrelated. However, roads in the parks were not being
6 built. All the roads in the Park-to-Park Highway were being
7 built between 1916 and 1920, but there were no
8 appropriations for park road construction, which created an
9 interesting situation. People could get to the parks but
10 couldn't get around inside the parks. Stephen Mather and
11 the Park Service started the core task of providing roads
12 inside the parks. It was an extremely difficult task.

13 A transmountain road was vital to the progress of
14 the region. There was lots of controversy within the
15 different communities on how and where the construction of
16 the road should be commenced. During this same time, Marias
17 Pass Road was being considered for construction, but they
18 were to serve discrete purposes. Marias Pass was definitely
19 being built to provide transportation purposes. The
20 Going-to-the-Sun Road, still known as the Transmountain
21 Highway, was not meant to be a practical road, it was to be
22 an attraction.

23 In 1924 Horace Albright and Stephen Mather got
24 Congress to come up with seven-and-a-half million dollars to
25 be made available in 1925 which was huge money for the Park

1 Service, more money than they had ever dealt with before.
2 And it was very quickly increased. Congress also became
3 very convinced that the people wanted roads in national
4 parks as they did. The reaction was not one of joy. The
5 reaction was distinctly one of anxiety. Stephen Mather was
6 very anxious. The whole credibility of the Park Service
7 being professionally capable of administering road projects
8 was at stake.

9 Two concepts for building the road consisted of a
10 series of switchbacks or, as the road was built, a
11 bench-type of road. The engineer insisted the switchbacks
12 was the practical way of building the road. The landscape
13 architect insisted the road could be benched. Thanks to the
14 Bureau of Public Roads, who provided an engineer who did the
15 actual work of surveying, it was determined that the
16 bench-type of road was possible and it preserved the scenery
17 of the Park. The Going-to-the-Sun Road established what a
18 park road should be. It created the intrabureau agreement
19 between the Bureau of Public Roads and the National Park
20 Service, which assured that similar policies and standards
21 would be put in effect in park road construction during the
22 1920s and 1930s. It was the first time to see the real
23 expression of the importance of conserving scenic resources;
24 the importance of creating an incredible experience for the
25 park visitor. Not just getting him through the Park but

1 creating this wonderful experience, this primary experience
2 for so many visitors that don't even get out of their cars
3 of Glacier National Park. And it also created a precedent
4 in the sense that all you really need is one of these.

5 Construction began in 1921. It didn't end until
6 1952. That's when the final paving contracts were let. It
7 opened in 1933. So thirteen years later, at least, one
8 could drive over the road. But lots of construction was
9 still going on at that time. The major structures of the
10 road weren't completed until 1937. The initial estimates
11 for construction were something like \$600,000. It ended up
12 costing over two-and-a-half million dollars. Over 40,000
13 feet of guard wall that was required. It was the biggest
14 engineering project the Bureau of Public Roads had ever
15 attempted or the National Park Service. Going-to-the-Sun
16 Road is the only road in the United States to be a national
17 historical landmark.

18 Mr. Carr shows other historic roads in other parks
19 with similar management issues for rehabilitation: Mount
20 Rainier has a wonderful system of historic park roads which
21 are in the process of being rehabilitated. Very successful
22 work there using stone veneer over a reinforced concrete
23 core and also in preserving historic retaining walls by
24 injecting grout in the back of them under pressure. Other
25 roads include: Yellowstone Park from the Tower Falls

1 observation platform and near Upper Falls platform;
2 General's Highway at Sequoia Kings Canyon; Colorado National
3 Monument; Blueridge Parkway. All the historic park roads
4 are roads that would not be built today because of the
5 impact on the resource. Nevertheless, they provide an
6 extraordinary experience.

7 Work has already been done at Logan Pass that is
8 an example of setting a standard of how a historic park road
9 should be treated. Product mainly of park staff working
10 over ten years to get this done. Some real quality work.
11 An example is essentially a hollow stone wall built by
12 masons, then the rebar is fitted in, then the concrete is
13 poured, so you have a reinforced concrete core to a stone
14 wall that will hold up better and meet crash test standards.

15 There are many issues to consider in road
16 rehabilitation; road width, roadside vegetation; habitat and
17 finding compromises.

18 This is another opportunity to set the standard
19 again to be a partnership for the Park Service and local
20 communities to how park roads should be rehabilitated, not
21 reconstructed. And that terminology, in the business, it's
22 very important. In historic preservation, according to the
23 Secretary of Interior standards, reconstruction is a whole
24 different set of implications from rehabilitation. Mr. Carr
25 believes that the appropriate level of treatment for the

1 Going-to-the-Sun Road, which has been agreed upon, would be
2 rehabilitation not reconstruction. And there's an important
3 difference there.

4 Questions are flooded.

5 MR. BAKER: In your opinion, would the
6 potential widening of the road surface, in the name of
7 safety, compromise the designation?

8 MR. CARR: Oh, it would not stop being a
9 landmark, no. Generally, things don't get unlandmarked
10 unless they burn down or disappear at some point. There's a
11 couple of boats that were landmarks that sank that were
12 unlisted. But that's not saying I want to see the road
13 widened. I think I implied, I think it would be wonderful
14 if we could maintain original road width, horizontal and
15 vertical lines and use masonry rather than concrete to
16 rebuild guardrails, et cetera. Those are all treatment
17 recommendations that would probably be good. That doesn't
18 mean they're possible, but that would be good. But no, I
19 don't think that, as a result of the rehabilitation of the
20 road, unless it's really handled badly, the road would e
21 unlandmarked. I could hardly envision that, unless it was
22 doubled in width or something and turned into an Interstate
23 highway. That's the kind of change that would have to
24 occur.

25 MR. WHITE: I was very interested into your

1 research into this road system. And I heard the remark you
2 made about the east entrance or the east side of the
3 mountains being the first entrance into the Glacier Park.
4 Presently, we have a road located on the reservation known
5 as Looking Glass Road. This road, presently, is in need of
6 repairs. And I think it compliments Glacier Park, East
7 Glacier, the whole area. But there's nobody that lays claim
8 to this. I was wondering, in your research, if you could
9 maybe give us a little background on the Looking Glass Road,
10 or if you've ever --

11 MR. CARR: I can't specifically -- of course,
12 the Blackfeet Highway was an important part of Lewis Hill's
13 conception of how the road system should be.

14 MR. WHITE: That's what we call Looking Glass
15 Road.

16 MR. CARR: Okay, great; sorry. But, yeah,
17 that was an extremely important -- it was basically the only
18 road that Lewis Hill saw fit to build, because it directly
19 served his facilities. So it was an important part of the
20 prePark Service development plan for the Park. It's an
21 important part of the whole complex of chalets and lodges
22 that Lewis Hill built. So that it could easily be
23 considered a historic part of that earlier conception for
24 the development of Glacier National Park. I don't know if
25 it's got the integrity to be listed in the National Register

1 or if that's even a desirable thing that people have been
2 looking into, but I could definitely see that the context is
3 there, put it that way. The historical context is there.
4 The history is there for that road to be significant enough
5 to be eligible for the Register, perhaps, because it was
6 part of Lewis Hill's original development plan.

7 MR. WHITE: I guess the question would be,
8 who owns that road? Would you have any idea? Nobody claims
9 it presently. Nobody claims it, the Department of
10 Transportation --

11 MR. CARR: And they were built under similar
12 cloudy circumstances. Because Lewis Hill directed the work
13 but the money was coming from the federal government in some
14 cases. So it's been a little bit murky, I think, from the
15 beginning, is all I can say. I certainly don't have the
16 answer to that one.

17 MR. DAKIN: The draft project document that
18 we got in our packages, I think does speak to this project
19 as being confined to the existing alignment and width of the
20 road. But it also seemed to be opening the door about
21 parking improvements.

22 Does anyone want to speak to what's on the table
23 there?

24 MR. CARR: I can't speak about the specifics,
25 but it comes up with every historic road rehabilitation.

1 Because often the little pullouts are too small now and
2 overwhelmed and either they should be removed or enlarged or
3 something should be done with them. In some cases they're
4 kept but access is restricted so that the original thing is
5 kept, but since it's no longer safe to use, it's not. Those
6 kinds of changes have to be expected, in my opinion. This
7 is just an opinion, but some changes like that have to be
8 expected. Because the road has to be -- continue to
9 function. And if people can't pull off safely and admire
10 views and so on, it's not really functioning. So there are
11 compromises that have to get made. Demolishing the masonry
12 guard walls and replacing them with new construction, which
13 looks sort of like the old masonry but isn't, is another
14 compromise. We have to meet with modern crash test
15 standards. No way we can work with Federal Highways and use
16 federal money.

17 MS. PAHL: How much of the masonry that
18 exists today is original?

19 MR. CARR: That's a good question. Less than
20 I probably imply when I talk about the integrity this road
21 is. Repairs have been going on for decades. And you can
22 see driving along the road -- I used to drive with Dennis
23 Holden who, for many years, plowed the road. And he could
24 point out when each section -- you know, because you could
25 see the slightly different colored stone or slightly

1 different style guardrail. He's say, That was done in '73,
2 '85, you know, point out each section. I can't do that.
3 But there's a significant amount of repair to masonry.

4 MS. PAHL: Repair is one thing. But this
5 demolition and replacement with new.

6 MR. CARR: Well, repair, in some cases is
7 there. Demolition by avalanche and replaced is something
8 else, or demolition by snowslide, whatever and replacement
9 by something else. When that guardrail goes, it goes about
10 a thousand feet down.

11 MS. PAHL: Is it possible to get a map that
12 shows segments?

13 MR. CARR: That's the kind of research I hope
14 that is going to happen. We don't have that level of
15 research. We don't have really in-depth section by section
16 of the road describing what the characteristics of this
17 section are, what the roadside vegetation is like here, what
18 it's like in the next section, how many types of historic
19 masonry are there and how much of it is left. It think
20 those are all good points. That kind of observation, direct
21 observation of how many feet of historic -- this repair was
22 done when, it's done in what kind of stone, it's successful,
23 it's not successful. A lot of it's not successful because
24 we were in there using all kinds of stone that was
25 inappropriate. Now, we'd like to use good stone. We can't

1 quarry it anymore though, because we can't open a quarry in
2 a national park. The great solution was when a lot of
3 Blackfeet, actually, were employed salvaging stone that had
4 come down naturally or from rock slides or from other things
5 and were salvaging it and stockpiling it, which was a great
6 solution. And that stone was used in some of the successful
7 rehabilitation that's been taking place like up at Logan
8 Pass, if I'm not mistaken. I could get corrected on some of
9 this, if I'm going too far.

10 MR. KILPATRICK: I was just going to add to
11 what you say. Talking with Jack Gordon over at that panel,
12 it's 50 percent or a little bit less than 50 percent,
13 although we don't -- that still has the integrity. Though
14 we don't have it section by section, that's based on general
15 mapping.

16 MR. GORDON: We have the inventory, but we do
17 need to have it checked because it changes sometimes foot by
18 foot. And just to make one other point, we are not removing
19 historic fabric and rebuilding it. We have come to an
20 agreement with the Federal Highways, a compromise on height
21 where they said We'll agree to retain the historic height
22 which is crenulated at 24 and uncrenulated at 18. However,
23 we went to the photograph that Ethan showed with the
24 concrete core. But that is -- that's in areas where they're
25 noncontributing.

1 Over 50 percent of a wall section is in such a
2 disrepair that it needs to be fixed. But we are not
3 removing -- to date we are not removing the core fabric,
4 unless sometimes we've had to in the past with like
5 retaining walls that Al Killian discussed.

6 MR. CARR: Is that just negotiation with
7 Federal Highways or is that also negotiation with the state
8 regulation officer?

9 MR. GORDON: That's with SHIPO (State
10 Historic Preservation Officer) as well. We're in total
11 agreement with that.

12 MR. O'QUINN: Has not that issue all ready
13 been addressed and approved?

14 MR. KILPATRICK: Just those critical sections
15 that are covered in that EA (Environmental Assessment) where
16 the improvements we're going to be doing this year, next
17 year. So it wasn't looked at in an aspect of the total
18 road, it was just looked at for those critical sections
19 based on what Al's going to talk about later, the critical
20 sections that needed to be repaired.

21 (Proceedings in recess from 3:35 p.m. to
22 3:40 p.m.)

23 Continuing further with the agenda, introduction
24 of the Park Road discussion panel includes John Kilpatrick,
25 Chief Park facility management officer. Prior to working

1 with Glacier National Park he was also the former assistant
2 chief Park facility management officer at Rocky Mountain
3 National Park also Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

4 Mr. Kilpatrick welcomes everyone and introduces
5 the rest of the panelists: Jack Gordon, Park landscape
6 architect; Al Killian, senior geotechnical engineer with the
7 Federal Highways; Dick Gatten, design operations engineer.

8 In response to a question that Bill Dakin had on
9 pullouts, pullouts is part of a wider issue. And as many
10 may have already guessed, there's a huge puzzle. And
11 there's pieces that have to come together to come to
12 appropriate decisions. Some of those pieces is in
13 determining how flexible the Park is going to be with
14 pullouts, deal with a comprehensive view survey, visitor use
15 surveys, commercial services plan and transportation
16 planning is also a major component of that. Extending
17 those, the Committee will begin to see how those tie into
18 whether or not they have pullouts, where they have them, how
19 big they are, so on and so forth. It is on the table, but
20 it's on the table in the context with how it fits in with
21 transportation planning, et cetera.

22 Jack Gordon, Park landscape architect. He's been
23 with Glacier Park since 1990. At that time he was with the
24 Denver Service Center, now with park staff. All those years
25 dealing with Federal Highways in design and construction on

1 the Going-to-the-Sun Road. He will bridge the gap between
2 what has been presented by Ethan Carr. Mr. Gordon hates
3 following Mr. Carr. He's a hard act to follow because his
4 information is much more detailed.

5 The period from 1952 onwards, the road went
6 through from 1952 to '82, there was very little done on the
7 road. The last contract in 1952 was a Morrison Knudsen
8 which ended up paving the Logan Pass section, which
9 culminated in the paving complete for the whole road. After
10 that, repairs were infrequent and funded out of the Park
11 operating budget; another reason why there wasn't much done.
12 In 1982, Congress passed the Surface Transportation
13 Assistance Act, which included funding for Glacier Park and
14 rehabilitation of the road.

15 The Federal Lands Highway Program projects, funded
16 by gas tax money, from 1982 to present, has basically
17 conducted heavy maintenance to keep the road intact.

18 Since 1982, the sections of the road that were
19 done, though it appears the construction was going back and
20 forth, was because the road base was actually going out.
21 That was a management decision because of impacts. The Lake
22 McDonald ten-mile portion and St. Mary to Rising Sun
23 four-mile portion of the road was rehabilitated. Logan Pass
24 is the only section of the road in the alpine section that
25 has been worked on to date. It is seven-tenths of a mile in

1 there. The major impact of that was leaving the road open.
2 The Park tried night construction; had difficulty with that.
3 But the parking area at Logan Pass was certainly an issue.
4 It was supposed to take a season, and it ended up taking two
5 seasons. It was during this Logan Pass project that it was
6 decided by Superintendent Mahalic that things need to be
7 done differently. The impacts to the visitors and not
8 getting much done with reconstruction made the Park rethink
9 this whole project. That's why all are here today. From
10 Logan Pass, the 4.5 mile section of road from upper McDonald
11 Creek to Avalanche Creek. That project was closed out in
12 1999.

13 Reoccurring issues have come up over the years as
14 far back that Ethan Carr was talking about. Problems with
15 source materials, rock sources for stone masonry, follow
16 into today. Source problems, contractors even back in the
17 30s had problems with shaping stone and having it break.
18 That was encountered that last year. Trouble with hauling
19 as well. This culminated the Morrison Knudsen contract with
20 an agreement to haul in import Minnesota granite that is
21 still with us today in some sections.

22 The confined work space is also a problem. Some
23 of the slides in the alpine section, the 11 miles, is
24 literally hanging off the side of a mountain. The road
25 standard is 22 feet wide and it has been maintained over the

1 years. As far as the rehabilitation issue, on the Lake
2 McDonald project, 20 out of 41 turnouts were removed that
3 informally had occurred over the years. They were
4 nonhistoric, they just happened, they were unsafe. On the
5 Avalanche Creek project ending in 1999, some asphalt was
6 removed in a section of the road that had been reconstructed
7 during flooding and was widened back in the '60s. That was
8 put back to a 22-foot wide road. The same was done on the
9 east side at Rising Sun. Efforts have been made to date to
10 maintain the historic character of the road, as far as
11 width.

12 Construction staging has always been a problem,
13 even during the original construction. Delays in closures
14 is more an issue today than way back. The cost of stone
15 masonry, primarily, has always been an issue. The historic
16 records show that in 1933, 1940, 1948 the issue of the cost
17 of stone masonry came up as far back as then. The Park
18 Service prevailed in continuing with the construction of
19 guard walls. Guard walls are those things along the road
20 that are supposed to protect you. The retaining wall is
21 holding up the road. There is roughly 40,000 linear feet of
22 guard wall alone.

23 Parking has primarily, in the last couple decades,
24 become a real problem.

25 The current contract, following the upper McDonald

1 Creek project, is structural repairs along the road. There
2 are 11 sites where the Park are dealing with primarily
3 structural repairs, retaining wall work in order to keep the
4 road open. The EA that was discussed covered all of the
5 retaining walls that are planned on be corrected. Dealing
6 with about half.

7 Some innovations are avalanche-resistant guard
8 walls. There are over 70 avalanche chutes along the road.
9 Looking at constructing what are called avalanche-resistant
10 walls in order to retain stone masonry and yet not have to
11 replace them with removable rail every year. It is a test.
12 It has been done at Mount Rainier.

13 Other things being done to provide for safety,
14 reduce delays and quicken the opening. One is a precast
15 concrete pour stone veneer guardrail to strengthen
16 construction. That allows the flexibility of having the
17 contractor construct them off-site anytime of the year and
18 move them up during the short construction period up on the
19 road. Another is removable rail. Glacier, perhaps, is the
20 only place that uses a log removable rail, again for the
21 avalanche shoots, that are removed in the fall, put back up
22 in the springtime. There is existing removable wall that
23 has proved to be somewhat not crash-worthy, so another
24 design must be done. It will be crash tested and then
25 replace the noncrash-worthy removable rail. Finally, the

1 reinforced concrete wall, retaining the historic height,
2 stone masonry crash-worthy wall. The Park has not, to date,
3 since 1982, removed historic fabric and put up something
4 else. There has been some dialogue about replacing the
5 stone masonry with some other features. It was felt it
6 would introduce some artificiality, thus, not embraced.
7 There is a quarry operation going on supplying roughly 3,000
8 ton of stone quarry rock for the Going-to-the-Sun Road.

9 Al Killian is the senior geotechnical engineer,
10 Federal Highways. His handout gives a skeleton outline and
11 a place to take notes. He went over the document handout
12 with some key existing engineering information using
13 overhead projector slides.

14 Mr. Killian spoke of walls that have damage. The
15 1994 Shannon Wilson study, is a base retaining wall
16 inventory document; 119 retaining walls with 49 being of a
17 critical nature; seven are in jeopardy of collapse. Since
18 then the Park has identified 127 walls with 76 having some
19 kind of damage. The 1997 and 1998 retaining wall updates
20 identified 76 walls with some kind of damage; 13 walls had
21 structural damage that merits serious concerns; again, seven
22 are very severe. To the left of the large map, the top
23 picture or photo that's been blown up, is at the loop
24 portion of the Going-to-the-Sun Road. It's calling that a
25 retaining wall but it got started in the initial study, it's

1 actually a rock rubble fill slope with some large rock on
2 the outside. That particular retaining wall is 60, 70 feet
3 high and has dramatically moved in the last two years.
4 There is concern about collapse of that wall. There is data
5 on movement of that particular wall. The second wall is a
6 beautiful wall, perhaps one of the most gorgeous on the
7 highway, but it has a crack. It's been hit with avalanches
8 and has been displaced four inches and is in jeopardy of
9 collapse. That one is on the contract that's being let this
10 year for an avalanche-resistant wall with a technique called
11 micropiling so none of the wall has to be torn down. It's
12 at milepost 30.03 (indicating on map).

13 Another document, FHWA (Federal Highways
14 Administration) letter of comment on GMP alternates. It
15 contains comments about traffic, road width, staging, and
16 various other elements the Committee should be interested
17 in. It also discusses innovative ideas for working on the
18 road.

19 The planning team identified some major work
20 categories from those study documents. First being the
21 historical stone masonry retaining walls. A strong focus on
22 preservation and rehabilitation. There are 7,000 linear
23 feet of stone masonry guard wall that have been damaged or
24 gone due to avalanches, mud slides, rock rot. Some are
25 useless in that the shoulder has settled sufficiently that

1 there may be only a few inches of guard wall remaining.
2 That poses a safety issue that needs to be addressed. Some
3 portions on the east side tunnel where the guard wall is
4 gone and there is a very steep slope that exists now. There
5 currently is no plan to put a guard wall in that section of
6 road. Removable guard walls is an issue being negotiated
7 with the designers. It is quite a challenge.

8 The asphalt pavement in the alpine portion, the
9 area from Logan Creek all the way through the loop and up
10 over Logan Pass and to Rising Sun is in pretty good
11 condition. Part of the reason is it's quite old, in excess
12 of 25 years. Common pavement life for asphalt pavements is
13 in the range of 20 to 30 years, depending on how you design
14 it and the kind of traffic you have on it. Because there is
15 no truck traffic, that's one positive. Another positive is
16 that there's not traffic on it during the winter, and so
17 it's covered and there's less problem with freeze/thaw
18 effects. Also the initial constructors of the road
19 established subgrade, and so what is pretty much needed is
20 something like an inlay where the existing asphalt is milled
21 out and replaced. Getting paving equipment up in that
22 section where at points it is only 18 feet wide will be
23 quite a task.

24 Drainage deficiencies from the maintenance folks
25 point of view are concerned. There's problems with the

1 drainage. That creates a concern regarding the integrity of
2 the guard walls. Keep in mind, because of floods, snow
3 avalanches, every year there is more damage. There's more
4 guard walls blown out, more retaining wall damage.

5 In terms of money, there's about 32 walls that
6 need structural repair out of 76. The other 44 actually
7 only need repointing. That's a slow process and a costly
8 process, but is an important aspect for all taxpayers
9 because a great deal of life can be saved, integrity can be
10 preserved and money can be saved. The turnaround, in terms
11 of money, can be a ratio of 10 to 1 if it's not taken care
12 of. There is approximately two-and-a-half million dollars
13 for repointing.

14 Most work can be done within some means of traffic
15 control, except for a few cases. One of them being the
16 loop. In order to do that work, to save that particular
17 area, it's a very tight corner, almost a 360. And it takes
18 a crane to be placed up there. And the road's so narrow
19 there is no way to do it. So the thought is to do it in the
20 shoulder season or perhaps after the road or when the road
21 in that particular case gets closed or near closure. It
22 can't be on in the spring because of the high water because
23 of instability, but it could be done in the shoulder season.
24 There's a lot of positives and a few hang-ups and some
25 fairly serious issues that are hard to get around, like the

1 paving issue.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I have a quick question. How
3 much of the guard wall is cosmetic in that it could not take
4 a lick? In other words, it's giving a false sense of
5 security.

6 MR. KILLIAN: I would say probably 50 percent
7 of that 7,000 lineal feet. Some of it's got -- you know,
8 really heavily cracked and is structurally deficient. Some
9 of it doesn't have the height and the cars will shoot right
10 over the top of it. Some the other part of that 7,000 -- it
11 may be more than 50 percent. Some of the other part is not
12 too bad.

13 MR. O'QUINN: Have you had records or
14 incidents where cars have hit and gone over?

15 MR. KILPATRICK: Yes, cars have gone over
16 that road. If we could just hold the questions a bit so we
17 can get back on schedule with Dick Gatten and a time period
18 for questions.

19 --o0o--

20 Dick Gatten talks about the current contracting
21 activity and also about the major work categories that are
22 still remaining to be addressed.

23 He explains the Federal Highway Administration.
24 The Federal Highway Administration has three federal land
25 offices. And one of them is the western federal lands one,

1 which is in Vancouver, Washington and that's where
2 Mr. Killian and Mr. Gatten are from. And that covers the
3 northwestern states and the state of Alaska.

4 Within the office, there are several design teams.
5 And one is the park road design team which Mr. Gatten is
6 head of. Designers who continually worked on park road
7 projects and are sensitive to the needs and issues are on
8 the team. The partnership with Glacier National Park
9 started back in the early 1900s with the Bureau of Public
10 Roads, which is what the Federal Highway Administration used
11 to be. The park road team coordinates very closely with the
12 Park and are very aware of and sensitive to Park needs as
13 well as issues in the surrounding communities.

14 The goal with the Advisory Committee will be to
15 attend the meetings and provide technical support.

16 Under the current contract activity, the FHA is
17 using an indefinite delivery requirements contract, rather
18 than competitive bidding. And the reason is, while the
19 Advisory Committee and MK Centennial are working on the more
20 global needs for the 30 miles or so of the Going-to-the-Sun
21 Road that need to be rehabilitated, the FHA are continuing
22 to peck away with the existing funding. So the Park Service
23 had funding approved in the neighborhood of five million
24 dollars for fiscal '99 and fiscal 2000. And that money is
25 what is being used in the current contract that has been

1 mentioned. The advantage to that type of contract is that
2 solicitation of technical proposals from contractors are
3 evaluated and are selected or ranked by more technically
4 competent that can address the retaining wall needs and the
5 specific designs that Mr. Killian and his consultant have
6 worked up for the repair and stabilization of the retaining
7 walls. Proposals have been received. The highest ranked
8 technical contractors will be looked at for pricing and
9 select what will be considered the best value for the
10 government, the Park; someone who can manage with minimum
11 disruption.

12 The site specific wall designs focus on
13 preservation of the historic character and significance of
14 the Going-to-the-Sun Road. It also focuses on minimizing
15 impacts on visitors and on the local economy. There's a lot
16 of innovative design and effort that went into it to try to
17 leave the existing walls in place, if they can be stabilized
18 in some other way. Real stone is also being used where
19 needed in the repairs.

20 The FHWA has learned from past projects,
21 experience, mistakes. The current contract attempts to
22 implement some of that learning. There's numerous
23 construction constraints affecting the completion of the
24 work and which add to the cost but are considered necessary
25 to minimize the socioeconomic and visitor impacts. Some of

1 those are dealing with heavy traffic volumes, dealing with
2 those within a very narrow road prism. In many cases, 18 to
3 20 feet wide. Space limitations for staging of the
4 construction. There is a very limited construction season
5 that may only go from mid June to mid October, about a
6 four-month time period. And there are very restrictive Park
7 management objectives in this particular contract.

8 Some traffic restrictions from the Park include
9 one work area on each side of Logan Pass would be allowed at
10 any one time for a total of two work areas on the road at
11 any time, one on each side. A work area is defined as a
12 thousand feet long. So there could be more than one wall
13 repair being done within that work area. Once Logan Pass is
14 accessible to passenger vehicle in the spring, until
15 September 27th, traffic delays would not exceed 15 minutes
16 per work area. Which means, then, a total of not exceeding
17 30 minutes for a one-way trip across the road. This is
18 going to be very difficult to manage, and it's a contractor
19 requirement, with only a few exceptions.

20 Lastly, the major work categories remaining is
21 improved and rehabilitated approximately 19 to 20 miles of
22 road in previous contracts. That leaves approximately 30
23 miles in, round numbers, that still needs to be
24 rehabilitated. The Park's priority, of course, with the FHA
25 recommendation, was to address the critical stone masonry

1 retaining walls that were subject to failure in the near
2 future. So this contract currently will address those
3 issues. When that's completed, funding permitted -- there's
4 about 5 million dollars, tentatively another 3 million in
5 2004. Assuming the funding anticipated is granted the
6 priority one and two walls that have previously been
7 mentioned will be completed. Some of the critical walls
8 will have been addressed, and maybe some of the urgency will
9 be alleviated. The remaining work is repointing of the
10 grout of the walls in an effort for preservation.

11 The stone masonry guard walls, there's a
12 substantial amount of work there. Asphalt pavement needs
13 still needs to be addressed, but probably towards the
14 rehabilitation work. The walls and outboard lane
15 deficiencies and guard walls need to be addressed first,
16 then pavement. Because of the width of pavers and the
17 narrowness of the road, perhaps only two miles per year can
18 be paved in the alpine section.

19 Mr. Gatten concludes by stating this is a
20 challenge. The Advisory Committee is part of the challenge.
21 The Advisory Committee and Park Service have an opportunity
22 to provide input as to how MK Centennial does their detailed
23 studies and comes up with alternatives. There is an
24 opportunity to guide that and provide comment and input
25 along the way and develop a range of alternatives and

1 conditions that will address the remaining work and preserve
2 what's up there as a national historic landmark.

3 John Kilpatrick gives a brief flavor of the
4 maintenance operation.

5 Going-to-the-Sun Road or the road out of rock.
6 Since the completion of the road, the Park visitation has
7 gone from 74,000 per year to 1.7 million. Each visitor in
8 cars has enjoyed the Park and also taken their toll on that
9 road as well. Subject to earth slides, avalanche slides.
10 There are 72 active avalanche zones on that road. Frost,
11 snow load, freezing, periodic flooding also take their toll
12 on this road each year. The Sun road is not the only road
13 in the Park to maintain. The Park has 99 miles of paved
14 road to maintain. There's 101 miles of secondary, unpaved,
15 roads, 41 bridges, 50,000 lineal feet of guard walls, 25,000
16 square yards of retaining walls, and two tunnel structures.
17 And those are required to be maintained all of those
18 features with \$500,000 a year. That's the base operating
19 budget, currently, for the roads.

20 Mr. Kilpatrick invites any Committee member to
21 contact him and he will take them on a tour of the spring
22 opening. He also invites them to walk the road. He
23 encourages the members to take advantage of the expertise
24 and history of Mr. Bill Dakin's knowledge of the road.

25 For instance, in the spring opening, after the

1 snow has been cleared away, it takes 800 to a thousand man
2 hours to put in place the concrete removable guard walls
3 that are seen, to put in the removable wood guardrails, to
4 clean the ditch lines. That 800 to 1,000 hours of labor is
5 not funded.

6 He encourages the Committee not to make the same
7 mistakes of the past. Look at the whole picture, address
8 inadequate maintenance for funding of the roadway, because
9 that's what's led to the current situation. The long-term
10 maintenance of the road should be part and parcel of
11 whatever solution is come up with to the long-term fix. If
12 that can be done, another hundred years on this road should
13 be accomplished.

14 Questions are floored.

15 MR. O'QUINN: The first part of my question
16 is to Fred. Is the Park Service going to be the lead agency
17 on the environmental document?

18 MR. BABB: Yes.

19 MR. QUINN: Is the Federal Highway
20 Administration going to be the formal cooperative agency?

21 MR. BABB: We haven't talked about that level
22 of detail, whether it's the cooperative or just a
23 participant. We haven't gotten that far yet.

24 MR. O'QUINN: Do you anticipate filing an
25 FHWA procedure on the federal document?

1 MR. BABB: As of now, no. We're going to be
2 following Park Service. If there's advantages to doing
3 something different, definitely, we'll undertake that.
4 That's just based on the experience we have right now, we're
5 following it.

6 MR. BAKER: When you were doing the Logan
7 Pass rehabilitation in the past couple years, were you
8 allowing that contract to go 24-7, 24 hours a day, seven
9 days a week?

10 MR. GORDON: We originally set it up to have
11 night work in that contract and had closure. I believe it
12 was from 10:00 to 6:00 or something like that. They tried
13 it for a while. It didn't go 24 hours. They did end up
14 doing a lot of hauling at night. But when it got into
15 grading and things of that nature, with lights and stuff,
16 Logan Pass is the worst place in the entire Park to work at
17 night. There were days that you couldn't see in front of
18 your face or nights even because of the fog and you were in
19 a cloud bay. But to answer your question, we did have night
20 work initially and then ended up pretty much bagging it
21 about one season into the contract.

22 MR. KILLIAN: Keep in mind that when you're
23 looking at the alpine section, one of the difficulties with
24 the night work, is that you've constant rock haul. John's
25 people are cleaning rocks all the time. So, generally

1 speaking, when the construction people are able to be out
2 there, they're able to hear, see the rock fall coming. And
3 it's important the two go together. Because if you can't
4 hear it and then pick it up visually, then you're really
5 hamstrung, in terms of how to protect people. Now, you can
6 protect people, because it's possible. You can build cages
7 and do things like that. So I don't want to say that you
8 can't do that. But it's just as a matter of issue, if
9 you're thinking about those things. It's a dangerous place
10 to work.

11 MR. JACKSON: We earlier heard that vehicle
12 size was less than 8 feet wide and 21 feet long. And I'm
13 curious as to whether you could commingle single-lane
14 traffic, if you limited the vehicles to something that was
15 more like a standard sedan size or less.

16 MR. KILLIAN: When you say commingle
17 traffic --

18 MR. JACKSON: Well, I mean, one way, let's
19 say.

20 MR. KILLIAN: I think that thinking like that
21 is possible. I think anything like that's possible. And I
22 just -- think that that's something the Committee perhaps
23 needs to look at. When we went through some of our
24 exercises and thinking outside of the box, which may be not
25 so hard for us to do as people might believe, we talked

1 about one-way traffic and we talked about all different
2 configurations of traffic management.

3 MS. PAHL: What's the size of the historic
4 red buses?

5 MR. KILPATRICK: 25 feet. 14 feet wide. 25
6 feet long and how wide. Disregard, 25 feet long. Don't
7 know how wide.

8 MR. SHIREMAN: We'll get you those dimensions
9 tomorrow.

10 MR. DAKIN: You know, I had a couple of sharp
11 pains in my taxpayer's wallet here. Because I remember this
12 whole wrangle about crash-proof guardrails was going on even
13 12 years ago when I still worked at the Park. This is a
14 whole career for somebody; right?

15 This question that Brian had about safety and the
16 guardrail, as I understand it, it's always been like this.
17 That you have to get Federal Highway money, then you have to
18 meet Federal Highway crash test standards with replicated
19 guard wall. Is that right?

20 MR. GATTEN: The focus is on safety, when we
21 go in and readdress some of the things that were built early
22 on. We have, I think as mentioned, agreed to -- see, the
23 Park has restricted the size of vehicle, and they're also
24 going at a fairly low speed in that alpine section. So we
25 agreed to crash test the wall that was 18 and 24 inches high

1 on the crenulation, which is not standard, and we crash
2 tested it only for the type of vehicles that use the road.
3 And it passed, and so that's what we have agreed to use. So
4 I'm not sure if I know if that's your entire question.

5 MR. DAKIN: Well it doesn't seem to me that
6 the original stone masonry probably would never have been
7 ever as crash resistant or as safe as what you're going to
8 replace it with. And that's part of the problem in terms of
9 designing something that looks like old masonry but has a
10 higher safety standard; right?

11 MR. GATTEN: Jack maybe could answer it
12 better. But if we have historic guard walls that's over 50
13 percent, I believe original fabric, I'm learning some of
14 these words, then we don't rebuild that according
15 to -- we're not disassembling it where there might being
16 some small minor repairs to be done, and we're leaving it
17 the way it is. But if we have a section that's more than 50
18 percent gone, or if the outside lane deficiencies had sunk
19 down, whatever, if we do have to remove it for one of those
20 reasons, then we'll replace it with the crash test.

21 MR. GORDON: I'd like to make one point to
22 the question earlier regarding somebody driving through the
23 guard wall. We have not had anybody drive through the guard
24 wall. We have had a car or truck drive over the guard wall.
25 That was what Al was talking about -- or Dick. There are

1 sections that are too low. But we've had people drive
2 through the removable rail, just to put a slant on that.

3 MR. SLITER: Could I ask, is there a
4 difference in the Federal Highway standards as they pertain
5 to speed limits, based on -- you now, you're not going to
6 see a car going 60 miles an hour down this road. And if the
7 federal limits are based on a certain speed limit and you've
8 actually got a car that's going to hit that wall going 15 or
9 20 miles an hour, at the most 35, where is the gray area
10 there?

11 MR. GORDON: When the crash testing went on
12 for the stone masonry guard wall, as it will for the
13 removable rail -- a little late, Bill, but we're getting to
14 it -- the crash testing is done at angles and speeds that
15 are similar to what you'd experience on the road. And that
16 was a major breakthrough as well.

17 MR. BROOKE: Paul's never seen Roscoe Black
18 drive the road.

19 MR. KILPATRICK: I'm sure you've seen plenty
20 of people doing 60.

21 MR. BROOKE: I've been collecting paper on
22 this thing for too long, and some of it I don't know where
23 it came from. And I'm curious, if you know about a document
24 called Glacier National Park Programming Other Technologies
25 for Road Construction in Alpine Environments. And it talks

1 about gems of technology, and there is currently somebody,
2 either in Federal Highways or the Park Service, who did a
3 scoping of alpine construction. Are you familiar with that?

4 MR. KILLIAN: That was during the planning
5 that we had in the other category. And some of those gems,
6 yeah, included like the Greenland paving and all kinds of
7 things. As to the where that document is, I have to plead
8 ignorance on that.

9 MR. BROOKE: I have it. I'm just not trying
10 to throw you a curve ball there. I was just curious where
11 it came from. I wasn't sure where it came from. And I
12 guess my next question is, how much thought has been given
13 to some of those gems that are talked about there? Are they
14 being healthfully kicked around still or --

15 MR. KILLIAN: Yes. Some things like the
16 paving in the middle of winter under snow conditions, yeah.
17 We all have the same reaction to that. But, you know, we
18 did our job to explore that.

19 The different kinds of wall designs that would
20 leave the historic fabric in place, indeed, we are
21 implementing those. The preconstructed guard wall, stone
22 masonry guard wall concept, is on the front burner. For
23 those areas where we believe that we will need to have that
24 stone masonry guard wall, that concept essentially is, if
25 you would take a guard wall and build it in place as a stone

1 masonry guard wall, you would go along and you got these
2 very irregular joints. And the concept is one that because
3 of the time frame to construct, that perhaps say in Hungry
4 Horse in a warehouse, you would start constructing that and
5 then you would put a breaker, a bond breaker in. And then
6 you would continue the construction. So that you could take
7 them apart like Tinker toys, haul them up there and -- I'm
8 reluctant to use that term but I don't know a better
9 one -- like Jersey barrier pieces, but of that kind of size,
10 haul them up there and then drop them right in the place.
11 Conceivably, it makes a huge difference in terms of time
12 that you're on the mountain trying to construct these
13 things. You get the weather element out, you get the
14 quality up. So that's still a very live item.

15 --o0o--

16 Mr. Gaskill thanks the panels for their
17 presentations and then gives the Committee a homework
18 assignment and then talks about the agenda for the next day.

19 The question is, did the Committee members
20 understand everything that they learned today and heard
21 today? Since the answer is probably no, the members are
22 asked to think about what it is that they really didn't pick
23 up that they still want to learn, because the same people
24 that were present today will be available tomorrow morning.
25 So any questions that come up over the night may be asked of

1 them tomorrow.

2 The homework assignment is to read the draft
3 project agreement. There's a lot of good information in it.
4 That should be read tonight.

5 Wednesday morning starts at eight o'clock and
6 there will be a recap of today's accomplishments and events,
7 probably an updated agenda.

8 This time is the public comment period. David
9 Hadden is here to comment. He is the only public comment.

10 MR. HADDEN: Thanks very much. My name's
11 Dave Hadden, and I represent the Montana Wilderness
12 Association. And I'm here to ask the Committee and Glacier
13 National Park, in consideration of rebuilding the Sun road
14 and accommodating the public access to the Park, to do
15 everything it can to conserve and enhance the values of the
16 North Fork drainage.

17 The values of Glacier National Park are not
18 separable from the existing values of the North Fork basin.
19 Glacier National Park comprises almost half of the North
20 Fork and needs the other half to conserve the whole on
21 public -- on the private land and the national forest lands
22 that comprise the other half of the North Fork. It needs
23 the whole basin to conserve the values of Glacier Park.

24 The values that people from all across America and
25 the world come to visit Glacier National Park for are

1 contained in the North Fork country. Scenic beauty, open
2 space, quiet, wilderness, tranquility, and perhaps most
3 important, wildlife. The North Fork is a sanctuary for all
4 these values. They are values that cut across economic and
5 political lines. They are what make America's national
6 parks, and Glacier National Park in particular, the envy of
7 the world.

8 The Sun road rebuild project doesn't directly
9 threaten the qualities or the integrity of the North Fork.
10 However, the proposed North Fork paving project does
11 directly threaten North Fork and the Park resources.

12 The proposed paving project does so by making the
13 North Fork easier to visit, easier for more people to visit,
14 easier to commute from, easier to subdivide the private land
15 along the river bottoms, and easier to love to death.

16 In America, we've seen wild country and lands
17 around our national parks disappear, and the integrities of
18 the national parks threatened, in some places lost.

19 Montana Wilderness Association and its 3,000-plus
20 members urges the Committee and Glacier National Park to
21 develop alternatives for public visitation and accomodation
22 that do not include the loss of the North Fork's present
23 qualities.

24 I don't know how you can do that. You're the
25 Committee that's making recommendations to the Park, but we

1 would look for a position in some capacity that advocates
2 alternatives to the paving project. You will be looking, I
3 assume, at some aspects of how to accommodate the public,
4 and the North Fork road issue is one of those items. Thank
5 you very much for your time.

6 Yes, sir.

7 MR. BAKER: I'm know not quite sure on which
8 area of the map you're talking about. Could you just point
9 it out?

10 MR. HADDEN: It's not on that map. This is
11 not the North Fork drainage. This is McDonald Creek and
12 Logan Creek. It's the North Fork Road from Columbia Falls
13 to the west -- thank you. It's the North Fork Road from
14 Canyon Creek to the Camas entrance of the Park. And the
15 proposal is to pave this road. And it's been proposed for
16 paving as a way of accommodating the visitors to Glacier
17 National Park while the road is being reconstructed.
18 However, the scenic values are not the same, and the
19 wildlife values are extraordinary, particularly in the area
20 north of that Park entrance.

21 MR. WHITE: Is that road within the Park?

22 MR. HADDEN: No, the road is not within the
23 Park. But it is proposed for paving, and Congress has
24 allocated 2.4 million dollars to pave that road surface or
25 to look at alternatives for paving.

1 MR. BABB: I think one important
2 clarification is that the Park Service isn't proposing the
3 road.

4 MR. HADDEN: Right. I didn't intend to imply
5 that. I just meant to imply that it is -- the paving
6 project does include Park resources, and the Park does, in
7 theory, have a voice to express on its values in the Park.
8 We're looking forward to continued support of Park values.

9 MR. SLITER: Dave, has the Association
10 considered the impact to the North Fork River, if we get
11 into an increased traffic situation on the North Fork Road
12 as a result of this project that we're considering? Has the
13 Association considered the dust air pollution and
14 sedimentation of the river?

15 MR. HADDEN: Yes, it has.

16 MR. SLITER: And it maintains its position
17 based on that?

18 MR. HADDEN: Yes. Jack Stanford at the
19 University of Montana's Biological Station, whose done
20 extensive work in the drainage, says that the amount of dust
21 that would be generated, present or in future, from road
22 traffic is insignificant. That one culvert washout along
23 any of the forest roads or Park roads, one culvert washout,
24 would far exceed by a hundred times -- or a hundred years
25 any deposit directly on the river from the North Fork dust.

1 So North Fork road dust is inconsequential.

2 MR. SLITER: Has Dr. Stanford documented
3 that?

4 MR. HADDEN: No. The quality of dust and the
5 ways of measuring it are so difficult that his position is
6 that it can't be -- it can hardly be measured.

7 MR. BROOKE: I just have a quick comment
8 that. I appreciate the comments. He points out something
9 that I hadn't really given much thought to. And that is, if
10 the road is closed, it's going to push impacts somewhere
11 else. And we've hardened the resource here, and we're used
12 to in expecting people on this corridor. And bears and
13 other wildlife and amenities aren't used to people in other
14 places. So there's a spin-off to doing this project right
15 in mitigating the impacts that ultimately ends up benefiting
16 the values you're talking about.

17 MR. HADDEN: Exactly right. Thanks very
18 much.

19 --o0o--

20 Mr. Gaskill indicates in the Committee members'
21 notebooks there's a sticky notepad. If they have any ideas
22 or comments or questions that might be useful for tomorrow
23 to think about or consider, they want to write it down in
24 there and give it to him or other personnel, they'll see if
25 those questions can be addressed tomorrow.

1 At 5:10 p.m. Mr. Shireman suggested comment forms
2 to be filled out by all and then asks for comments.

3 Susie Burch would like hard copies of the three
4 economic analyses and the three engineering programs.
5 Barney O'Quinn would like the safety studies also.

6 The meeting was then closed by Mr. Shireman at
7 5:10 p.m.

8 (Proceedings in recess from 5:10 p.m. to
9 Wednesday, March 1, 2000 at 8:00 a.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Table of Contents	
2		
3	Wednesday, March 1, 2000 -	Page
4	MK Centennial Team - Scope of Work	151
	Mary Riddle - Public Law	175
5	Open Discussion	179
6	Fred Babb - Vision Statement Presentation	195
	Open Discussion	209
7		
8	Committee General Session	231
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	Public Comment -	
	Don White	338
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 The second day of the first meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 8:00 a.m., March 1, 2000, by Acting Superintendent Rick
4 Shireman.

5 He summarized the previous day's proceedings and
6 comments, including more time for questions and answers.
7 The Committee was advised that when the last member, Anna
8 Marie Moe, arrives, each Committee member should probably
9 give her another brief introduction of themselves along with
10 a brief recap of yesterday's proceedings for her benefit to
11 bring her up to speed. The chairperson will be selected at
12 some time today.

13 Questions that were asked yesterday on economic
14 studies that were requested will be available today. The
15 full set of the technical and engineering studies will be
16 available on the third day, as they are quite extensive.
17 And the red bus dimensions are 25 foot long and 7.58 feet
18 wide.

19 There are changes to the day's agenda that have
20 been pointed out. There will be flexibility with regard to
21 it.

22 Mary Riddle will present compliance issues.

23 Facilitator Craig Gaskill, switched hats from
24 facilitator to assist in the presentation of MK Centennial.
25 He introduces the project manager for MK Centennial, Dick

1 Bauman.

2 Mr. Dick Bauman states MK decided to give
3 information on qualifications. MK understands it's a
4 showcase, and want to do their best to succeed in the
5 project and develop the project that meets all the
6 requirements.

7 The main role that Mr. Gaskill and Mr. Babb and
8 Mr. Bauman need to do is to learn. They have different ways
9 to develop different alternatives. And they can develop
10 just about anything the Committee wants them to, if they
11 request; whether it's mitigation techniques during
12 construction or different ways to do the construction. But
13 overall, he wants to understand that they understand it's a
14 rehabilitation project.

15 There are some particular concerns about safety on
16 the project; two types of concerns. Based upon the
17 information that has been seen from Federal Highways, there
18 needs to be an understanding that there's a lot of urgency
19 to get some of the serious walls repaired as quickly as
20 possible. That's why construction is moving ahead this
21 summer. There are some very serious problems along the
22 project with the condition of the walls. And as concerns
23 were voiced about having the road closed, there is a
24 necessity to understand about the job that there could be a
25 wall failure at any time with the seven walls that are the

1 most critical. So while deliberations are taking place,
2 there needs to be an understanding that there are issues
3 that need to be addressed as quickly as possible.

4 Part of MK's role will be to evaluate the work in
5 process that the Federal Highways has developed and to add
6 to that, if possible. The condition of the road hasn't
7 actually been seen yet. Their first actual day on the job
8 was Monday, February 27.

9 So there's a safety issue related to the loads,
10 weight.

11 Another safety issue is more long-term. When a
12 road is developed or a road that has a width of 18, 20, 22
13 feet, another part of the issue to discuss is a traffic
14 accident problem caused by the number of vehicles on the
15 project. Traffic engineers, when they do design to improve
16 safety along a project, work with two basic principles.
17 Either they separate vehicles by space or they separate
18 vehicles by time, if there's conflict. Separating vehicles
19 by time, that's like a traffic signal; traffic going
20 east-west and north-south. A signal is put up and you give
21 part of the time to the north-south and part to the
22 east-west. So those conflicts are separated by time.

23 The other approach is to separate conflicts by
24 space, i.e., with a divider in a road. MK is working with
25 the given that the width of the road will remain as is. So

1 you can only get so many vehicles along the road at any
2 particular time. Restriction of size of vehicles is one way
3 to handle this situation. Discussion of highest flow needs
4 to be considered, especially as the Park becomes more
5 popular; control of the flow of the vehicles.

6 MK Centennial itself is the transportation
7 division of the Morrison Knudsen construction company. But
8 the offices tend to be separate from the construction group.
9 Corporate headquarters is in Denver.

10 MK focuses their work on resort areas. They
11 recruit outside specialists for special jobs such as this.
12 They tailor make the team to fit the problem they're working
13 on such as with this Going-to-the-Sun Road team. The team
14 consists of experienced staff that had worked on projects
15 similar in the past. This panel is unique for MK, the first
16 Committee formed by Congress, yet quite visible. They've
17 had much success on previous projects. Real time project
18 control is used for costs on a weekly basis. Attention is
19 paid to how the cost is managed. Everyone on this team
20 wants to work on this project at Glacier Park.

21 Mr. Bauman is the manager, John Marone is the lead
22 design engineer in Denver. The project manager on the job
23 is Kurt Suter. He has experience with avalanches,
24 experience with high alpine construction work. Craig is
25 essentially in charge of the planning, environmental

1 socioeconomic part of the project. Jay is in charge of the
2 engineering aspects of the project.

3 (Whereupon a handout was given to the Committee
4 members showing specialized areas under both Jay and Craig.)

5 One challenge is to keep the project moving, on
6 time and under budgets, which means skilled people are
7 necessary. How to communicate is going to be a task. MK
8 wants to figure out a way to submit information that all
9 need. Every member has e-mail and MK proposes to submit
10 everything through e-mail with attachments.

11 The geotech firm on the team is Bolder and
12 Associates and are specialists in geotechnical work in
13 Canadian. Kurt Suter is the mentor. Two deputies on the
14 project are Craig Gaskill and Jay Brasher. Mr. Bauman
15 introduces them both.

16 Mr. Jay Brasher gives some past relevant
17 experience on projects similar to the Going-to-the-Sun Road
18 project.

19 They've designed 150 miles of mountainous roads
20 through sensitive cultural, natural and historical projects;
21 eight projects within the last three years. Much of the
22 work has been in resort and recreational areas, thus being
23 able to understand the many impacts that these projects
24 create. MK has a large capacity for work.

25 Past projects include Conejos in southwestern

1 Colorado. Completed the design of the project for the FHA.
2 It was a two-mile long stretch of road, very low-volume, but
3 in a very dangerous area called the Pinnacles. The majority
4 of the road, 1.7 miles, was actually built on a retaining
5 wall. Expensive site improvement, safety improvement
6 project. A real challenge to build the retaining wall under
7 traffic. This road is also closed in the wintertime similar
8 to the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Built in one-and-a-half
9 construction seasons. That road is 22 feet wide:

10 The Guanella Pass Road in Colorado. Half the
11 project is paved, the other half is gravel. It required a
12 lot of engineering modification. It's a very steep
13 topography and a lot of switchbacks. Many cut walls and
14 fill side retaining walls needed to be done to save the
15 environment.

16 A similar project is the Cottonwood Pass project,
17 a 20-mile long road. Half of the road is paved and has been
18 reconstructed by Federal Highway Administration. The other
19 20 miles is not paved, very windy road. A high riparian and
20 wetlands area. This project actually reduced the impact
21 area and increased the wetlands area.

22 Presently working on the Beartooth Highway in
23 Wyoming proceeding west towards Yellowstone. The highway
24 has already been widened to between a 24 and 28-foot top
25 width. This project is 18 to 20 foot wide. There are five

1 bridges located on the project. All the bridges have
2 historical significance, and mitigation is needed to be
3 constructed.

4 A design goal for the Going-to-the-Sun Road is to
5 restore the road while maintaining the visual, aesthetic,
6 and historical character of the roadway corridor, while also
7 minimizing the socioeconomic impacts associated with the
8 rehabilitation.

9 The design approach would begin with an inventory
10 of the existing landscape character and historical aspects
11 of the project; a review of all of the data by the National
12 Parks and Federal Highway Administration and to augment that
13 in working with the Committee. The design analysis will
14 consider the roadway visibility, natural and cultural and
15 historical resources. Site sensitivity to construction
16 impacts will be considered. Need to develop revegetation
17 techniques. They need to build upon the work that the FHA
18 has performed to save as much of the historical fabric as
19 possible.

20 All of those issues must be balanced with the very
21 serious construction issues associated with the project.
22 Maintenance of traffic is a very important issue, technics
23 must be found to deal with that. There is a very short
24 construction season. Balancing the habitats, the natural
25 resources and wildlife in the area, the constraints

1 associated with that must be considered.

2 A critical issue associated with this project are
3 the material sources and waste sites. Finding material
4 sources, probably material that comes outside the Park, is
5 going to have to be imported. There's also limited room for
6 staging the existing narrow platform width. And just
7 general access to the project during the day with the
8 traveling public, with the road open, getting materials into
9 the Park and to the construction sites, poses a challenge.
10 Safety of the traveling public during construction must be
11 considered, and that has an impact on construction and the
12 dewatering. Any work done in the Park must take into
13 consideration any erosion that's created.

14 MK has the ability to schedule and capacity to do
15 the work, even with the limited resources available. MK can
16 get the work done.

17 Craig Gaskill presented his experience of the
18 team, including understanding the compliance issues. Over
19 500 NEPA projects have been accomplished by this team.
20 Other laws that they have experience in, National Historic
21 Preservation Act, Section 7 consultation, 49 CFR, 23 CFR,
22 and others.

23 Important areas in terms of planning were the
24 socioeconomic, cultural and natural resource evaluation, GIS
25 (Geographic Information Services) familiarity, public

1 process/communication. Jean Townsend is socioeconomic expert
2 on project.

3 Public process communications uses an open-house
4 format, one-on-one discussion.

5 It's important to maintain and establish the
6 credibility of the entire project team and the Committee
7 itself to the public; being responsive to the public, open
8 to the public so they can't be accused of holding back and
9 making decisions in the dark.

10 (Whereupon a two-minute video was shown to the
11 Committee showing some technics available in terms of
12 simulations.)

13 Dick Bauman asks if the Committee has questions
14 about putting the team together.

15 MR. JEWETT: In your chart here, you
16 mentioned a couple people that I can't find on the chart;
17 Norma, for one, and Paul Polzin.

18 MR. GASKILL: We didn't actually put where
19 they are going to be.

20 MR. JEWETT: Their roles will be pretty
21 significant, in my view. Could you update the chart?

22 MR. GASKILL: Yeah.

23 MR. JEWETT: The second question I had was,
24 Dick, you mentioned in the beginning there was the
25 possibility of imminent wall failure on seven sections; is

1 that right?

2 MR. BAUMAN: Yeah. That came up in the
3 presentation yesterday afternoon.

4 MR. JEWETT: Can you explain to me the laws
5 and the regulations and the liability standards that allow
6 that road to be kept open and used if it's in that imminent
7 failure?

8 MR. BAUMAN: Since I haven't done the
9 evaluation, I think I may have to get Dick -- I guess Al has
10 left already. Mr. Dick Gatten needs to hear the question
11 again.

12 MR. JEWETT: From a layperson's perspective,
13 over the years you'll see a bridge that's in imminent
14 failure, and the state highway transportation will close it
15 until it's repaired, for liability reasons, is one example.
16 If there are seven sections of wall on Going-to-the-Sun that
17 appear to be poised for immediate failure or imminent
18 failure, how can the road remain open? How does the Federal
19 Highway Commission allow it to happen?

20 MR. GATTEN: Al had another meeting to go to,
21 so he's not here. But as I understand it, his evaluation of
22 the condition of the wall on the road -- he prioritized them
23 as a priority 1, 2 and 3. Priority 1 is the highest
24 priority. And I don't think he said that any of them are in
25 danger of immediate failure.

1 I believe his definition was that they should be
2 repaired within one to three years. In other words, there's
3 a need but it's not like, you know, that we would expect it
4 to fall down tomorrow. But you can't really predict that.

5 I think the worst-case example he showed, really,
6 wasn't the retaining wall, it was that stone wall at the
7 loop. And that's supposed to be addressed this fall. So
8 we're trying to work within the time frame of what he's
9 defined as needing to be addressed. So one, two, three
10 years, I believe, was the priority 1 and 2 walls.

11 MR. SHIREMAN: Let me try to understand that.
12 And please understand that this is based on two months at
13 Glacier but also based on 20 years of operation of road
14 facility in national parks in dealing with road closures in
15 three other park areas that are very similar in context.

16 What we have to think about is the stability of
17 the road over time. At any given point, at a snapshot point
18 within a road's history, there are going to be certain
19 sections that are in better or in worse condition. And the
20 key is to identify which of those are most dangerous or most
21 in need of repair at any given time.

22 At this point, there are those seven areas that
23 have been identified, and a couple of them were up in
24 pictures yesterday that you can take a look at. Those are
25 already being planned for repair and replacement and funding

1 in the next couple of years. And the environmental process
2 has been taken care of to deal with those particular
3 sections of road.

4 You may recall that there was a number thrown out
5 of 146 retaining walls along the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Of
6 those, seven have been identified as critical for repair.
7 And those are already scheduled. What we've got to be
8 thinking about is how, over time, the rest of those
9 retaining walls along the road change in condition and to
10 have a plan in place to make sure we're tackling each of
11 those sections as it becomes more critical in the process.
12 So in other words, some of those retaining walls that
13 currently are in good or fair condition, are going to
14 eventually get to the point of being in poor or imminent
15 failure.

16 Now, the concept of imminent failure tends to let
17 people believe that all of a sudden the whole thing is going
18 to collapse and have a significant failure and that we're
19 going to have structures and vehicles and things sliding off
20 the edge of the road. In fact, many times, imminent failure
21 means the road becomes visibly undriveable and that it has
22 to be closed in order to do the repairs. And there's not
23 much time available between when that happens and when the
24 repairs have to go to keep it safe.

25 An example occurred, I think in 1994, and, John,

1 please correct me as I make mistakes here. And you can see
2 the outcome of that on a picture that's over in the far
3 corner of the room, if you'll take a look at that at the
4 next break. During the spring opening in 1994, the Park
5 road crew discovered a section of road that had sloughed off
6 during the winter months. And I believe that was close to
7 the east tunnel?

8 MR. KILPATRICK: It was due to the plugged
9 culvert in the west tunnel.

10 MR. SHIREMAN: A section of road sloughed off
11 into the canyon. It required about two weeks of time for
12 repairs during spring season opening. It was fortunate that
13 it was discovered early on in the road opening process,
14 because the Park was able to do those repairs during a time
15 when the road would not have been open anyway. If that had
16 happened later in the year, say, through an avalanche, a
17 sudden rainfall that had plugged the culvert or something
18 along those lines, we would have had an immediate and
19 imminent failure, and the road would have needed to be
20 closed for somewhere in the range of two to three weeks.
21 That's what we're trying to avoid, is those points of time
22 where a section of the road becomes unsafe to the point that
23 it has to be closed and we have to deal with the planning,
24 the design, the construction, the environmental compliance,
25 all of those things that would expand that closure during

1 the time that we would expect the road to be available for
2 park visitors.

3 I hope I'm making some sense here in terms of the
4 difference between knowing what needs to be done and having
5 a plan in place, so that we expedite the repairs and know
6 which repairs need to be done in a priority order and
7 dealing with those failures after they have occurred, in
8 trying to figure out all of that planning process in an
9 emergency stands.

10 MR. KILPATRICK: About a couple of years ago
11 we had another retaining wall that was in danger of imminent
12 failure. We closed the road and repaired that wall. The
13 triple arches were in danger of failing, and we did that
14 repair during the month of October. It was highly hazardous
15 doing that work during that time. If you drive up the road
16 this spring, you'll still see the temporary repairs there.
17 We do monitor the road. Al Killian comes out a couple times
18 a year to look at this road.

19 There are 50-some-odd miles of this road. There's
20 no possible way he can look at every single retaining wall
21 on that road. And so it's kind of like a necklace of pearls
22 draped across the Divide, that there's a whole lot of places
23 where we can have problems that cause a closure. A plugged
24 culvert can wash out that road just as easily as a failed
25 retaining wall.

1 Another thing that you need to recall is that this
2 initial inventory report was done in 1997, updated in 1998,
3 prioritized, I think, in 1998 as well. So that report is
4 already three years old. And so time is gaining on us, and
5 we're not gaining much ground in making repairs. I think
6 those are things that you need to keep in the back of your
7 mind as you move through this process.

8 MS. PAHL: Rick, from yesterday's
9 presentation, I have 127 retaining walls. What is the right
10 number?

11 MR. SHIREMAN: I had written down 146, so
12 I'll refer back to the true experts.

13 MR. KILPATRICK: I feel like I'm counting
14 trees. You know, what I would like to say is that last
15 year, I think when we did some clearing of vegetation on
16 that road, we found retaining walls that we didn't know
17 existed. They're just hidden or material that's come down
18 off the road, pushed over the Garden Wall. So I think that
19 that's one of the reasons we talked about yesterday that we
20 really need to do almost a foot-by-foot inventory so we
21 really can label that. And that all takes resources, and it
22 takes money.

23 MS. PAHL: Well, what number do you want us
24 to use?

25 MR. SHIREMAN: What I would suggest is say in

1 excess of a hundred, and recognize that some of those number
2 changes depend on how you define a retaining wall. You saw
3 an example yesterday, that I think Fred was talking about,
4 that was identified as -- in the list as a retaining wall
5 but was, really, a rock wall fill. Those are where those
6 numbers tend to fluctuate.

7 MR. KILPATRICK: Rick, in our best count
8 today, it's 126. So -- but, I mean, we may go up there and
9 find we have a new one.

10 MS. PAHL: They're having babies.

11 MR. KILPATRICK: I think they're hidden
12 babies.

13 MS. BURCH: With today's technology and
14 little or no maintenance, how long will a retaining wall
15 that we fix in the near future -- what's the life of a
16 retaining wall?

17 MR. GATTEN: I have to apologize, I have a
18 hearing problem.

19 MS. BURCH: With today's technology and
20 little or no maintenance, how long will a retaining wall
21 that's built today last?

22 MR. GATTEN: How long of one that's built
23 today?

24 MS. BURCH: If we fix a retaining wall now,
25 what life should we expect?

1 MR. SHIREMAN: While you're thinking of the
2 technical aspects of that, I think you need to redesign the
3 question. Because if you add the issue of without annual
4 maintenance, the average life expectancy could be less than
5 a year. It's very important that the annual maintenance and
6 the continued inspection and clearing of culverts and
7 ensuring that drainage works is in place. Because you can
8 build a brand new section of wall and, if you have not dealt
9 with the drainage properly in terms of annual maintenance,
10 it could fail immediately.

11 MS. BURCH: Then I will rephrase it.

12 But what I'm thinking of is maintenance that
13 requires a substantial time output. And by that I mean, not
14 just clearing culverts, monitoring, but something that would
15 entail a road closure to maintain or a notable amount of
16 work for the Park staff. I'm thinking in terms of, this is
17 part of what's creating our problem, is the fact that we
18 don't always have the resources to maintain all of the
19 infrastructure. We're paying a price for that now,
20 concessionaires and the Park Service both. So I think when
21 we address this, that's part of what I'd like to know, is,
22 what kind of life will we have with a moderate maintenance
23 plan. Maybe that's a better way to say it.

24 MR. GATTEN: I don't know how to predict
25 that, exactly. But I do know -- I mean, as far as getting

1 regular money for maintenance. But I believe that if Al
2 were here, he'd tell you that what he's identified as walls
3 that have deteriorated, where the grout has deteriorated and
4 there's a need for what he called repointing, which is going
5 in there, removing some of the loose grout and replacing it
6 with new, I believe if there were a regular program for
7 addressing those needs, then he feels the walls will last
8 almost indefinitely, unless you have some support problem
9 right at the base. And the plan is, we hope in the next few
10 years, to address three-pointing with what we call heavy
11 maintenance, or money that's not really maintenance money,
12 it's the Park Road Improvement Program money. I think, with
13 the proper care, they'll last almost indefinitely. They've
14 been there 70 or 80 years now.

15 MS. BURCH: Good.

16 MR. MCDONALD: One of my wife's phobias is
17 that being earthquakes. What kind of seismic study analysis
18 will you be doing for this project? I'm somewhat familiar
19 with -- on the Flathead Reservation, we have a lot of new
20 data on seismic activity. And it's resulted in creation of
21 new parameters for us in our construction and our Safety
22 Dance program. And it seems we're having more and more
23 information available that wasn't available ten years ago in
24 western Montana. And it seems like this highway would be
25 prone to catastrophic failure with a fairly significant or

1 even minor earthquake.

2 MR. BAUMAN: The field of seismic design has
3 changed a lot in the last ten years. There were structures
4 in California that they thought were designed to be
5 earthquake resistant that have come down in the last five or
6 six years because they just haven't evolved the world to
7 design even at that point. So that there's a -- we're
8 involved in a major -- what's called a seismic retrofit of
9 major structures in California now going back in and doing
10 the way the steel is wrapped around the columns to improve
11 the seismic.

12 It's always a risk in a rehab project, because you
13 can't go back and totally rebuild without taking every
14 structure down and totally reconstructing it. You're
15 probably not going to have enough money to take down
16 structures that are in good shape that have been well
17 maintained. So the process will be, when a structure has to
18 be replaced as part of the rehab project, then it will be
19 designed to meet current seismic standards. But if a
20 structure is currently in good condition, I doubt that there
21 will be sufficient money to go back and fix the ones that
22 are not broken. So it will be an evolutionary process. As
23 major repairs occur on the structures, they will be updated
24 to current seismic standards.

25 MR. BROOKE: Dick, I've got a question for

1 you, in terms of the Master Plan and other references. And
2 I think we heard it yesterday from the Park Service. Their
3 experience at Logan Pass, their construction
4 experience -- and I refer to it as their single experience.
5 And I don't mean to be derogatory, I'm just making the
6 reference to it. When they had that construction experience
7 and they came away from that and they decided that they had
8 to change the way they were doing business, that didn't work
9 very well. Have you folks had the opportunity to review
10 what went on there, and do you have any observations about
11 it yet, or is that premature?

12 MR. BAUMAN: We didn't. As I said, we didn't
13 start, officially, under contract until Monday of this week.
14 So we haven't had the opportunity to review that yet.
15 That's part of what we'll be doing this spring.

16 MR. BROOKE: As far as you're concerned, when
17 you started this project, you started with a clean slate.
18 There's no restrictions of like 15-minute delays and those
19 kinds of things. It really is open, and the Park is going
20 to be affected by the recommendations that we make.

21 MR. BAUMAN: It's a clean slate. We're all
22 going to work together to do the best we can. We've looked
23 at the specs for the work that will be done this summer. If
24 I put my contractor hat on, I'm a little worried about the
25 15-minute periods. That's pretty difficult. And I guess my

1 main concern with that is, we want to develop a construction
2 process for the contractors so the contractor can succeed.
3 We'll have to look at this summer as an experimental process
4 to come up with the best way to get the work done, starting
5 with the goal of the 15 minutes.

6 I believe in proactive construction management. A
7 lot of times the contractor thinks that you'll back down on
8 the time constraints. He'll fail purposely to say that it
9 can't be done in that time. So we need to work and help the
10 contractor figure out a way to do it as efficiently as we
11 can, with the minimum of delays. And right now, I'm not
12 sure what the number of minutes is going to be that solves
13 that problem.

14 MR. BROOKE: One final, as connected, and
15 that is, when you talk about your experience for -- or MK's
16 experience, have you done high mountain alpine roads where
17 you, in fact, kept one lane open through the entire
18 construction project?

19 MR. BAUMAN: Yeah. Jay gave the example of
20 the Conejos project. There was no other way. It was like a
21 cul-de-sac. There was no other way in or out, so we had to
22 keep the road open during the construction.

23 MR. BRASHER: That road actually provided
24 access to a town. So there were emergency issues that had
25 to be addressed, also, so we had to maintain that road open.

1 It was the shortest way to down. In the wintertime, people
2 would get up there using snowmobiles. But in spring and
3 summer, we had to maintain at least one lane of traffic.
4 Bill Dakin.

5 MR. DAKIN: Can I follow up on that? How did
6 the traffic on that road compare with the traffic load
7 projections that would be on the Sun road?

8 MR. BRASHER: The traffic on that road was
9 much less.

10 MR. GASKILL: I'd actually talked to Kurt
11 Suter quite a bit. He's the person out of Switzerland. As
12 far as some of the projects he's worked on, Jay showed some
13 of those pictures. And he said he's worked on -- a lot of
14 these roads that they've worked on are the only roads to
15 some of these villages. In one case, it was so difficult
16 and it was a small enough volume that what they actually
17 ended up doing was providing helicopter service for a short
18 period of time they couldn't provide the access service.
19 They actually had to close it down. That came up to be the
20 best solution. So there's a lot of options. That doesn't
21 necessarily mean that's the best way here, but there are
22 certainly some innovative thoughts out there.

23 MR. BRASHER: My point there is that our work
24 is going to be evaluating all those different scenarios and
25 coming up with those.

1 MR. BAUMAN: And mitigation is during that
2 construction is part of the issue. What kind of
3 alternatives can we do? We did a job on one area where part
4 of the capital cost of the project was purchasing 30 more
5 buses to provide more alternative transportation to the site
6 along the corridor during construction. But, actually, we
7 were able to qualify for federal funding to purchase the
8 buses as part of the mitigation for the project. Maybe we
9 can use this money to buy more red buses, you know. There's
10 all kinds of things to talk about and look at through
11 mitigation during the project.

12 MR. KILPATRICK: One of the advantages of
13 having MK here is that they will be able to see what goes on
14 during the construction project this summer.

15 MR. WHITE: I was wondering, the inspections
16 on this project, who's going to be doing the final
17 inspection?

18 MR. BAUMAN: For the job this summer?

19 MR. WHITE: This summer and, I guess, the
20 Logan Pass project.

21 MR. GATTEN: Are you asking who's going to do
22 the design?

23 MR. WHITE: The final inspection.

24 MR. GATTEN: Federal Highway. Our office
25 provides not only the design but the construction staffing

1 on the project. So we have a project engineer and inspector
2 that's out there. And then, of course, the Park has their
3 people that look at things as they go along. So we monitor
4 and administer the contract.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Dick, I have a question and
6 then a comment. And I don't know a lot about construction,
7 so you'll have to forgive my ignorance. But will you use
8 all of your workers or will you use local people to help
9 with the construction? Will you use local labor on the
10 project or will you be bringing in a lot of your own
11 workers?

12 MR. BAUMAN: Well, the work that we're doing
13 now is doing the preparing an engineering document and the
14 socioeconomic document. Primarily, that will be the team
15 that we've talked about this morning. If there's a decision
16 that we need origin destination information, like total
17 number of through trips through the Park, if we do that kind
18 of an O and D study this summer, we'll hire local people for
19 that.

20 MS. ANDERSON: And then I just have a
21 comment. As I said yesterday, we've been very concerned
22 about the publicity that's already out that people think the
23 road is closed. So we did a brainstorming session a couple
24 of weeks ago, and we decided where else could you sit for 15
25 minutes, 20 minutes, half an hour, whatever it would take

1 during a delay, and have the kind of scenery we do? So
2 there is a positive. We'll actually have an opportunity to
3 enjoy the positive. So that's kind of the angle.

4 MR. BAUMAN: I started school in Custer,
5 South Dakota, so I told Paul I've seen them working on the
6 nose of the monument while the project -- doing
7 construction. But the other thing I've seen is the sculptor
8 that started Crazy Horse. When I was in grade school, in
9 the '40s, they were working on that project and charging
10 people to come look at it. And when I went back there last
11 summer, they're still charging people and still working on
12 it. And after 35 years I could finally see some shape
13 coming to it. So there are people that are actually making
14 their living by charging the visitors to look at a
15 construction project underway.

16 I think we can showcase this project, as the
17 renovation is done, to make it an interesting part of the
18 visit.

19 MR. KILPATRICK: This is John Kilpatrick.

20 Linda, you had asked about using local labor. We
21 haven't even awarded the indefinite quantities contract yet.
22 Federal Highways is still in the process of reviewing the
23 proposals that they have. In the last ten years, to the
24 best of my knowledge, all of those contracts have gone to
25 Montana firms. It's really up to the contractor, as it's

1 allowable in the contract. And so we'll have to wait and
2 see who is awarded that contract.

3 MR. GASKILL: Can I suggest that maybe we
4 move onto the compliance presentation, and then we'll still
5 have opportunity in the Q-and-A section to ask more
6 questions; okay? After a five-minute break.

7 MR. SHIREMAN: Before we take our break, I'd
8 like to introduce Russ Landt. Russ, would you raise your
9 hand back there? Russ is a recent retiree from Glacier
10 National Park. He was on the road crew for about forty
11 years, and has some very great knowledge, levels of
12 knowledge about the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Russ for many
13 years was the operator of the Pioneer Cat that made the
14 first cut through the road opening in the spring. So if you
15 want to hear some great stories about road openings, Russ is
16 the person to talk to.

17 (Proceedings in recess from 9:45 a.m. to
18 9:55 a.m.)

19 The metric measurements of the buses are 7.62
20 meters long and 3.21 meters in width.

21 Mr. Gaskill introduces Mary Riddle, the Park's
22 compliance officer, Office of Planning, Design and
23 Construction in Denver. She stayed on as chief member of
24 interpretation.

25 Ms. Riddle thanks the Committee for asking her to

1 attend.

2 Congress authorized a million dollars for this
3 study, additional economic and engineering study on the
4 Going-to-the-Sun Road. However, to date, there does not
5 appear to be enough money to do the environmental analysis
6 associated with the study. Part of the work for the
7 Committee will further determine if there is enough money
8 out of that million dollars or whether there isn't. If
9 there isn't, additional funding will have to be sought.

10 The recommendations that the Committee will come
11 up with to the Park, will be analyzed. How that will be
12 analyzed is how all federal agencies do compliance. The
13 National Environmental Policy Act and the CEQ regulations
14 direct that all federal agencies analyze the impacts, the
15 direct, the indirect and cumulative impact of their actions
16 on the environment. And that includes the socioeconomic as
17 well as the natural and cultural environment.

18 Every agency was directed by CEQ to come up with
19 their own implementing guidelines for NEPA, and so the Park
20 has their own guidelines which are called MPS 12.
21 Hopefully, in May, the new guidelines will be approved,
22 which will then be called Directives Orders 12. Those are
23 based on the CEQ regulations and NEPA.

24 In addition to NEPA, the Park has to do compliance
25 with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, which means

1 that they have to consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife
2 Service and that, because there are five federally listed
3 species in the Park, the Park is frequently talking with the
4 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And there are formal
5 processes that are gone through. Section 106 of the
6 National Historic Preservation Act is another thing that
7 must be done as part of the Park's planning efforts, which
8 requires consultation with the SHIPO (State Historic
9 Preservation Officer) and sometimes with the advisory
10 council. Then there are a number of permits, both state and
11 through the Army Corps of Engineers, that must be obtained.
12 So dependent on the committee's recommendation or
13 recommendations and what those entail, will then detail how
14 the Park moves forward further in order to do the compliance
15 for this project.

16 NEPA, again, tells the Park to analyze the direct,
17 the indirect and the cumulative effects on the environment,
18 and they also tell the Park to do that with the public. So
19 the public has the opportunity to participate in that
20 process from the beginning, to provide comments, and it
21 requires that the federal agency consider those comments in
22 making the final determination.

23 As stated, the recommendation or recommendations
24 from the Committee will be analyzed in some kind of
25 environmental document. As to what that is will really

1 depend on an assessment of whether there's an adequate range
2 of alternatives that have been looked at, the level of
3 controversy, what are the impacts of the alternative or
4 alternatives that the Committee recommends or that the Park
5 takes to the public. So the final determination of whether
6 this will be an EA or an EIS, to some degree, has not been
7 made. So far, the assumption is that it will probably be an
8 EIS but depending on what comes out of the study and what
9 comes from the Committee, there may be some opportunities
10 there.

11 For those who don't know, an Environmental
12 Assessment, or an EA, is done to determine whether there is
13 significant impact. If there is not significant impact,
14 then the Park can sign a finding of no significant impact.
15 If there is, then a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register
16 is issued and the EIS process is started. But the Park also
17 has the ability to determine early on that it is likely to
18 be a significant impact, so the Park will move ahead with an
19 EIS.

20 Scoping has not started officially on this study.
21 And by "officially," meaning there has been no notice in the
22 Federal Register stating there is an EIS, at this point, for
23 this project. When that occurs still has to be worked out.
24 And part of that will determine on how the Committee decides
25 to proceed and what the final scope of work looks like that

1 MK Centennial works on and a number of other factors.

2 Questions are floored.

3 MR. SLITER: Mary, you said that we're going
4 to run short on dollars when we get to the environmental
5 compliance issues?

6 MS. RIDDLE: That's correct.

7 MR. SLITER: Is that what you said?

8 MS. RIDDLE: What I've said is, today, it
9 appears that we'll run short of dollars. When you look at
10 the scope of work and the cost estimate and the money that
11 was redirected for us to spend on this study, it does not
12 appear, at this point, that there is enough money to do the
13 Environmental Analysis.

14 MR. SLITER: Then wouldn't it be in our best
15 interest to make sure that we've secured that money and know
16 that we are doing everything we can to be in compliance? I
17 mean, correct me if I'm wrong. Some people tell me that
18 dealing with lawsuits from environmental organizations is
19 just a cost of doing business these days. But to me, it
20 seems like we -- you know, it would behoove us to make sure
21 that we have all of our ducks in a row before we try to
22 proceed, rather than get two-thirds of the way through
23 something and spend a bunch of money, only to find out that
24 we ran out of money, can't comply and run into a brick wall
25 anyway.

1 MS. RIDDLE: Where we would run into where we
2 can't comply is that we could not initiate your
3 recommendation or our preferred alternative until we have
4 done the appropriate level of analysis required. So in the
5 big picture, yes, it would be nice to have the funding now
6 to begin the compliance on this project. However, the fact
7 is, we don't. And I understand from the conversation
8 yesterday that there will be very limited money available
9 for us to go to ask the Park Service for next year. But we
10 certainly may be able to compete for that money.

11 MR. KILPATRICK: Paul, this is John
12 Kilpatrick. We've identified that we do need this funding.
13 We've identified it as what's called an unfunded
14 requirement. And we're going to go into this in a little
15 more detail so you'll have kind of an explanation of where
16 we think that we're at on the budget. And you, on the
17 Committee, will be very involved in that in the budgeting of
18 that money by the decisions that you make.

19 We're looking at a timeline, just for the work
20 that you guys are doing, and this is an estimate, somewhere
21 between 18 to 24 months, just for this initial phase. So we
22 do have some time to try to secure that funding.

23 Our congressional representatives are aware of the
24 issue, and it is an issue. I don't think that it would stop
25 this Committee from proceeding with what Congress has asked

1 you to move forward with, because we recognize that we have
2 to go through the NEPA compliance process, and we're going
3 to work on securing the funds to do that.

4 MR. SHIREMAN: I'll follow up with that and
5 add to what John has said here in that there is a
6 step-by-step process. In order to come to some
7 understanding of what is going to be required, in terms of
8 costs for the environmental process, we have to know what
9 the alternatives are going to be, as Mary has said. That's
10 the responsibility of the Advisory Committee and the Park
11 Service and our partners to figure out. We need to get a
12 sense of the range of alternatives that you will be
13 recommending in order to get a sense of the cost involved in
14 doing the environmental compliance.

15 So while we can make some general predictions, we
16 need your work completed or at a level where we can be
17 fairly clear when we go into the requesting process for
18 specific amounts of dollars to complete the environmental
19 process. So this is a continuing kind of activity we take
20 one step at a time. We recognize that the next step is to
21 get that next funding level in place. And the Park will be
22 working on that, with your assistance, in figuring out what
23 directions we need to go.

24 MR. O'QUINN: I guess I'm a bit confused. I
25 guess I asked yesterday if the Park Service or Federal

1 Highway Administration is the lead agency on this. I
2 understand that the Park Service is the lead agency. I'm
3 very, very familiar with the FHWA part of the NEPA process.
4 I'm not familiar with the Park Service process, which gives
5 me some concern. Because what I'm hearing described is a
6 two-phased approach to where certain planning efforts will
7 be undertaken that will identify alternatives, and studies
8 will be undertaken that, under the Federal Highway
9 Administration process, would be -- or procedures would be
10 part of the NEPA process. And what I'm hearing is that
11 we're going to do a lot of studies and come with a lot of
12 suggestions for alternatives, and perhaps recommendations,
13 and then a NEPA document be done behind that, which is more
14 or less certifying what you've already done. And to me,
15 that really does leave the process wide open for lawsuits.
16 Because the whole NEPA process is a public process.

17 And if I were going with a clean sheet of paper
18 and start this study, I think you've got, as a part of the
19 management plan, a tier to problematic document, which
20 identified the need to improve the highway but, at the same
21 time, limited alternatives to it was not looking at an
22 alternative on a new alignment but pretty much is -- let's
23 call it a heavy maintenance project. So I think that's what
24 comes out of your first document. And that sets the stage
25 for what alternatives you have.

1 It would seem to me that the next thing is the
2 development of a purpose and need, most of which you already
3 have intuitively anyway. But that, in turn, limits the
4 alternatives that may come up in the NEPA process. If you
5 develop a strong purpose in need that kind of sets the stage
6 for what alternatives can be evaluated, that precludes, for
7 the most part, of straw dogs coming in from strange and
8 incredible places that you have to include in the NEPA
9 process because they don't meet the purpose and need of the
10 project. But so far as this group coming up with the
11 alternatives, and I think that's important that we do that
12 to try to give some direction as an extension of the public
13 involved in the process. But for us to try to develop the
14 alternatives and then give it to you and the consultant and
15 say Go develop those alternatives, without fully engaging
16 the public, you're on the slippery slope of being two-thirds
17 the way through the document and come to find out you've got
18 new alternatives that somebody wants you to look at.

19 I think it's very important that this process be
20 intertwined with the formalized NEPA process from the get-go
21 and get that public involvement early and -- so that you
22 don't get part of the way down. I understand you do not
23 have, necessarily, all the funds to complete it. But if we
24 start the process as a combined process, I feel like you've
25 got --

1 MS. RIDDLE: Go ahead.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I just feel like -- that it's a
3 cleaner process.

4 Now, you can come up with alternatives that do not
5 have to be evaluated all the way through the process, you
6 know. As you know, you may be noncompetitive to not
7 feasible for approval and get rid of them that way.

8 I think there are some limitations that were set
9 out in the first document, the management study, as a tiered
10 document, but, again, it was not very, very tight as to what
11 could or could not be evaluated. And so if we start this
12 process as a combined -- not just a planning study that this
13 Committee is recommending and the Park Service and the
14 consultant are going to evaluate and then we're going to
15 decide what kind of environmental document we're going to
16 do. But if we wrap it together and say We're doing an
17 environmental document from the get-go, I think we stand a
18 lot better chance of having something that would stand a
19 legal sufficiency test than if we start and do what I'll
20 call a planning study or feasible study and then try to tack
21 on an environmental document behind it.

22 MS. RIDDLE: It's certainly not our intent to
23 split these up so much that we leave -- that we don't
24 communicate well with the public and that the public is not
25 participating in this process. I think that we -- you know,

1 there is still some question as to what level of detail we
2 will need to go to.

3 When you say tier off the General Management Plan,
4 there's tier in the formal, legal sense of the word and
5 there's tier in the informal sense. Yes, you need to tier
6 off the General Management Plan in the informal sense, in
7 that that plan really sets the direction on what we will and
8 will not do.

9 MR. O'QUINN: I thought the General
10 Management Plan was a formal tiered-one environmental
11 document.

12 MS. RIDDLE: It is an Environmental Impact
13 Statement, and it does have a record of decision issued with
14 it. As to whether additional -- whatever comes out of this
15 Committee and whatever comes out of the studies that MK does
16 for us as engineering studies as to whether they can be
17 tiered off the Environmental Impact Statement associated
18 with that GMP, I can't answer that question yet because we
19 don't know what they are. If they are completely different
20 or something that wasn't covered in the analysis in the GMP,
21 we'll either have to do -- it will either require another
22 EIS, depending on the level of impact and the controversy
23 and the range, or whether -- or perhaps we can tier it off
24 that existing EIS and do an EA. But I don't know what those
25 options are.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Yes, but just from the process.
2 And I know that I've been involved in a number of what we
3 called environmental screenings or where you, as part of the
4 highway planning process in the system planning and before
5 you get into the NEPA document you've gone environmental
6 alternative evaluations. And the problem with that is that
7 if it does get into court, you do not really have anything.
8 If you've got an EA FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact)
9 or got an EIS with final EIS record of decision, you've got
10 something the courts recognize. But any process that
11 doesn't follow the CEQ guidelines or whatever other federal
12 regulations the agency has, you don't have anything that's
13 going to stand in court.

14 MS. RIDDLE: That's right.

15 MR. O'QUINN: And you can't do every project
16 as if it's going to court. But I think this one is one that
17 there's enough controversy already associated with it, that
18 we would be wise to assume that there's a pretty good chance
19 that that can happen.

20 Now, you've got two platforms you could move off
21 of. You could go ahead and start right up front and assume
22 there's going to be enough controversy and impact and put a
23 Notice of Intent in the Federal Registry and say We're
24 starting an EIS process and let it go wherever it goes. The
25 other one is -- as you suggested, is you could do an EA and

1 then decide and, say, formalize with the public involvement
2 that you're doing an Environmental Assessment, and then
3 decide whether you're going to do a FONSI or do an EA or an
4 EIS. Which at that point in time you can go with your
5 Notice of Intent and do it.

6 It would seem to me that in this case, if the
7 alternative comes out for basically heavy maintenance is
8 going to be expensive, but hopefully the impacts are going
9 to be minor to the extent that it would probably fall within
10 the FONSI. Now, that being the case, why don't I just go
11 ahead and say we're going through an EA. And if we run into
12 trouble, then we can always say Okay, this is
13 getting -- we're getting impacts sufficient that we're going
14 to need to do an EIS and go to the Notice of Intent. But go
15 ahead with the formalized process from the beginning rather
16 than just do these studies that may or may not fit into it.

17 MS. RIDDLE: That -- I mean, we are intending
18 to go forward with the formalized process with the
19 Environmental Analysis. As to when that actually occurs --

20 MR. O'QUINN: That's my concern is, why not
21 start the clock running? When you say "when it occurs," is
22 this not part of the public involvement process of an
23 environmental evaluation, this Committee itself?

24 MS. RIDDLE: Yeah, it is. So you
25 could -- the concern has been is that we don't have enough

1 money to complete the analysis. And so we have been trying
2 to see if we can secure funding in order to -- before we
3 start that.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Well, again, and I'm repeating
5 myself. What concerns me is that if you delay in starting
6 until you have all that, and all this work is done
7 preliminarily, if you will, if you could get into a court
8 situation where somebody could throw a flag and say This was
9 not part of the NEPA process, back up, start over.

10 MR. JACKSON: What was the level of
11 compliance that was used for the project this coming summer
12 that went through?

13 MR. O'QUINN: They did an EA FONSI on that
14 and did a good one.

15 MR. BABB: I want to just add a little bit
16 about what Mary said. When we go through the next panel,
17 we're going to lay out sort of the box that we're working
18 within. And then when we go down the schedule and products
19 we have a couple options in regards to how we can proceed
20 and how we can use those fund sources. And, obviously, some
21 of the things that you're bringing up right now are, to me,
22 what we need to talk about. And you used at break as sort
23 of like where the rubber hits the road or what direction
24 we're going to do, whether we want to juggle any of the
25 money. We have certain monies that are earmarked for

1 certain things, through the Congressional Record and other
2 things. That's what we're going to bring up to the
3 Committee. And then we'll just talk about that, how we can
4 get the most back for the dollars that we have available.
5 And, in essence, like what Mary is saying is, we agree with
6 the things that you're saying. It's how do we want to get
7 to that end result like you're mentioning.

8 MR. BAUMAN: If I can add to that. Congress
9 works in wonderful ways. And if you look at the legislation
10 that created the Committee, it stipulated that there would
11 be an engineering report and a socioeconomic report produced
12 in a specific set of time, like 15 months from when this
13 starts.

14 You're right. There's a real jeopardy of moving
15 into those reports without starting the EIS process. But
16 they funded the engineering and the socioeconomic reports
17 and haven't funded the EIS work yet. So this is our third
18 day on the job, and we're working into this. By Friday we
19 should have some pretty good ideas laid out about how to
20 work through the mine field and do it in a procedure that
21 keeps us legitimate and out of court, makes the project a
22 bullet-proof process as we work through it. But we're still
23 looking for -- we're still here looking for ideas, today.
24 And we understand the risks, and I totally agree with what
25 you're saying; that we don't want to go into this thing and

1 spend a lot of money and take up a lot of people's time and
2 get two-thirds of the way through it and get zapped in
3 court.

4 MS. RIDDLE: Part of what we did was we began
5 this Committee partly at the request of Congressman Hill to
6 be a part of the putting together of the study. And so you
7 are working on the scope of work that has not already been
8 determined. You simply have a draft in front of you at this
9 point. So there's certainly room to amend that scope of
10 work and to change it to what you would like to see. So
11 you're coming in at a very early point in the process that
12 normally you wouldn't be participating in.

13 MR. O'QUINN: Well, it's like someone said
14 earlier, I don't remember who it was, with MK, that -- and
15 I've worked with a lot of steering committees of various
16 types but this is a little different. I guess I don't quite
17 understand it yet.

18 MR. SHIREMAN: I think the point here is that
19 everyone needs to recognize that we are very, very early in
20 the process; that the public and your participation here is
21 about three degrees earlier than public involvement would
22 normally start. And I think that that may be part of the
23 confusion.

24 MR. O'QUINN: I think it is. Because
25 normally the scope of work has pretty well been defined,

1 you've got a contractor onboard and some very early work has
2 been done before that steering committee is put together.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: Keep in mind -- and please
4 correct me if I'm wrong about this, Dick -- generally
5 speaking, for Federal Highways projects, you have to have an
6 approved project, a funded project, in place before you can
7 get money for the start of an EIS. We're even before that
8 process.

9 MR. O'QUINN: No, it just has to be in the
10 Transportation Improvement Program, but it doesn't have to
11 be funded.

12 MR. BROOKE: I'd like to hear from Tony what
13 the Park's conservation people hear on this issue, because
14 it's a critical issue.

15 MR. SLITER: I guess my initial question
16 would be from what you've heard. I see you've been sitting
17 over there very quietly and drinking all this in, but are we
18 on a slippery slope by not securing and knowing that we've
19 got the means to get all the way through the environmental
20 impact part of this project first? Are we setting ourselves
21 up for a fall later, based on your experience in the NEPA
22 process?

23 MR. JEWETT: There are two questions raised,
24 Paul, yours, which I thought was a really good question
25 about the money, and then Barney's, about the procedure.

1 And I don't necessarily have answers to either of those.

2 But I -- on the legal question, Mary, I mean, FACA
3 committees are not novel and, certainly, FACA committees
4 tackle public questions that lead to NEPA procedures and
5 public involvement. I mean, there's a long track record of
6 that and, certainly, will answer Barney's questions, with a
7 little research, and find out what -- how those
8 intersections happen and when they happen and find out if
9 they're on the right path. That seems to be a pretty simple
10 thing to do.

11 MR. KILPATRICK: This is John Kilpatrick.

12 You've hit on a central point. And the fact is
13 that we, by public law, have and, through FACA, convened
14 this Committee. And that public law charges us to move
15 forward with exactly what we're doing now. Most other
16 public laws, and NEPA is among those -- and if you'll
17 notice, we've tried to get ahead of this process as best as
18 we can, even at this point. Because when we call -- when
19 MK Centennial gave you their presentations, their
20 capabilities, they have full NEPA capabilities. They have
21 full ability to approach that public process. And that is
22 something that we're -- actually, we'll get into that with
23 the panel that was originally scheduled earlier this morning
24 to allow you to understand what funding we have, what
25 funding we need, where we need to go, how we need to pull

1 these processes together.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I think that the engineering
3 studies, from the standpoint of doing the traffic analysis,
4 the origin destination studies of whatever type that are
5 done, coming up with scenarios as to how you could improve
6 the road and maintain the traffic, these are all very
7 legitimate early-planning-type tools, safety studies what
8 the accidents rates have been. All this is bringing
9 together the -- what we call the purpose and the needs are
10 and some of the alternatives that might be evaluated and
11 start looking at those.

12 I think the real concern I have is, if we, as a
13 Committee, try to define the alternatives that the
14 consultant is going to evaluate and get very far into that
15 evaluation process, then start the NEPA process and the
16 public involvement process and at that point open it to the
17 public for input, we can get other alternatives that -- or
18 modifications of alternatives that are not on the table.
19 And we're going to have to back up and pick them up. I
20 mean, that goes without saying.

21 MS. RIDDLE: That's exactly right. And
22 that's why this Committee has partly been put together from
23 such a diverse group. You are all representing different
24 publics out there, and so you're right in that. There
25 always is an opportunity that something could come up that

1 nobody thought of before. But I would say, based on looking
2 at this group of people, I think it's pretty unlikely that
3 you all are going to come up with the whole gambit of
4 alternatives that should be looked at.

5 MR. O'QUINN: But from a legal standpoint,
6 there is no problem with doing background planning studies.
7 And from what I'm understanding, that's where we are, about
8 at this moment in time, is an engineering study and an
9 economic study. And they can be used and drawn on for the
10 NEPA involvement process when it gets started.

11 But the caution, again, is -- and I'm repeating
12 myself, is that's not all inclusive. That you stand a
13 chance, if you don't start the public involvement process
14 earlier, and open it up for some of those types of things,
15 that we have no guarantee at all that you're looking at all
16 the alternatives that you have.

17 MS. RIDDLE: You're exactly right. So
18 there's a couple of ways that we could go here, and we need
19 to come to some agreement about it.

20 MR. GASKILL: I hate to do this, but our
21 agenda item has a 10:30 break, and that is a special break.
22 It's actually a time-sensitive break. So I'm not going to
23 cut this discussion off, except for this time-sensitive
24 special thing that we have. Then we'll get right back to
25 it. But when we get back to it, I think a lot of these

1 questions that have come up, some of the answers are going
2 to start coming out of that panel presentation that he has.
3 So I think it's a very important discussion, and I'd like to
4 jump in, myself, with some of these answers, but I think I'm
5 going to hold back.

6 But our special presentation -- I've got to make
7 sure that it's actually ready here, is coming around the
8 corner. Time-sensitive, you know. Everyone in the back
9 table is sensing they're doing something special. I hope
10 you can all sing.

11 (Proceedings in recess from 10:30 a.m. to
12 10:45 a.m. for cake and celebration of Superintendent Susan
13 Lewis's birthday. All sing Happy Birthday to her, she blows
14 out the candles, and she is presented with a birthday card
15 signed by employees of the Park, MK Centennial and the
16 Advisory Committee. She thanks everyone.)

17 Craig Gaskill introduces Fred Babb, who has
18 thirty-six years of experience. Used to run his own firm as
19 a construction and design firm. Now working as project
20 manager for Glacier National Park.

21 Fred Babb gives vision statement presentation. He
22 reintroduces the current panel, asking Mary Riddle to join
23 the presentation. The panel consists of John Kilpatrick,
24 Fred Babb and Dick Bauman. Mr. Kilpatrick is going to walk
25 through the process; where the project has been, where it's

1 at now. Mr. Bauman is going to summarize the commitment
2 that MK Centennial and their team brings to the project.
3 Then Mr. Babb will pull it together talking about the scope,
4 funding and timeline that has been made and has to be made.

5 Mr. Kilpatrick explains the process that was gone
6 through to provide the Committee with a world-class
7 engineering firm to work with. Part of the Park mission was
8 to select a firm with world class experience and reputation
9 to provide for the engineering, economic analysis associated
10 with the group. In accordance with the Federal Acquisition
11 Regulations the Park went out with the following actions: On
12 September 9th an announcement was placed in the Commerce
13 Business Daily advising the public of Glacier National
14 Park's intent to procure an indefinite quantities contract
15 for architectural and engineering services. "Indefinite
16 quantities" means the ability to expand the contract to
17 cover the necessary needed amount of work. The announcement
18 indicated that the contract was going to be for a five-year
19 period, up to a million dollars' worth of work a year on
20 that contract, and that no individual task order could be
21 over \$500,000. It's a large contract and has a long life.

22 The announcement required the selected firm be
23 able to work with the Citizens Advisory Committee and
24 federal officials in certain activities: Park planning; road
25 engineering studies; socioeconomic studies; transportation

1 studies; structural management and logistics; visitor
2 capacity studies; special studies; resource studies;
3 preparation of environmental documents; preparation of
4 supporting documentation; decision making; public
5 involvement and coordination with committees and local
6 community groups. Essentially a full-service firm.

7 The selection of the firms was based on the
8 following criteria of professional qualifications as they
9 relate to the foregoing: The Park did not look at the
10 hourly cost or rates of the firms. They were looking for
11 technical expertise; world class engineering experience;
12 relative experience; specialized and recent experience;
13 including technical expertise in mountainous road
14 reconstruction through sensitive cultural, natural and
15 scenic areas; accomplish projects on time and budgets;
16 ability to communicate verbally in writing and
17 electronically and in person with the public and Glacier
18 National Park staff; familiarity with technical systems
19 including geographic information systems. Twelve firms
20 responded to the announcement. The firms represented some
21 of the most well-known firms in the country and
22 internationally, including; Mongolia, Canada, Switzerland,
23 China, England, Saudi Arabia, Nepal, Germany, South Africa,
24 India, Bangladesh, Italy, Russia, Palau, Puerto Rico,
25 Mexico, and Chile.

1 In November of 1999 a selection team consisting of
2 Fred Babb, John Kilpatrick and Roger Maxwell, a team leader
3 in the support office in Denver, met with the Denver service
4 center's contracting officer, Ed Defoya*, and formally
5 reviewed each of the 12 firms' statements of qualifications.
6 Those were narrowed down, through that process, to four
7 firms. In December of 1999, the week before Christmas, the
8 selection team interviewed each firm at their corporate
9 offices. That was a very engaging process. There was much
10 discussion between the review board and the firms. It
11 allowed the team to understand the four corporate
12 philosophies better, to meet the corporate teams, ask
13 questions of the individual members submitted. It was a
14 very detailed, in-depth process of review. MK Centennial
15 was a top runner.

16 In February 2000, the contract was awarded to MK
17 in order to allow the Park to maintain the timeline and
18 productively utilize the year 2000's entire season. A note
19 was added that all the firms were qualified.

20 Dick Bauman continues on, giving additional
21 summary to the timeline. This project is attracting a lot
22 of interest within the corporation. Dennis Washington,
23 Montana based, is the chairman of the board of Morrison
24 Knudsen and is very interested and watching the project.
25 The corporation's committed. The team is committed to and

1 pleased to be a part of the job. They understand it's a
2 long-term commitment. They understand in this type of
3 process that nothing ever goes in a straight line.

4 MK is looking forward to learning from and hearing
5 from the Committee; concerns addressing particular issues
6 and problems; where there's give and take and where there's
7 a particular concern or issue that there is no negotiation
8 on. The more dialogue shared the better.

9 No one wants to be involved in a program that will
10 end up in a lawsuit. Comments by Mr. O'Quinn regarding NEPA
11 requirements are legitimate and appropriate to discuss at
12 this time. This Committee is unique, not only because it
13 was created by Congress, but because the Park Service has
14 made a special effort to involve the Advisory Committee much
15 earlier than most in this process. This Committee is
16 starting from the very beginning.

17 John Kilpatrick adds that MK Centennial has only
18 been provided one task order and that was to show up at this
19 Advisory Committee.

20 The last part of this discussion group is
21 presented by Mr. Babb. He requests the assistance of
22 Advisory Committee members Susie Burch and Linda Anderson to
23 keep him to a time limit while discussing five categories on
24 two presentation boards; project philosophy, criteria and
25 goals, products and funding, schedule, team coordination or

1 coordination. He mentioned some key words that came up in
2 day one's discussion that he felt were positive; icon park,
3 do it right, gateway, trust, respect, tourism,
4 interdisciplinary.

5 Focusing on one key word from the day before,
6 "partnerships," Mr. Babb elaborates on what that means to
7 him; being a creative process, people grow, and visions are
8 realized. Something's implemented. It's not all talk.

9 He proceeds through the positive words and
10 thoughts that were mentioned in the prior day's discussions
11 and commented on them creating a dialogue with the Committee
12 members, asking for their input. Criteria and goals:
13 Preserve the historic character, fabric and significance of
14 Going-to-the-Sun Road. Minimize impacts on the visitors or
15 the people that are coming to Glacier to experience it.
16 Minimize impacts on regional and local economy. Perhaps
17 "minimize" is the wrong word; maybe increase the economics
18 and improve the experience for visitors is better. Perform
19 critical repairs before road fails. Minimize cost of the
20 rehabilitation. Make it cost effective, whatever is done.
21 Minimize impacts on natural, cultural, scenic, all the
22 resource values that are there. Provide a high-quality
23 experience. Rehabilitate Going-to-the-Sun Road to a quality
24 maintenance condition. Make sure we get the money's worth.

25 He continues with the current status of the

1 project: Public law in the congressional record that issued
2 a million dollars to do certain things. Those things were
3 to prepare an independent engineering study, complete
4 economic analysis and form the Advisory Committee. Pretty
5 general language. Additionally, the project has received a
6 SHIPO study of \$105,000. There has been a request for a
7 study including transportation and visitor use. Also
8 submitted was a form under the Alternate Fules Request,
9 starting in 2001, with regards to design and fabrication of
10 transportation vehicles and purchase of those vehicles. It
11 is a matching program but also progressive and is written
12 for multiple years. The fabrication aspect gets up to 3 to
13 4 million dollars. Funding of the transportation and
14 visitor use request (\$225,000) should be known within the
15 next week. Funding of the 4-year vehicle fabrication and
16 purchase request should be known by, perhaps, summer of this
17 year. There are two studies (in purple area of handout) not
18 funded regarding resource data. No specific request has
19 been made for the resource data nor is there a channel
20 within the Park Service and Federal Highway of making a
21 request for that type of money.

22 MR. OGLE: Why is that resource collection
23 data study not included in the MK Centennial?

24 MR. BABB: It can be. But in looking at
25 MK Centennial and the magnitude of things we're doing, we

1 think there's going to be some gaps here. We're also
2 worried about how far the money will go and whether we can
3 cover what we need with the funds available. So we wanted
4 to put it up there so it wouldn't fall through the cracks.

5 MR. JACKSON: Didn't that digitized study
6 they're doing for the road itself contribute to that for
7 significant data collection? Don't you have an agreement to
8 have them turn that over to you when they're done with it?

9 MR. BABB: I'm sorry, I didn't hear --

10 MR. JACKSON: They just talked about doing
11 some digitized GIS stuff for the whole road corridor.
12 Wouldn't that contribute specifically with the data
13 collection, and don't you have an agreement for them to turn
14 that over to you when they're done?

15 MR. BABB: Meaning MK Centennial?

16 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

17 MR. BABB: Yes. But what we're saying is, to
18 do all that information along with what we have to do up
19 here, we're not sure the money will cover it. It depends on
20 the detail of the data, so we need a separate line to gather
21 that data. And that's going to be an outcome of the
22 discussions today and tomorrow.

23 MR. JEWETT: The transportation visitor use
24 study, is there a description of that that you have
25 prepared?

1 MR. BABB: Yes. And I can get that for you.
2 It's about four pages. Yes, I can get that and Xerox it and
3 send it out.

4 MR. JEWETT: I'd like to have a copy of that,
5 if I could. Part B of that was that the Park also,
6 apparently, has put in for and has plans for a personal
7 services plan, I believe; is that correct?

8 MR. BABB: Yes.

9 MR. JEWETT: How is that integrated into the
10 transportation use study?

11 MR. BABB: It's dovetailed. It's part of
12 that. So we took what we had in the scope of that and what
13 we needed for transportation and we wrote it into one scope
14 of service, which is what I will give you. And we also have
15 a scope that we can also give you that deals with the
16 alternative fuel program and shows how that's budgeted.
17 But, again, that's going to be awhile while we find out
18 about that money.

19 MS. PAHL: In that transportation money that
20 you talked about, these other vehicles, does that include
21 rehabilitating the existing 33 red buses?

22 MR. BABB: We put in money -- it varies.
23 We've left it loose enough that it can be used to
24 rehabilitate existing structures, existing buildings --

25 MS. PAHL: Existing buses?

1 MR. BABB: Yes -- or new. That's why we have
2 it written because we can give that money to the private
3 sector. It doesn't have to be Park Service dollars.

4 MR. SHIREMAN: Ask the question again,
5 Barbara, because I'm not sure. I know that I did not hear
6 it.

7 MS. PAHL: The question I had is, the money
8 you referred to in terms of the transportation vehicles from
9 Congress, can that money be used to rehabilitate the
10 existing fleet of red buses?

11 MR. BABB: Amy's shaking her head no, but
12 what I was told --

13 MR. SHIREMAN: The \$225,000?

14 MS. PAHL: No, no, no, no, no, no, no, the
15 other money you talked about. And you say yes and Amy says
16 no.

17 MR. BABB: The way it's written up now, it is
18 for both design, fabrication or construction of either
19 rehabing the existing bus or the new bus.

20 MR. KILPATRICK: The funds source is an
21 alternative fuel source. I don't think -- I think that it
22 would be probably a difficult sell, but we have applied for
23 funds under the State of Montana, under some of their
24 special programs, to rehabilitate the existing buses that we
25 have. And we haven't heard back on that request yet. I

1 know that Amy received a phone call from Sandy Stroul*
2 yesterday regarding some aspects of that request, so
3 apparently that's moving through their system. The reason
4 it's a difficult sell under that alternative fuels program
5 is we're talking about 60-year-old buses.

6 MS. PAHL: I know all about those buses.

7 MR. KILPATRICK: I know you do. But I'm
8 saying that for the benefit of the rest of the Committee
9 members. It's a difficult sell under that program. And I
10 think we may have a better opportunity under a state program
11 that allowed us to apply for funds to rehabilitate the
12 existing fleet.

13 MR. SHIREMAN: And please understand, also,
14 that the transportation plan that we have has a fairly good
15 aspect or apparently good chance of getting the 225,000.
16 The other -- the alternative energy funding is a request for
17 funding, and that's just it. It's going to take a
18 considerable amount of luck and a lot of work to actually
19 get that funding approved. So you need to understand it's
20 just a request. It's not money that we have available now.

21 MR. BABB: And to just add to what Rick said,
22 is I don't know much about alternative fuels. And I sort of
23 got a kick. I wrote the thing up and had some people review
24 it and I got a call back. They said, God it's great. It's
25 one of the best ones that we've read. We think you have a

1 good chance of getting something out of it. But, again,
2 like Rick said, who knows. But I'll get you a copy of what
3 we wrote up and give that to the Committee. Since I'm out
4 of time, can I go to the schedule? Is that okay?

5 MR. O'QUINN: Fred, would not your
6 transportation/district use study be an integral part of the
7 economic analysis that's going to be done in the green up
8 there?

9 MR. BABB: Yes.

10 MR. O'QUINN: That's basic data you're going
11 to need.

12 MR. BABB: We feel there's a tie to all this,
13 I mean, that they're all integrated. It's like how do they
14 track together, and how can we get the maximum out of the
15 funds that we have? And that was a good lead-in. So I'll
16 go to the schedule. This might be hard for you to see.

17 MR. BROOKE: Are the red buses going to be
18 free to ride, then, if it's taxpayer dollars that we're
19 using?

20 MR. BABB: I have no idea. If I was driving
21 them, yeah, I think anybody could get on.

22 --o0o--

23 Mr. Babb continues on with a list of all the
24 products, a suggested timeline and accomplishments that
25 occur, more or less, in every two or three or four months.

1 Just a first cut timeline.

2 The project agreement is the first (green). Task
3 orders are a specific scope of services agreed with MK to
4 provide. The first one's should be done in March.
5 Engineering study; economic analysis, historic road study,
6 transportation visitor use, data collection, environmental
7 document.

8 In the spring, March through May, task orders,
9 data analysis, begin data collection. This is an option
10 what was talked about earlier in the day; begin the
11 compliance process, i.e. scoping. Start it in March (dashed
12 blue line.) In the summer, data collection is completed.
13 Also start working up preliminary alternatives that are to
14 be looked at. Not cast in stone; concepts, general. In the
15 fall, suggest that the Advisory Committee have its second
16 meeting; walk the road to see it firsthand with an
17 opportunity to discuss what has been seen, review draft
18 alternatives providing input. Look at data analysis and
19 data collection and any recommendations or findings that
20 come out of that that are significant. In the winter,
21 complete the draft documents, based on the input that has
22 been made including public participation. That is a thread
23 throughout the whole process. Complete the draft documents
24 with product that is ready for internal review. The Park
25 Service, the Committee, MK Centennial review it, it's all

1 proper.

2 In spring of 2001, complete draft compliance
3 documents, whatever level decided; assessment, EA, whatever.
4 In the summer of 2001, make corrections to that document,
5 review it, print it, and it goes to public to comment
6 on draft EIS. Send that out for review, complete public
7 participation. In the fall/winter of 2001 and beginning of
8 2002, incorporate the public comments and complete the
9 decision process.

10 Reason for two-year schedule is the program money
11 for Park roads obtained ends 2003. The Park wants to be in
12 a position to know exactly what they want and they have
13 buy-in to compete effectively in the program. The call will
14 come sometime in the end of 2002. The process can still be
15 made throughout that time period for funding.

16 MS. PAHL: You're talking about T 21.

17 MR. BABB: Whatever they call it.

18 MS. PAHL: T 21 already came after ISTEA.
19 There will yet be another version.

20 MR. BABB: We want to be in position for
21 that; that's right.

22 --o0o--

23 Mr. Babb continues with discussion of funding
24 issues, adding that public involvement has to be overlaid in
25 this whole process.

1 A key issue in terms of funding is that there is
2 only a certain amount of money available, with many products
3 that need to be done. The dilemma is, Are there any changes
4 that we want to make? How do we want to use that money most
5 effectively? What level of detail do we need to get in
6 regards to any new data we need to collect? In other words,
7 what data is needed to make those decisions. Those are
8 suggested topics to be discussed.

9 Questions are flooded.

10 MR. MEZNARCH: Fred, you mentioned the call
11 in 2002. Could you be more specific?

12 MR. BABB: T 21 ends at 2003. In other
13 words, that's the end of the program.

14 MS. PAHL: The authorization for the bill
15 ends in 2003.

16 MR. BABB: Like Barb was saying is, there's
17 always a call for the next five years, seven years, whatever
18 they decide to go to -- six years. So we want to be in a
19 position that we can get ours in the ring early, lobby for
20 that, so that we're like a year out from that so we know
21 what we want, we can do it politically and a whole bunch of
22 other things.

23 MR. BAUMAN: One of the things I learned
24 working for the transit agency in Denver is that there's
25 ways to get earmarks that are independent of the

1 transportation bill. And the typical process for the House
2 Appropriations Committee is -- starts with the staff of the
3 Appropriations Committee in November. And they work through
4 a program to -- they do a draft bill and hearings in March,
5 starting in a couple weeks before the 2001 budget.

6 So another approach that the Committee may be able
7 to help on, is to do an independent funding that's not part
8 of the transportation bill, comes out of general
9 appropriations. And if you choose to do that, you can
10 actually go for funding before the environmental work is
11 complete. The appropriations wouldn't be authorized until
12 the environmental work is complete, but it takes almost a
13 year to get the funding set up anyway. So another choice
14 you might think about, if you want to accelerate this, is to
15 do some independent work on the side that's not part of the
16 transportation bill.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: That leads into another
18 question that I'd like to ask the Committee. Are you
19 familiar enough with the transportation bill process, or do
20 you need to get a brief summary of that process?

21 MS. PAHL: My question is, is it really the
22 Appropriations Committee or the Transportation Committee?
23 And I raise this because when I went to visit with Jacque
24 Lowey for the red buses, she advised me that that should go
25 through Transportation, where you have a senior senator on

1 it, and not go through the Park Appropriations where you
2 also have a senator on that as well. I'm wondering, are you
3 sending folks in the right direction?

4 MR. BAUMAN: There's several ways. And
5 usually you use the resources you have, who's got seniority
6 on your committee. But it doesn't have to be with the
7 Department of Interior, it could be the Public Works bill,
8 it could be a Transportation, where you've got the --

9 MR. SHIREMAN: Do you need some more
10 information on Transportation?

11 Fred, do you feel comfortable in responding to
12 that, to just sort of a general perspective on the
13 Transportation bill; how that's developed and the process,
14 or do we need to have Dick come in and do that.

15 MR. BABB: Probably Dick would be better than
16 I would.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: We'll hold off to give you
18 some additional information. We'll try to get him back in
19 this afternoon and do that.

20 MR. BABB: Can I mention one other thing? I
21 forgot to mention also about how we're going to work
22 together in the coordination. And we tried to address that
23 on page ten in the green document.

24 In essence, what it says there is we have a
25 multitude of players that make up the core team and that

1 somehow we need to get a handle on that. The core team
2 involves people from the Park Service, Federal Highways,
3 MK Centennial, and, of course, the Advisory Committee.

4 So what we've done is we've picked a person more
5 or less in each one of those entities, myself, Dick Gatten
6 for Federal Highways and Dick Bauman for MK Centennial, to
7 sort of be the leader of that larger group. And what we
8 want you guys to talk about is how you would want
9 to -- whether you want to pick one person to augment those
10 people, or how you would want to be part of that leadership
11 group. In other words, we want you guys to be on the same
12 level as the three people that I just mentioned. And then
13 our vision is, is that smaller group of people will provide,
14 what do I want to say, the orchestration or the overall
15 management of the process. And then you'll notice, also,
16 there's a decision team, and that's Karen Wade, Regional
17 Director you met yesterday, and then the Superintendent,
18 Rick now, and then Suzann come what, April, middle April,
19 end of April time frame. So that's the decision team as
20 laid out. And, again, it's only a draft to start our
21 talking, because we didn't want to move too fast without
22 getting everybody else on board also.

23 MR. O'QUINN: Fred, as you mentioned, the
24 studies, the additional studies as well as the contract with
25 MK, they all kind of go hand in glove. In fact, the

1 transportation study and engineering studies, they tend to
2 blend into one another, as I see it. But the transportation
3 visitor use is more global -- not global but
4 regional -- whereas that data, again, will fill in slight
5 somewhere; who's going where and for how long.

6 MR. BABB: I agree completely.

7 MR. BAKER: You had mentioned in the fall of
8 2000 there was going to be a walk on the highway with the
9 Committee. Would it be possible, in the spring of this
10 year, if it can be assembled, that we could have -- we could
11 observe, as a Committee, the opening, or what goes into the
12 opening, like a special day or something?

13 MR. KILPATRICK: I'll actually have to let
14 the DFO answer that. But we only budgeted for two meetings
15 of the Committee a year. And Fred hasn't gone over that,
16 but he will shortly, about the cost of our operations. But
17 I extended to everyone here yesterday the opportunity to
18 schedule a visit up on the road with me. It would be nice
19 if we could do that in groups. It would be nice if the
20 groups were four people at a time, because I don't have
21 enough Piep units to take you in an avalanche zone. I wish
22 I had 17 of them; I can't afford them. But, certainly, we
23 can certainly arrange for that.

24 MR. BABB: John mentioned a good point, I
25 should say, that on this study here, last year -- we got the

1 money in '99, we spent a little over \$30,000. So starting
2 this fiscal year we had about \$970,000 left. On historic
3 landscape study, I think we spent what, Jack, about
4 17,000 -- 10,000 we spent on that. So there are
5 expenditures.

6 The other thing John mentioned was what was
7 budgeted for the Advisory Committee and then support, in
8 other words, to you guys is about \$97,000 a year. That's
9 for the two meetings. So that has to come out of this
10 million dollars also. So if you round it off to a hundred
11 thousand each of the two years, if we go with two years,
12 then that means we spent about 230 now plus whatever we
13 spent the first four or five months this year. So that gives
14 you an idea where we are at fiscally.

15 MR. O'QUINN: The only question I'd have
16 there, and just in talking informally with some others, it
17 seems like maybe we would be more effective, perhaps, having
18 three meetings that may go over a year, but more up front
19 and less later while the data collection is going on and
20 getting input from MK as to what they're doing rather than a
21 report after it's all kind of been done.

22 MR. KILPATRICK: One of the other things is
23 that you guys have the ability to set up subcommittees as
24 well. And the DFO, as I understand it, does not have to be
25 present for subcommittee meetings of this group. So if you

1 choose -- it depends on how you choose to approach the work.
2 But if you choose it, we're going to have a group of us
3 that -- a subgroup of us that want to get together in the
4 spring to monitor or whatever, I think you could do that.

5 MR. SHIREMAN: John is exactly right. You do
6 have the capability of breaking up into smaller groups and
7 managing the process and providing some additional points of
8 exchange. But remember what Miriam told you yesterday is,
9 any of the work that's done by those subcommittees has to be
10 reported back to the full Committee at some point for the
11 full Committee's debate, agreement and recommendation.

12 MR. BABB: What everybody is saying, and we
13 definitely feel the same way, is between wherever we show
14 meetings like we're showing them here and over here, we want
15 to find a way that we can bridge the gap where we continue
16 to work together and don't want to wait six months and seven
17 months and get back together again. We want to keep the
18 dialogue going.

19 MR. SLITER: Fred, do you have a figure on
20 what the cost, per day, to convene this Committee is,
21 including transportation costs and, you know, the whole
22 shebang?

23 MR. KILPATRICK: That \$97,000 includes a
24 portion of Fred's salary and the clerical function that
25 supported all of this -- the prep work and organization work

1 that went into setting up this Committee. I have never
2 divvied it up on a daily basis, no, because some of that
3 money is expended during the course of a year. And so it's
4 really not a fair analysis to say, Gee whiz, you divide it
5 by six and that's what you get. Because there has
6 been -- there's been 13 months' worth of work that went into
7 the organization of this Committee. Now, that may seem like
8 a really long time, and I'm sure some of you thought, Gee,
9 they've just forgotten about it and they're never going to
10 call us. But that, in fact, was half the time that it took
11 to establish the last Advisory Committee in this region.
12 And so from that standpoint, bureaucratically, it was
13 lightening speed. And so I guess in answer to your
14 question, Paul, I don't think that's a fair conclusion to
15 draw. I think that would be a misleading statistic to
16 develop.

17 MR. BABB: But we will -- come the end of
18 this month, March, we'll have a pretty good idea, based on
19 this three-day session, what it would cost.

20 MR. OGLE: If the salaries and things are all
21 pumped into the 97 grand, out-of-pocket expenses to bring
22 the out-of-town folks in here for the one extra meeting is
23 not going to be very great.

24 MR. KILPATRICK: If you'd like, we can
25 certainly -- probably by tomorrow, we could pull together

1 what the travel authorizations were for the Committee
2 members. The hotel rooms and those costs are very easy to
3 get.

4 MR. SLITER: That's the point I was trying to
5 arrive at. I wasn't trying to insinuate that your salaries
6 and whatever don't count. What I'm getting at is we may, as
7 a Committee, take a look and say Okay; the prep work of
8 convening the Committee and getting it organized, the cost
9 of that was significant. Now, what are we going to do with
10 it? Are we going to say we spent all this money to organize
11 this Committee so it could meet twice a year as a whole,
12 then be fed information by its subcommittees which -- I'll
13 guess the subcommittees will likely be made up of the least
14 expensive people, which makes it the local people. I'm just
15 wondering, if we've gone to all this trouble and expense to
16 convene the Committee, let's meet once in awhile, instead of
17 trying to do this electronically or whatever. I think we
18 need to know what the facts are, know what the costs that
19 are involved so that the Committee can make a decision as to
20 whether we want to meet more often.

21 MR. KILPATRICK: I think we can get that cost
22 per meeting pretty easily.

23 MR. SLITER: Thank you.

24 MR. JACKSON: I think we're all ready -- the
25 NEPA process can't be separated. And I presume you have

1 some money that you're manually to spend on public meetings
2 that way. And I presume in a certain way they're going to
3 merge, and so there should be some scale economies or
4 whatever associated with that. And if, in fact, that's the
5 case, then I think this Committee has got to expect to be
6 here during public meetings. And I presume that you have to
7 think that through too.

8 MR. KILPATRICK: I think that's a decision
9 that we need to come to. I don't know that FACA advisory
10 committees -- and actually from my personal perspective,
11 FACA committee meetings don't substitute for the NEPA
12 process and the NEPA public meeting. Whether the Committee
13 has to be there at a NEPA meeting, I don't think so. I do
14 think that the public needs to be at these meetings, and
15 that's why this is an open meeting.

16 As far as funding goes, we have what you see. We
17 have a million dollars, roughly, for this Committee. We
18 anticipate that to complete an EIS would cost somewhere
19 between 1 and 1.5 million dollars. I'll put that in
20 perspective. The EA on the Beartooth Highway, which was a
21 35 million dollar reconstruction, and I don't know exactly
22 what was in that bill, but that EA cost 4 million dollars.
23 And so just to give you a perspective on the cost of some of
24 these environmental documents. Right now, we're short a
25 million to a million-and-a-half dollars. Some of the

1 decisions that you guys have to make are How do we move
2 forward with the process? Where do we bring the EIS in? We
3 balance the dollars and say, Well, gee, we're going to run
4 out of money on X date, so where will we get those funds to
5 process?

6 MR. BAKER: Pulling up what Paul says, it
7 says that we're supposed to meet again in August. Yet I'm
8 looking at the timelines of like the visitor use study,
9 which comes out in September. I would strongly suggest that
10 we possibly have a meeting, like Paul says, maybe sometime
11 in the end of May or June and a third meeting at the end of
12 September and October, once some of that data results is
13 pulled out. I mean, the meeting in August would
14 mean -- really, we would be waiting for data material to be
15 coming in again.

16 MR. SLITER: Could we get a copy of the
17 budget as it exists now, taking into account two meetings a
18 year, what everything else is being paid out from the
19 budget?

20 MR. BABB: Okay. Uh-huh, yes.

21 MR. O'QUINN: I thought you had changed and
22 was suggesting that second meeting to September or October.

23 MR. KILPATRICK: Part of the reason that we
24 suggested that is -- originally, I had just thrown out on
25 the table prior to this meeting that we actually meet when

1 we close the road, which is the third Monday in October.
2 That's somewhat risky, because as the local folks here know,
3 it could be under three feet of snow. This year -- I mean,
4 you could walk on the road through November. So we just
5 threw that out as a good time to get up and look at the
6 road.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Well, I think, and not debating
8 it, but if we're sliding the third meeting in, if we are,
9 I'm not saying we are, we need to have enough time for you
10 guys and MK to get some work started. And I think April,
11 May or May, June, even, is a little quick on that. Maybe
12 July, August, and then another meeting fairly quick after
13 that. The final thing in the fall would be what I would be
14 thinking. I don't know. I don't know what the others feel
15 like.

16 MR. BROOKE: I tend to agree that front
17 loading this project, in terms of our time and comments to
18 you and assistance to you in forms of recommendations, is
19 going to be more helpful than, you know, twice a year and
20 twice a year. Even if you got out in the second year and
21 you cut one of your meetings out of there because you put it
22 up here, I think the front work is going to be much more
23 important than the back-end work. I also think that it's a
24 little arbitrary to try to set those without -- MK probably
25 has a lot -- should have a lot to say about when that is.

1 Because I, for one, don't want to waste my time if you don't
2 have some studies and information for us to look at that
3 says Hey, look at this important data.

4 MR. BABB: Let me ask you a question. If the
5 group -- I mean, if you'll go milestone, sort of forget the
6 chart where they appear, the first thing that we've said is
7 that we've got to assess the existing data to see where we
8 have voids. So that's sort of one decision point, in a
9 general sense. The next sort of decision point is sometime
10 during the summer or at the end of the summer where you've
11 started to put together some rough alternatives and you
12 basically are coming to the conclusion of the field season
13 or you're in the field season, if you do it in the middle of
14 summer. If you look at sort of a general forgetting where
15 they fall, they're sort of the first milestones in the first
16 six or seven months. And I guess the first question would
17 be would the Committee want to have a meeting after they
18 hear the assessment of the -- what MK's found after looking
19 at all the resources, or would you rather have it later in
20 the process?

21 MR. KILPATRICK: Fred, let me add one more
22 thing in there. Another part of that milestone is the
23 socioeconomic end of that. And, of course, there's folks on
24 the Committee that can speak much better to the ability of a
25 contractor to begin gathering some of that data to help you

1 make some decisions on where we want to go. That's another
2 milestone that is equally important as the engineering
3 portion of this.

4 MR. BABB: Maybe what we do is go through the
5 discussions you guys have and we sort of put that in the
6 parking lot as a decision we have to leave. I hear you want
7 to be involved through the process, you don't want these
8 long gaps. And before we leave, we have to decide, if there
9 is an intermediate meeting, when do we want to have that and
10 schedule that. And also, schedule the part about the road.
11 Because John and I and Jack, in the back, there are about
12 five of us that walk the road. Admittedly, I'm new to
13 Glacier. We learned an unbelievable amount by walking those
14 three miles or whatever we did on the road. You'll be
15 amazed at when you really see the condition of the road.
16 You'll learn a heck of a lot.

17 MR. KILPATRICK: Tom, your wife really won't
18 want to go over it.

19 MR. BROOKE: I want to revise it briefly, the
20 issue of the environmental compliance. And a little bit of
21 this may be food for thought to roll around a little bit. I
22 know FACA can't substitute for NEPA public involvement,
23 certainly. But having been on several sides of the
24 environmental litigation question, one of the things that a
25 court of law looks at is, Well, what kind of public

1 involvement was it? And, certainly, this Committee and the
2 fact that it allows for public comment at the end or provide
3 for more of that, seems to me to be an opportunity to
4 provide a belt and bootstraps to this process. And I think
5 we really ought to give some thought, and maybe do some
6 inquiry, into how we can make this more dovetail with the
7 NEPA process so it is more of a suspenders to the whole
8 thing.

9 And my final point is, I guess I, for one, have
10 always looked at this process, after the Park Service kind
11 of backed away and pulled it out of the General Management
12 Plan and set it aside as this outside process, that the
13 threat of lawsuits kind of went like that, and especially
14 the environmental threat of lawsuits. Because the
15 environmental comment I heard on the plan throughout the
16 state, and I attended a lot of the meetings throughout the
17 state, was pretty positive. And one of the things with this
18 road is, we're not widening the road, we're not building a
19 new road. And unless you're going to put a quarry in the
20 middle of a grizzly bear den, I don't see that huge threat
21 of litigation.

22 And I'm not so sure it's always right to approach
23 these processes on the basis of, Well, we're going to get
24 sued, we're going to get sued. I think you need to approach
25 them on the basis of, What's the best thing we can do for

1 public involvement so that we get the kind of information
2 and involvement that is quality and proper. And then the
3 chips have to fall where they may, if you do everything that
4 you can. And my only point is, I think there's an
5 opportunity to do something with this that dovetails into
6 the whole NEPA process that's not be utilized. And maybe
7 it's as simple as publishing and noticing this in the
8 Federal Register. And maybe it was; I don't know.

9 MR. SHIREMAN: Just to follow up on that,
10 Will, the meeting was published in the Federal Register, as
11 it's required by FACA Advisory Committee meetings, and there
12 was significant announcement in local and regional media.
13 So all of the attempts of making this truly an open meeting
14 were complied with, legally and beyond, in terms of bringing
15 that involvement.

16 I think you make a couple of very good points, in
17 terms of looking at this as a part of the continuum, keeping
18 the public involved and aware in the process. And one of
19 the things that you all talked about yesterday was the idea,
20 the concept of using this as a model. We need to make sure
21 that we're meeting the compliance process. And I think a
22 little bit of research on how we can best fit that together
23 is appropriate and a wise thing for us to work on.

24 MS. RIDDLE: It is certainly possible for us
25 to provide a Notice of Intent, publish that in the Federal

1 Register, and begin scoping in the formal sense. And from
2 that point on, any of your meetings would become part of
3 that record of the entire process. And that's certainly
4 doable.

5 MR. KILPATRICK: The only part of that is
6 that we have to figure out the dollars that go with that.
7 Because right now, we have the authorization we have for a
8 million dollars. And until we get extra money -- I mean,
9 you guys just need to be aware of the cost of that. At some
10 point we're going to run out of money.

11 MR. BROOKE: And that's a realistic way to
12 approach it. But, boy, it drives me crazy when you make
13 decisions that way. Because then when you get to the end
14 and somebody challenges this thing or somebody raises the
15 issue of, Why didn't you do that? Well, we didn't think
16 we'd have the money for it.

17 MR. KILPATRICK: Well, don't get me wrong,
18 Will. Personally, I think that's the right approach. And I
19 think we have a good opportunity of getting the money. It's
20 just that I'm just trying to make you aware that there is a
21 cost to doing those public meetings. There is a cost of
22 following that path. And you guys just need to be aware of
23 that and know where those adjustments are coming out of the
24 budget.

25 MR. O'QUINN: To do what she suggested to put

1 in a Notice of Intent and start a formalized scoping
2 process, this being part of it. You're not putting in the
3 schedule when anything's going to take place. The
4 formalized public meetings may come much later after you
5 have your funding. This just gets the process officially
6 started. There's no timeline you're working on. So to do
7 what you're talking about is insignificant, in the amount of
8 additional money.

9 MR. JACKSON: I think this Committee may want
10 to have an opportunity, in the evening, to have a public
11 involvement session where we listen to the public ourselves.
12 I think there's a lot of folks here with strong
13 constituency, much stronger than mine, that might want to
14 afford themselves that opportunity. I think that fits into
15 what you're doing, and I think we're tied at the waist. But
16 I want to go back to one other thing, which is the
17 philosophy and goals. Could you put that back? Because
18 this is the last chance we can comment on that.

19 MR. BABB: This one or the philosophy?

20 MR. JACKSON: Philosophy. I guess that is
21 the goals anyway.

22 One of the things that came up, specifically two
23 or three times that isn't on there, and it came up with Don
24 White's discussion of relationship to the Tribe and buying
25 materials from them and, I think, comes with the idea of

1 looking after -- taking the opportunity of seeking gains for
2 the disadvantaged. And I think the whole question of what's
3 going to happen to people who are unemployed and so on. And
4 I think that's missing in the sense of only an impact
5 analysis. It makes no judgment of that kind of class
6 orientation and so on. And I think that should be on there.
7 So I think that seeking opportunities for the economically
8 disadvantaged, and I think that is a part of this
9 discussion, and should be a part of the criteria and goals
10 for looking at that. And I expect, in a way, there's
11 probably come some other things. And I think we should be
12 pretty careful to look at that, because it went by pretty
13 quick. And if we don't focus on that, things will follow
14 from that and flow from that that we'll miss, I'm afraid.

15 MR. KILPATRICK: Dave, I think you're right.
16 And one of the issues of that Don brought it up earlier was
17 Indian preference in contracting. That regulation doesn't
18 apply to the National Park Service. It does apply to the
19 Bureau of Indian Affairs. Now, one of the contracts -- what
20 we have done in other contracts, specifically on the east
21 side of the Park, was have an incentive for a contractor to
22 provide those opportunities for Native American people. And
23 that was a good thing to do. We actually negotiated with
24 the TERO (Tribal Employment Rights Office) office to do that
25 after the contract was actually awarded. And I think that

1 is something that should be looked at.

2 MR. SHIREMAN: Let's take one more comment,
3 and we will go to lunch and come back and continue
4 discussion. But we need to hit the agenda for lunchtime.

5 Anyone else have something?

6 MR. JEWETT: I just had a request, actually,
7 of Fred. Number one, I think you should get the government
8 penmanship award.

9 Secondly, those three pages, given that they are a
10 draft and that they're fairly simple, really sort of
11 encapsulate a lot of things. And if you could make sure
12 they're transcribed and we could receive a hard copy.

13 MR. BABB: I want to give credit where it's
14 due. I have a significant other, and she helped me on that.
15 She's an art major. I give credit to Judy.

16 MS. PAHL: The only comment I might make
17 before those become part of the record, in following up, is
18 that maybe it's more negative than it needs to be. Some of
19 those you might want to look at writing it in a more
20 positive way. Because I still think a lot of this project
21 may be about how it's communicated. And so far, it's been
22 communicated negatively. And I think we can help make this
23 communicated in a positive way, starting with those forms.

24 MR. BAKER: Specifically with the use of the
25 word "enhance." I don't see the word "enhance" in there

1 anywhere.

2 MS. PAHL: "Enhance" is a very good word.

3 MR. KILPATRICK: Don't forget, you guys have
4 the power of the pen.

5 MR. GASKILL: We'll talk about it some more.

6 MR. SHIREMAN: What we'll make sure in the
7 transposition -- we'll write "draft" in very large letters
8 across the front of them. And also, you may want to come
9 back with some of those in front of you in the next few days
10 and put those on your list of action items to finalize and
11 manipulate or do whatever.

12 Let's go ahead and take a break for lunch. I will
13 mention that Anna Marie Moe has joined us. And the first
14 order of business right after lunch is to give her a chance
15 to introduce herself to the rest of the group and have you
16 introduce yourselves to her. So we'll be back at one
17 o'clock, and John has something to add.

18 MR. KILPATRICK: Yes, I do, I have a burning
19 issue out there. Paul asked about the cost of the meeting.
20 Some of the folks here have purchased their own plane
21 tickets and rental cars. Those are the costs that are
22 missing. So if you will stop back by Mary Ansotegui and
23 tell her what your plane ticket costs or your rental car
24 costs, we can have the costs for you when you return.

25 MR. BABB: And I'd like to thank Linda and

1 Susie for keeping the time record.

2 (Proceedings in recess for lunch from 12:05 p.m.

3 to 1:00 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 The meeting was called to order at 1:10
2 p.m. by Rick Shireman. Everyone announced the items in
3 front of them. Included are the letters of nomination
4 for each of the members of the Committee with a
5 biography of each.

6 Secondly, in the materials there is a
7 handout of the Committee members with phone numbers,
8 addresses, fax numbers and e-mail addresses. Rick asked
9 all to review the information, making sure all
10 information is correct, and if it's not, talk to either
11 Dayna or Debbie and make sure that they get the
12 corrections so they can give you a corrected sheet by
13 tomorrow.

14 Third, examples of the three economic
15 studies brought in by Larry Frederick from the Park. If
16 you want to have individual copies of any or all of
17 those three economic studies, he asked all to sign up on
18 a sheet before the end the day so Larry or Mary can get
19 the copies for all before you leave.

20 Fourth, Rick announced there is a videotape
21 of the spring opening of the Going-to-the-Sun Road which
22 runs about 42 minutes, which will be shown tomorrow at
23 lunchtime while you're eating lunch.

24 Also over lunch Mary put together the
25 information that the Committee had provided her for the

1 travel costs and they do have a rough breakout on that.
2 She will get a copy to everyone.

3 The costs were as follows: travel for the
4 members of the group was about \$5,100; travel for
5 speakers, \$2,200; the microphone and equipment was
6 \$6,700; the court reporter costs were \$2,000;
7 miscellaneous supplies and materials, \$550; the
8 Cavanaugh cost of the room was \$1,300; and then the
9 total costs for MK Centennial, including salaries,
10 travel and their time here this week only was 22,000,
11 with another 8,000 tied to research and development of
12 materials from MK Centennial prior to the meeting. The
13 meeting itself totaled about \$34,000. All information
14 will be given to Committee in a hard copy.

15 Announced Connie Costanza as being the new
16 court reporter for today and tomorrow.

17 Craig Gaskill talked a little about how they
18 wanted to proceed the next day and a half.

19 Introduced Anna Marie Moe, and then asked
20 Committee members to take a couple minutes to give a
21 summary of who they are and maybe some key elements they
22 have learned so far, which they did.

23 MS. MOE: My name is Anna Marie Moe. I am
24 here representing the state government of Montana. I'm
25 the Economic Policy Advisor for Governor Racicot. I

1 apologize for being late. I was at the National
2 Governor's Association in D.C. and just got back
3 yesterday.

4 The reason why I'm on the Committee is I
5 think that I'm in a unique position to look at, not
6 only, it from the economic perspective of local areas
7 around the Park, but also statewide. Glacier National
8 Park is one of our biggest tourism draws.

9 In addition to that, coordinate with the
10 various state agencies that may be involved and probably
11 will be involved, whether it's the Highway Department or
12 Travel Montana, to help with some of the advertising and
13 promotion that may be coming along.

14 In addition to that, I used to work at
15 Travel Montana. I worked there for four-and-a-half
16 years and I just left that position in August.

17 My vision and goals, I guess, is to try and
18 come up with the best alternatives that we can for this
19 important project. No matter what decisions that we
20 come up with as an Advisory Council, there's going to be
21 people upset on both extremes, and to try and make sure
22 that we have a good process that we can be able to
23 defend and hopefully turn that into a positive, as many
24 people have said.

25 My expectation is -- both from my role, is

1 to learn as much as I can and to contribute both from a
2 statewide perspective and from the tourism industry.

3 --oOo--

4 Craig Gaskill announces no more
5 presentations. Tells the Committee it's up to them how
6 they want to proceed with this. Need to choose a chair-
7 person for the Committee. Leave that option up to them,
8 now or later. Also need to come up with some of the
9 directions of the seven items brought up yesterday.
10 Start with visions and objectives, communication
11 protocols; scoping project agreement, one of the bottom
12 lines we would need in order to proceed. Get an
13 agreement from the Park Service on the type of things
14 you feel important for us to work on. We have a start
15 on that.

16 The project priorities. Talked about some
17 of the funding limitations. Everything that's potential
18 out there to do can't be funded within existing funding
19 but there are funding opportunities out there. What
20 are your priorities in terms of what are the most
21 important things to do.

22 The public participation. That's kind of
23 tied to communication but a little different. There's
24 an internal protocol of how they all provide information
25 back and forth, and that ties into your meeting schedule

1 as well. Do you want more than two meetings a year,
2 when those are, how often does the Committee meet. Does
3 the Committee want subcommittees or public
4 participation. But as we talked about our NEPA process,
5 that can be a very integrated process and are both used
6 for the same purposes.

7 Then the processing schedule. A lot of
8 these things are overlapping. The process kind of ties
9 to the process of the public participation of the scope
10 part of the agreement and how long this thing takes.

11 Fred talked about a two-year schedule, and
12 that would kind of get us to the point where we have the
13 draft EIS. Get that public issues view, comments and
14 the final would be prepared.

15 MR. GASKILL: So those are things we still
16 have to talk about. One of the things I might suggest
17 -- and it's just a suggestion, I might suggest that I
18 put up some of the visions and objectives that have come
19 out of the general management plan and out of your
20 charter, put those up on the wall. We put those up next
21 to the stuff that Fred came up with, and that can
22 provide a framework for a basic starting point for the
23 vision.

24 Then we can move to the next item. Work on
25 communication. First, what our communication protocols

1 are, how many meetings you want to have and how you want
2 to communicate with us, and internally, do you want to
3 set up a subcommittee? My suggestion is to do a
4 brainstorming process. I would think you have three
5 people on a table, sit together for maybe five minutes
6 and brainstorm ideas and then put all those ideas on the
7 board; make sure we got them all, then have you do a dot
8 exercise, put dots on the ones you think are the most
9 relevant or opportunity that would work the best for the
10 communication process; see if that will work.

11 Then we do the selection of a chairperson at
12 that point. For that selection, I guess I would
13 recommend -- and this is, of course, up to you again --
14 would be to follow the Robert's Rule of Order, for this,
15 where we would take nominations for a chairperson, have
16 a second for the chairperson, have a discussion on those
17 people, have a nomination to close any more -- a motion
18 to close nominations for any more chairpersons, and then
19 have a ballot.

20 MR. BROOKE: I think the selection of the
21 chairman is pretty important and I also think it's
22 pretty easy. We've got an at-large member here that I
23 think it makes more sense to have an at-large person be
24 the chairman.

25 MR. JEWETT: As a consultant, what kinds of

1 qualities are you expecting from the chairperson of this
2 committee?

3 MR. GASKILL: From our perspective, having
4 gone through these kinds of Advisory Committees before,
5 that the Committee plays an integral part of this
6 process. We can't go forward and not talk to anybody
7 for six months or three months or maybe a month might be
8 the most. We're going to need a lot of back and forth
9 interaction on whether we're going in the right
10 direction, providing the right information. A lot of
11 questions have come up, and we want to make sure that
12 we're doing the right thing as well. I think that the
13 chairperson is going to be the key person for that.

14 I think Fred had suggested an organization
15 of kind of a core group which would include the
16 committee chair, one person from MK Centennial, one
17 person from the Federal Highway Administration and one
18 person from the National Park Service to meet and talk
19 about issues that come up and get that information back
20 to their representative groups. I would think that
21 communication should be at least once a month and
22 probably more like every two weeks.

23 MR. JEWETT: Can the chairperson expect to
24 have administrative support?

25 MR. GASKILL: I think the way that this is

1 set up is that, if you feel it is important that the
2 chairperson have administrative support, then you tell
3 the National Park Service that part of the scope you
4 need to have support for that chairperson and they'll
5 write that into the scope.

6 MR. SHIREMAN: Certainly the Advisory
7 Committee as an extension of the chair would have
8 administrative support. That cost would be borne out of
9 the monies available. So you truly are a part of this
10 process that the committee is going to have to determine
11 what level of involvement they feel is appropriate and
12 what level of administrative support that you are going
13 to need to do your job effectively. So you're right in
14 here with us trying to plan that out, even trying to
15 figure the best way of getting the most work available.
16 And that administrative support we can provide from the
17 National Park Service.

18 MR. OGLE: Craig, you say communication
19 every two or three weeks. Talking about meetings?

20 MR. GASKILL: Communication could be a
21 conference call; it could be -- I think conference call
22 is probably one that would work well with the committee;
23 e-mail.

24 MR. OGLE: You're not talking about
25 meetings.

1 MR. GASKILL: I don't think you need
2 meetings. I think meetings are important from time to
3 time, but then sometimes a conference call is just as
4 important.

5 MR. BABB: The skills what I would say, is a
6 good speaker; comfortable running meetings; a good
7 listener; able to make decisions, in other words tough
8 decisions; motivator, and able to think out of the box,
9 be creative.

10 MR. GASKILL: I think one other thing I
11 don't think I heard was, someone that you would feel
12 comfortable representing the Committee in terms of with
13 the media and the public.

14 MR. SHIREMAN: And I think also in terms of
15 the charter for the group, the ability to build
16 consensus and to reach the understanding among the
17 members of the Committee.

18 MR. GASKILL: Back to where I was before,
19 would you rather work on -- would you like to start with
20 the kind of a summary what some of the vision is and the
21 objectives are that come out of past work and then go
22 into communication and then elect a chair, or would you
23 rather elect a chair right now?

24 MR. BAKER: Myself, well, do the chair right
25 now and get that out of the way and then go from there.

1 MS. SEXTON: Are we going to revisit what
2 Fred said this morning as well?

3 MR. GASKILL: In terms of the goals and
4 criteria?

5 MS. SEXTON: Um-hmm; all those things.

6 MR. GASKILL: We'll revisit what Fred had up
7 there and then we can go to the election of a chair,
8 because this won't take too long.

9 Now in terms of revisiting this, do you want
10 me to read this over again? Would you like Fred to do a
11 short summary of this?

12 MS. PAHL: No. We want to mess with it.

13 MR. GASKILL: Driving on Going-to-the-Sun
14 Road will remain the principal visitor experience.
15 That's one of the things that comes out of the general
16 management plan that's already been printed.

17 Charter from the Going-to-the-Sun Road
18 Advisory Committee. Says that the purpose of the
19 Committee is to advise the National Park Service the
20 development of alternatives for reconstruction of the
21 Going-to-the-Sun Road. Reconstruction including
22 scheduling costs and measures to mitigate impact on
23 visitors and local economy.

24 MS. SEXTON: The only one that I don't know
25 if it needs to be up there, mitigation efforts are

1 discussed but they're not really on the schedule. It
2 seems to me as far as funding and scheduling mitigation
3 efforts promotional information disbursed about the
4 condition of the road and the plans for the road needs
5 to be there somewhere prominently. I know it's
6 mentioned up there, but it's mentioned -- however, it's
7 not in the schedule for products, milestones and that
8 kind of thing. You have the study up there, the
9 economic analysis but not the mitigation. When you
10 talked about funding for additional -- I guess that's
11 studies, but if you had funds for mitigation I think
12 needs to be addressed early on.

13 MR. GASKILL: How would you like to word
14 that?

15 MS. SEXTON: You mean I'm supposed to
16 summarize? I guess in a sense what I'm talking about
17 would be a strategy underneath the goal. I think it's a
18 strategy that needs to be addressed early on and that
19 would be looking at funding versus mitigation. And,
20 see, you have the minimized impacts for local economy,
21 and certainly the mitigation would be one of those
22 strategies. So securing funds for mitigation. And
23 again, I think it should be in your schedule there.
24 It's an important enough element that it needs to have
25 more attention than I think what it was given in that

1 overall review.

2 MR. GASKILL: Look at funding sources for
3 mitigation as a strategy

4 MR. BAKER: How about establishing
5 mitigation strategy?

6 MS. SEXTON: Yeah; establish mitigation
7 strategy. And something about the timing of it, that it
8 needs to be in a timeline and established as well.

9 MR. GASKILL: Okay.

10 MS. PAHL: The piece that I'm looking at
11 over here is how to start talking about this in terms of
12 a visitor opportunity as opposed to a visitor
13 inconvenience. And so on the one hand there's a bullet
14 that says "provide high quality vision experience,"
15 which speaks to that point. But the one that says
16 minimize impacts on visitors, I'm wondering if you don't
17 want to downside the fact that there will be an impact
18 on the other. Somewhere I think we have to start
19 talking about these in terms of the opportunities, what
20 you can do as opposed to what you can't do.

21 MR. GASKILL: How about if we say "suggest
22 opportunities" as opposed to "minimize impacts?"

23 MS. PAHL: "Suggest opportunities" isn't
24 quite there. But let me think of some words that would
25 work.

1 MR. SLITER: On one hand Barbara's talking
2 about saying how great this is going to be because we're
3 creating all the opportunities for these people to come
4 look at the project, but on the other hand, Mary is
5 saying we need to mitigate for the fact that we're going
6 to see a reduction as a result of the project. So we
7 have got sort of conflicting --

8 MS. SEXTON: You can have a positive twist
9 on it.

10 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think you're gonna
11 sell it on the idea of coming to the highway
12 construction rehabilitation project. You may sell it on
13 the idea that the Park is open and that there's no
14 reason why you can't go through the road that's been
15 maintained and other areas of the Park, but try to sell
16 people to come out and look at a construction project
17 with a lot of orange cones on it.

18 MS. PAHL: I think that would be true from
19 570 through Kansas, but I don't think necessarily --

20 MR. O'QUINN: It's not like the nose on the
21 mountain. You're going to be in the middle of it.
22 You're going to be up kind of close and personal. I
23 think the sales pitch is on the Park itself and that the
24 visitor opportunity's there. But to try to sell people
25 to come look at a guard wall being improved or -- I

1 don't think that's going to fly.

2 MR. BAKER: I personally think there is a
3 story to tell of the rehabilitation. You may not be
4 able to see it, but I think there's a story to be told,
5 an interpretive story, that can be built a very, very
6 strong one around this project, because this is a long
7 -- I mean, this project started five years ago, six
8 years ago. And if the story can be told as what's
9 happening, why it's happening, the history of the
10 highway, et cetera, I think it can be wrapped around
11 something positive. You don't have to physically see
12 it. This is going to be a reading story similar to any
13 historical moment in Glacier or anything else.

14 MR. GASKILL: How about if we put in here
15 "provide positive opportunities for mitigation?"

16 MS. PAHL: Provide opportunities for a
17 visitor related to the rehabilitation project.

18 MR. JACKSON: Interpretive material, is what
19 you really mean, so that when you drive into the Park
20 you get something on not feeding the bears and you get
21 something on the project on what you're going to see and
22 what they're trying to do.

23 MR. GASKILL: Would that fall all under
24 here, Dave?

25 MR. JACKSON: Yeah; I think interpretive

1 materials.

2 MS. PAHL: These are opportunities to learn
3 about the project or to follow the project or to
4 understand, not just related to.

5 MS. BURCH: I could kind of go with the idea
6 of this legacy, you know, that this is how you maintain
7 a legacy. I've actually driven through, as most of us
8 have driven through the construction. I don't see how
9 that can end up being a positive experience. But since
10 we have so much interest in it now, are we just making a
11 list of things that we're going to want some feedback on
12 for the next meeting? Is that kind of where we are?

13 MR. GASKILL: I think what's important here
14 is to try and get kind of a vision on objectives which
15 you feel are important for this project, what needs to
16 be accomplished, kind of a road map where you want to go
17 -- not the road map, but kind of the direction where you
18 want to go or maybe even where you want to end up at.

19 I think the vision's a little more difficult
20 is why I wasn't sure you wanted us to start there. I
21 thought maybe we could suggest what some of the vision
22 might be and come back to it once we work on some of the
23 issues a little bit. If you want to actually start with
24 the vision we can do that as well.

25 MS. BURCH: Doesn't everything all kind of

1 hang on the vision?

2 MR. GASKILL: Typically it hangs from the
3 vision if you want to start at the vision, but it's
4 also, as you start learning more about it, you might
5 change the vision a little bit, but you might not.

6 MS. PAHL: I think that's okay in checking
7 back with the vision and making modifications as you
8 learn more. That's usually what happens, is a vision
9 needs to evolve.

10 MR. GASKILL: If anybody has a vision
11 statement they would like to propose, I'll certainly
12 write that down.

13 MS. BURCH: Now maybe I'm being really basic
14 here, but to me the vision is to get the road back,
15 rehabilitate the road as MK Centennial said this
16 morning, to not even know that you were there. And to
17 -- my vision would be no minimized road closures because
18 of the careful work we do here from the next
19 generation. And that's what I think. If we do that, if
20 we focus on the road, than all the visitors' experience
21 and so on is going to follow after that.

22 Now there have been some topics sort of
23 suggested that maybe we should be getting into this
24 transportation study. And I think in a way we have to
25 address some of that transportation study because it

1 relates to the road right now. But if we go too far
2 into that, we're going to be way outside what we could
3 accomplish as a group here, I think.

4 MR. GASKILL: I heard rehabilitate roads,
5 minimize closure?

6 MS. BURCH: For the future.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Isn't what we're trying to get
8 to wrapped up in the charter, why we're here?

9 MR. GASKILL: The purpose of the Committee
10 is to advise the National Park Service a development of
11 alternatives for reconstruction of the Going-to-the-Sun
12 Road focusing on road condition and reconstruction
13 strategies including scheduling costs and measures to
14 mitigate impacts on visitors and local economies.

15 MR. O'QUINN: That's what we're about?

16 MR. GASKILL: The only thing I've heard is
17 maybe instead of reconstruction, rehabilitation might
18 just be another word that better describes it.

19 MS. PAHL: Not another word, a better word.

20 MR. BROOKE: I tend to agree that we've got
21 our charter, and I think we could really get ourselves
22 tripped up here in the division thing, if you will.
23 After all, let's remember there is a master plan that
24 was done of Glacier National Park and there's an
25 environmental impact statement for that master plan

1 involving public comment and process. And we've got a
2 pretty narrow charter here that if we start getting into
3 things like vision statements or documents, we're going
4 to find ourselves off the road and in the barrow pit.

5 MR. JEWETT: I would support that.

6 MR. DAKIN: I certainly agree, I'd like to
7 not invite new language that only gets us tangled up in
8 conflicting kinds of obligations. I'd like to stick
9 with as simple as we could, stick with the charter,
10 proceed from there.

11 MR. GASKILL: I think the things that have
12 come up pretty much follow within that anyway.

13 All right. Is that a good place to start
14 for our vision?

15 MS. PAHL: Purpose.

16 MR. BROOKE: Our vision is what they told us
17 it would be. I don't mean to be lack of imagination or
18 anything. I think we have talked about some of the
19 things, like instead of mitigating impacts we're talking
20 about maybe maximizing opportunities and some of those
21 things. But that's the only purpose here.

22 MS. PAHL: And that's what Fred was talking
23 to us about this morning. That's a practical pragmatic
24 approach to all this.

25 MR. GASKILL: Well, Barbara, that was what I

1 kind of wanted to cover

2 MS. PAHL: Those were the words.

3 MR. GASKILL: Those were the words you were
4 looking for, maximize opportunities. And you want to go
5 through some of what Fred had, and that's that.

6 MS. SEXTON: When you look at his list this
7 morning, that probably needs to be the maximized
8 opportunities. That that you presented to us this
9 morning is what we're using to start a working draft,
10 and so we need to make sure the potential element is in
11 that draft. I guess that was my intent of bringing out
12 the mitigation and maximizing of opportunities.

13 MR. GASKILL: Fred, would it be okay if I
14 put on your list "maximizing opportunities"?

15 MR. SHIREMAN: Just for my clarity of
16 understanding, you're talking about maximizing
17 opportunities for visitors and maximizing opportunities
18 for the local economies. But we're continuing to
19 minimize cost. What I'm asking you to do is be very
20 specific about the changes that you're putting on this
21 list so we can incorporate those into documents.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Is this a very positive
23 outreach program on the part of the Park Service towards
24 what's going on in the Park with regard to visitor
25 accessibility part of that last thing that was put on

1 there? Was that a good strong PR program? Which it
2 goes beyond what we're trying to do with the road.
3 That's a park thing. That's not yours. It's really not
4 ours.

5 MR. GASKILL: That is a methodology or
6 technique that can be used to achieve this.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Is that one of the things that
8 we're talking about here?

9 MS. PAHL: It's there in the purpose.

10 MR. GASKILL: Just a matter of priority what
11 you would want to put on it, I think.

12 Okay.

13 MR. JEWETT: I don't want to split this too
14 fine, but I have a little bit of problem with that last
15 one simply because I think that there are appropriate
16 opportunities for visitors and there are appropriate
17 opportunities for local economies. But the overriding,
18 I think, consideration here has to be how is the road
19 rehabilitated while the Park values are maintained. And
20 I think that maximized opportunities for visitors, if
21 they're not appropriate, building a tram up to the top
22 of Logas Pass. And the same could be said for some
23 opportunities for local economies if they're not
24 appropriate to work for cross purposes.

25 So if there's not any objection, I'd just

1 like to put "appropriate" between "maximize
2 opportunities."

3 MR. DAKIN. I might suggest that maybe where
4 they become contradictory is in the use of the word
5 "maximum." And if we simply had something like "explore
6 opportunities" to provide. You're right. Because
7 maximize, if you take it literally, does mean trams and
8 heli-tours and all kinds of things. That's where I
9 think we're working against ourselves here, is the use
10 of that word maximize. But I believe our document
11 should identify and explore those kinds of opportunities
12 and perhaps they can be dealt with in some advice making
13 some of our alternatives.

14 MR. BAKER: How about enhance appropriate
15 opportunities?

16 MS. SEXTON: Seems to me all of these things
17 should be appropriate. You should appropriately provide
18 cost as well.

19 MR. BAKER: But you could get into some
20 opportunities that aren't appropriate.

21 MS. SEXTON: I think in many of these things
22 that should be something that winds its way through all
23 of these, that you appropriately minimize the impacts
24 and so on. I don't know.

25 MR. O'QUINN:
We're not going to minimize the costs because to

1 minimize the costs --

2 MS. SEXTON: That's exactly right. Then you
3 need to do it appropriately. So I think again --

4 MR. GASKILL: Explore doesn't actually say
5 you're going to do something. Enhance assumes that
6 there's something already there. Maximize says you're
7 going to do the maximum amount possible. Optimize says
8 you're going to take what's available and try to make it
9 the best you can. So if you say optimize appropriate
10 opportunities, how does that sound?

11 MR. DAKIN: It sounds good. I'm not sure
12 what it means.

13 MS. BURCH: Are we hamstringing ourselves
14 for later on down the road? Aren't we going to be able
15 to talk about, say that's not appropriate? Is that what
16 I heard, a sideboard? Have we taken the sideboards off
17 to explore all this stuff? Right now we're trying to
18 gather a maximum amount of data. It doesn't matter to
19 me. That's certainly not something -- saying why put an
20 adjective in there right now.

21 MR. GASKILL: We can always come back and
22 relook at it.

23 Okay. Shall we move forward? Next question
24 is, a chairperson-elect or talk about communication
25 opportunities and protocols?

1 (All in favor to elect a Chair.)

2 MR. GASKILL: Would you like to go the more
3 formal process, which is, we were calling Robert's Rule
4 of Orders and take nominations or would you have an
5 alternative process we can just nominate some people and
6 see if there's general agreement and raise your hands?

7 Randy Ogle was nominated by William Brooke
8 and Barbara Pahl seconded the motion. There were no
9 other nominations, and Paul Sliter moved that
10 nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast in
11 the name of Randy Ogle for Chairman. David Jackson
12 seconded that motion. Barney O'Quinn moved that they
13 not do the written ballots and William Dakin seconded
14 that motion. Randy Ogle accepted the nomination and
15 took over chairing the meeting. He started by asking
16 everyone where they wanted to go from here to talk
17 about.

18 MR. MEZMARICH: We talked about
19 communications, and subset of that was the number of
20 meetings. We talked a lot about -- Barney, for example,
21 has not had the opportunity to be on the road
22 physically, where probably virtually all of us have
23 numerous times. I think he should be given that
24 opportunity, and maybe a meeting in mid summer would be
25 appropriate for that.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think as a part of when we
2 have our next meeting we need to find out from MK
3 Centennial when they're going to have their first things
4 completed. I think we're talking about, at least, some
5 economic studies and some engineering studies. Are
6 there other studies that are going to be needed to be
7 completed?

8 MR. JACKSON: I think it would be good to
9 have MK Centennial explain what is on the screen sheet
10 so that we better understand it and then have a basis
11 for making some recommendations as to what else might be
12 done, if anything, or how it might be addressed and so
13 on.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So Craig or Jay, one of you
15 guys in a position to give us a hand on when you think
16 these studies, the economic studies and engineering
17 studies could be completed so that we can then work
18 towards scheduling our next meeting. MS.

19 PAHL: The other study that I do think is coinciding
20 with the engineering study would be that historic road
21 study to really verify, which they don't have, I
22 believe, you know, how many retaining walls there are,
23 which are original, which are not, which are gone and
24 will need to be reconstructed. So it would be nice to
25 have that data going along with the engineering study.

1 I know they have funding for that. I don't know what
2 the time frame on that.

3 MR. O'QUINN: I think a question, before MK
4 tries to answer this, is really somewhat a Park Service,
5 because they haven't been given any tasks yet. And so
6 it may be, rather than him try to answer it, if Fred
7 could tell us which of these tasks he's fixing to unload
8 on them, that might help them.

9 MR. BABB: My personal opinion is, you can't
10 just say what studies need to be completed. Part of
11 your guy's task is to first decide whether he needs more
12 information or not. And to me, the first task on these
13 various studies is to assess what's been already done
14 and for MK Centennial to come back with a recommendation
15 of what additional studies need to be completed.

16 And so in essence, the first scope of
17 service would be assess those previous studies both
18 under engineering, economic, and probably
19 transportation, and I'm not sure what others, and set a
20 time frame where they can come and say what other
21 additional work has to be done.

22 One other thing you have to realize is that
23 when we put something up there for MK Centennial to do,
24 is we have to then write a scope of services for what
25 that entails, and then we negotiate price. And so all

1 that has a bearing on how much we can undertake in terms
2 of what monies we have available time frame. I don't
3 know whether that gives you your --

4 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah, I really think it does,
5 because we've seen the proper studies -- you've got some
6 up here, we haven't looked at them. And I don't think
7 as a committee we can very well go through those and try
8 to decide what needs to be done. I think that's the
9 scope of the Park's responsibility in working with you,
10 is do exactly what you just said, to get with them to
11 make recommendations as to to what the next step is.
12 They know where we're trying to get. They know what our
13 overall objectives are now, and I think we can't give
14 them point by point instructions on this. And what you
15 just outlined would be my thinking exactly. Where would
16 they recommend to the Committee we go from here.

17 MR. BABB: We tentatively identified that to
18 be basically May time frame, between now and sometime in
19 May or towards the end of May. And, again, we haven't
20 talked whether that's achievable or not and that's part
21 of the negotiations.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What were you talking about
23 being completed by May?

24 MR. BABB: An assessment of where we are in
25 data, and their recommendations on what other data needs

1 to be collected and probably a general idea of how we
2 proceed. At that time then we should know on some of
3 the other funding sources whether we're truly going to
4 get them or not.

5 MR. GATTEN: One other thing is, there will
6 be some more work required. We have seen enough and
7 talked enough about the socioeconomic part of it to know
8 we're going to have to do more sampling this summer;
9 means that the sampling is done during the peak of the
10 tourist season, which is when I think we need to be
11 doing the samples.

12 And then the socioeconomic data, the report
13 won't be done until late this year. The engineering may
14 get done before then. We can review the status of the
15 work that's done to date by early summer, but in terms
16 of going out and doing an inventory of all the walls and
17 that, that's additional work we're not sure we're going
18 to proceed with.

19 So all things aren't going to get finished
20 at the same time. They are going to come in pieces, and
21 you'll have to decide when you've got enough data to
22 ring the bell to do the next meeting.

23 Within about a month we can give you
24 milestones so some target is scheduled. But we've got
25 to sit down and do some more work reviewing the data

1 before we can put the milestones together to see how
2 much time it's going to take.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any questions for Dick from
4 the committee?

5 MR. GASKILL: Something I should have
6 mentioned before, and I interject here, there was a
7 question that came up before lunch about some more
8 discussion on the funding process. I've had requests
9 for a recap, if you could talk about the funding
10 process. He is prepared to give you an overview of the
11 funding process, so if you want him to do that at some
12 point we can throw that in as well.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It sounds like they're not
14 even going to have this assessment of what's out there
15 completed until late spring and then need some
16 direction, I guess, as to what kind of further studies
17 are going to be done. So what could we accomplish by
18 having a meeting in the spring?

19 MR. MEZMARICH: Someone will need to decide,
20 based on MK's recommendations, which studies should be
21 undertaken, or perhaps that's what we can do. I was
22 asking Barney what he thought, and he thought the
23 committee should be involved in that, that decision, and
24 perhaps in July, that would be an appropriate time to do
25 that. He would be able to see the road in peak season.

1 Everyone else would have an opportunity to take a
2 different look at it since we're convened. That seems
3 to be appropriate.

4 MR. O'QUINN: That might be a bit late to
5 get the consultant started. If they're going to have
6 recommendations ready to go in May, then maybe we need
7 to review that by passing mail electronically. And,
8 again, mid July I think might be just find out where
9 work in progress is.

10 I don't feel comfortable in waiting till
11 fall with this meeting. I was just looking at the
12 calendar, and I'd say sometime about that middle -- the
13 4th, of course, is the first full week of July, but
14 maybe the following week.

15 I may be knocking the eyes out of you guys
16 out here from an economics standpoint. I really don't
17 see that we're talking about three full days, a week. I
18 think we're talking about probably a one-day meeting.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You're thinking sometime in
20 the May time frame when they've had a chance to assess
21 things, we just not have communication with them until
22 our first meeting?

23 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah; through you. And you
24 could come to us, we talk to you, and then you work with
25 the Park Service and see if there's consensus on the

1 studies that need to go forward with.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What's the thoughts of the
3 rest of you on that suggestion? I don't have a problem
4 with the notion of communicating about what more studies
5 need to be done without a meeting. I think we can
6 handle that.

7 MR. O'QUINN: And I don't think we can have
8 them wait.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Would we be ready to have
10 that input by May, do you think?

11 MR. GATTEN: Yes.

12 MR. BAKER: Is that going to give them time
13 to examine the whole highway when it's not quite all
14 open yet?

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think all you guys are
16 going to do is review what reports are already completed
17 between now and then, aren't you?

18 MR. GATTEN: The complete engineering
19 report, we're going to do a field review of the road.
20 But between now and May we can do it, assuming we get
21 the notice to proceed on our next contract. See, we
22 don't have a contract to do it, so there's a
23 governmental process to go through to write a work
24 scope, negotiate a price, get the contracts to approve
25 that, give us a notice to proceed. If that all moves as

1 quickly as the last one did, we'll be well into the
2 technical part of the review of the data and the
3 engineering reports by May. But we can't finish that
4 until we do a field inventory and the road will have to
5 be open.

6 MR. SLITER: Is that John's department?

7 MR. KILPATRICK. We start plowing the road
8 second Monday in April. Depending on snow levels it may
9 be possible for you to see quite a bit of the road in
10 late May. It's very dependent. I mean, Bill, you know
11 this. I'm not really good at answering some of that.
12 I'm dancing around here.

13 MR. DAKIN: Well, I question that it would
14 be very easy or very worthwhile to try and assess the
15 overall condition of the road until the snow's gone. I
16 think it's a great opportunity that you've offered to
17 take individuals or small groups from this committee up
18 at their convenience and have them see that springtime
19 operation.

20 I'm just wrestling with this, too. Barney'd
21 like to get on site and see the traffic at its peak, and
22 yet I think July is a very difficult time for many of
23 the business people on this committee to really break
24 free. This is when we're doing the most of our work.

25 I was comfortable with September because

1 it's just a more relaxed period, and you can -- then
2 there's no snow on anything. You can see the whole
3 thing and you can actually walk on the road without
4 getting flattened. So there's a lot of considerations
5 there.

6 I'm not sure that we would have anything to
7 decide if we went before these people have had four or
8 five months to assemble more information.

9 MR. O'QUINN: There's two things that play
10 here, and disregarding the meeting date, but one is the
11 studies that they're going to recommend and go on the
12 contract to do. Then the second is the beginning to do
13 those things. And I think the actual field
14 investigations they are going to be undertaking would be
15 part of the studies. So I don't see why they won't be
16 able to come up with a pretty good idea in April or May
17 of what additional investigations they feel like they
18 need to do based on the studies that they have to
19 review.

20 MS. KREMINIK: I'm wondering if there isn't
21 two different timelines. I mean, obviously for the
22 engineering review they need to get up onto the road to
23 take a look at that before they can do more research,
24 but for an socioeconomic impact analysis they need more
25 than the middle of June to prepare for a survey this

1 summer. Just research methodology alone you'd need a
2 couple months to prepare that survey before they got out
3 into the field and did it. So perhaps we can divide
4 this into two streams and consider some fast tracking
5 for the socioeconomic stuff.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Can you address that, Dick?

7 MR. GATTEN: I think Jayne's right on.
8 There's different pieces of work and different timing
9 for when it is to be done.

10 The other thing is that, remember, we're
11 still working under your direction, and one of the
12 issues that I think Barbara had mentioned earlier this
13 morning was how many walls are there. Well, if you want
14 to know precisely how many walls there are and where
15 they're located and what condition they're in, you know,
16 we're -- I think John said they found some walls when
17 they cleared some brush that they hadn't encountered
18 before last summer.

19 So the level of detail that you want in the
20 engineering study helps -- you tell us. You help us set
21 the objectives for what that study is, how detailed you
22 want it. That helps tell us how much time it's going to
23 take. If we're reviewing what's already been collected,
24 we can get most of that review finished, except the
25 field part of it, in May. If you want to know exactly

1 how many lineal feet of wall and different kinds of
2 condition there are after this winter has vanished, then
3 we're going to need time after the road is open to
4 complete that kind of an inventory.

5 MR. SLITER: I think that talking with these
6 gentlemen back here, the people that know the road best,
7 is just having the road open isn't going to be enough,
8 because in order to get the road open they have to throw
9 all that snow off the side which covers up the retaining
10 walls and the footings and everything that really
11 matters under there. So it's a matter of -- it isn't
12 going to be the second week of June when you get a
13 chance to go look at those things in detail. It's
14 probably going to be more like July.

15 MR. BABB: I think you guys got to decide
16 what decisions you want to make and what you need to
17 know to make those decisions, how much the analysis is
18 worth to you. In other words, if you have a hundred
19 percent, are you willing to spend 15, 20, 10 percent on
20 that analysis. Because, again, you got to look at the
21 total picture and you don't want to run out of dollars
22 and opportunities when you only get part way.

23 And so we're really looking for some
24 decisions and some parameters that you can put upon us
25 when we, Park Service, and MK go into negotiations. I'm

1 not sure that's clear.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think we can answer
3 that, and this goes back to what we talked about just a
4 few minutes ago. Until MK sits down and looks at the
5 data that's available and evaluates that data and comes
6 back with a recommendation as to what additional work
7 needs to be done, I don't think we are in a position to
8 say, "we think you need to go look at every crack and
9 retaining wall."

10 MR. BABB: And I think that's fine. What
11 you're saying by that is, between MK and the Park
12 Service, they're going to make that decision, like as an
13 example, how many reports or how much time do we allow
14 MK to review that document; how much time do we say MK
15 has to write up the results, what form that results
16 comes from. I think that's okay to say that's our
17 responsibility, but that's what we have to know.

18 MR. O'QUINN: The only thing that I thought
19 we had in there was, once they make their
20 recommendations to you then that information was going
21 to be provided to the Committee, so that if we had any
22 concerns up or down on it, we could relay that back to
23 the Park Service for your consideration in expanding or
24 reducing the scope of work.

25 MR. BABB: I agree.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So when are you going to be
2 ready with those recommendations, Dick, do you think.
3 Is that the end of May time frame or is it sometime
4 sooner when you can be making recommendations to us on
5 what further studies you think need to be done?

6 MR. GATTEN: I think May's the time
7 schedule, assuming we can get a notice to proceed
8 sometime before the end of March.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You can do that without
10 doing field studies.

11 MR. O'QUINN: Some of the field studies
12 would be an outgrowth of this scope of work. So the
13 June, July is not an issue there. It's getting the next
14 task -- third task, I guess, to start to work.

15 But like Jane pointed out earlier, it may be
16 July or August before they can get out and start
17 inventorying walls. But soon after we get the
18 recommendations as far as any kind of traffic counts or
19 socioeconomic data that they want to gather or any kind
20 of turning movements or anything like that, we need to
21 go ahead and turn them loose pretty early, because June,
22 July and August is when they are going to need to do
23 those.

24 MR. GASKILL: Kind of follow up on that. In
25 order for us to make recommendations we will need to

1 know what type of information you're going to want in
2 the long run so we can make the proper recommendations.
3 Because if we recommend a traffic study but it's
4 something that you don't need to make a decision, then
5 we shouldn't recommend it.

6 MR. O'QUINN: I think this is where we're
7 coming back to you as a professional. You know where we
8 ought to be going and if you need traffic studies -- and
9 it's been pretty apparent to me we don't have them, and
10 it's kind of baseline stuff, that and accident
11 investigation. I don't think the committee needs to sit
12 here and micro- manage the kind of data that you and I
13 may have some insight in then I want to see it done.

14 MR. GASKILL: So we give you our best
15 insight --

16 MR. O'QUINN: If you feel that we need
17 traffic studies, I think you need to tell us we need
18 traffic studies.

19 MR. GASKILL: What's available, what's not,
20 and based on that you can agree with that or don't agree
21 with that.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You're telling us you think
23 the end of May is the soonest you can get that kind of
24 recommendation.

25 MR. GATTEN: Yes.

1 MS. PAHL: The road study was a item they
2 have \$105,000. My question, is that on your scope of
3 work or is that somebody like -- who is doing the road
4 study?

5 MR. KILPATRICK: Right now we have a
6 preliminary start on that done at the Denver Service
7 Center. I'm not sure exactly what we're going to do
8 with the balance of those funds just yet.

9 MS. PAHL: But in other words, it won't be
10 the scope of work for MK.

11 MR. KILPATRICK: It could be.

12 MR. O'QUINN: Same question with regard to
13 the transportation and economic study.

14 MR. KILPATRICK: Could be.

15 MR. O'QUINN: It would be additional funds.
16 It wouldn't be out of their million bucks.

17 MR. KILPATRICK: That's right. Here's the
18 key, is that we can't exceed a million dollars in one
19 year to MK, so we're going to -- that's kind of the
20 outside parameter that we're working towards. But, yes,
21 it could do the transportation planning issue part.

22 MR. O'QUINN: And it would be part of this
23 contract that that money be funneled back into it.

24 MR. KILPATRICK: It wouldn't come out of the
25 million dollars.

1 MR. MEZMARICH: So we have a start here, end
2 of May, the recommendations on May 2. The Park Service
3 staff, then what happens?

4 MS. SEXTON: Those recommendations could be
5 discussed on video conference or telephone conference or
6 something such as that.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think what I'm hearing
8 from the Committee is when get your recommendations they
9 go to the Park Service. You would then get them to us,
10 we will disseminate them amongst the Committee and we'll
11 get a process for feedback from the Committee on what
12 kind of studies the Committee thinks would be helpful,
13 and that could be done through a video conference
14 meeting or a telephone conference or just sending back
15 the feedback.

16 MR. BAKER: If you look at pages six and
17 seven in your green document, that to me seems like it's
18 a great base starting area. It gives both your
19 socioeconomic and your engineering, and if we all did
20 our homework last night and read this like we were
21 supposed to, it would show. Maybe there's some things
22 on here we want to add. Maybe you want to add a couple
23 sentences or whatever, but I think that's a good
24 starting point.

25 MR. JACKSON: I think we also need

1 clarification on some of that stuff, too. But I agree
2 completely. And if you go to the purpose of our
3 Committee it's simple. It says, "The purpose of the
4 Committee is to advise the National Park Service in the
5 development of alternatives for reconstruction/
6 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road; Park is
7 focusing on road conditions, reconstruction strategies,
8 including scheduling costs, measures to mitigate impacts
9 on visitors and local economies. These alternatives are
10 to be analyzed in environmental documents," and so
11 forth.

12 And what Bob points out here is on six and
13 seven, is a crude set of essentially proposals for
14 project agreement between the Park Service and MK
15 Centennial that would outline the engineering analysis
16 and the socioeconomic analysis, and I think that if they
17 were to clarify those a little bit for us we could then
18 comment and provide some additional insight. And I
19 think that's what we're really supposed to be doing.
20 Maybe I'm missing something, but I think that's what
21 we're here for.

22 MR. DAKIN: I would like to second that
23 suggestion, because it seems to me that we've left the
24 structured portion of our meetings here, that we kind of
25 just sort wallowing around on quicksand. And if we were

1 to start on page five of the draft project proposal and
2 let Craig and the experts lead us through that, I would
3 find it a much more orderly way of making all these
4 decisions that seem to be kind of overwhelming us at the
5 same time. That's what I kind of thought we would do,
6 is use the green document as a path through all these
7 decisions. Because it appears to me, frankly, that a
8 lot of thought's been putting into this thing.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you want to deal with
10 that before we deal with when the next meeting day is?

11 MR. DAKIN: This would inevitably lead us
12 into this graph on page nine of all the time frames.
13 And once I understood some of those time frames then I
14 think I could rationally decide when it would be an
15 intelligent type day to meet.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Everybody agree with that?
17 Craig, would you mind running us through this green
18 document starting on page five?

19 MR. SHIREMAN: Randy, I think one thing
20 everybody needs to understand is that the green document
21 is the contracting document developed by the Park
22 Service for the contractor. So the folks who have
23 developed this are John and Fred and some of the staff
24 at Glacier. So those are the folks that you would need
25 to talk with in terms of adjustment on this contract

1 rather than MK Centennial. MK would certainly have
2 input and feedback as to what is feasible given the time
3 frames that we're talking about and the technologies,
4 but this is, in fact, a document from the government.

5 MR. JACKSON: But isn't this the form of
6 advice our committee is supposed to provide specifically
7 to the Park Service as to what kind of studies are to be
8 done?

9 MR. SHIREMAN: That's right. So I would
10 suggest that you have Fred and John join, somehow, in
11 this discussion to walk through the documents with you.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let's take a five-minute
13 break.

14 (Short break was taken.)

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We'll have Fred run through
16 this agreement here this afternoon, kind of explain that
17 to us and then work through it. And they would like to
18 have some input from us on this agreement before
19 tomorrow so they can have kind of a working draft.
20 Looking at this agenda, the 11:15 to 12:00, we'll try to
21 address those issues this afternoon, also, and try to be
22 through that list as well as what Fred is going to do by
23 4:30 so that we can be prepared for some some public
24 input if there is any this afternoon.

25 MR. BABB: Keep, first of all the project

1 agreement, which is this report. Normally, look at the
2 overall project and develop a scope of service, that is
3 the moral that speaks to all the things we need to
4 accomplish. And we've written this as we normally do
5 for the players that have a major role to approve this
6 agreement. Those on the cover sheet are those people.

7 Then the format we normally use is, we go
8 through and give the readers a little bit of background.
9 People that see this are also people that are familiar,
10 not familiar with the project or even in the area. Talk
11 about the issue and the scope of work. In essence, on
12 page three that sort of talks about, at least how we
13 envisioned at the time we wrote this, of sort of what we
14 were trying to solve. Some of the bullets that are on
15 page three and four are some of those bullets I put up
16 there.

17 Section two, beginning of scope of services,
18 this is where whatever we agreed to on this document,
19 this will form the basis for which we write individual
20 task orders that MK Centennial and ourselves will
21 negotiate schedule price and all this. Real key
22 section.

23 And, again, the first part is sort of
24 assumptions and the products that we envision producing,
25 and those products are the ones we talked about earlier

1 this morning as we see the products and we modify the
2 list.

3 Then on "B," the next couple things are the
4 key sections. "B" is the engineering study. The scope
5 and the legislation is really very general. The Park,
6 along with Federal Highway and MK, reviewed it but
7 really not the initial draft. But they reviewed and
8 provided input. But that's how we see the scope of the
9 engineering study in a bullet fashion.

10 Cost and time frame, the chart, that sort of
11 isn't filled out. Heart of where we're talking right
12 now. Using the engineering study or the socioeconomic
13 study, the two prime ones so far that we've talked
14 about, I think what we're really looking for in the
15 first step, as legislation says, an independent analysis
16 of sort of where we are for the data that's their
17 engineering studies.

18 So the first point that we're saying is that
19 MK, the firm that we hire, needs to do an independent
20 analysis of, basically the, data that we have and then
21 make recommendations of where we go from there. That's
22 how I say and I see that's where we are.

23 MR. JACKSON: What do you mean additional
24 sites?

25 MR. BABB: B1, second sentence, page six.

1 What we've said there, the sites, in other words, MK
2 Centennial could come back in the engineering studies --
3 and I'm just going to use hypothetical examples. All
4 right? They could say in reading all the literature
5 that we've read we think it's a thorough analysis and we
6 really don't need any site specific data. Or they could
7 come back and say, well, geez, we're a little bit
8 nervous in the loop or we're a little bit nervous about
9 retaining walls, we would like to analyze two additional
10 sites and here are the two additional sites.

11 We jumped a little bit ahead and say there
12 might be those additional sites. Let MK Centennial go
13 out and look at that literature, come back to us and see
14 whether B1, B2 as listed are appropriate or ...

15 MR. JACKSON: When you say literature, you
16 mean data?

17 MR. BROOKE: This is more than just data;
18 right? Drill core samples, something up there, they're
19 going to have the ability to do that. MR.
20 BABB: What they would do, the first task they come back
21 and say, well, we have to do core samples and we
22 recommend doing boom, boom and boom, along with several
23 other things. Then that would be then the next level of
24 detail that we would go out and gather.

25 In other words, the Committee would have

1 input into that, saying, yeah, we agree with you on
2 those core samples and you might say, geez, those core
3 samples are really on the west side; we might say we
4 want to know that same information on the east side. So
5 maybe you do more core sampling.

6 I don't know whether that answers your
7 question.

8 MR. BROOKE: It scares me a little bit
9 putting some shackles around MK. Maybe I mis-
10 understand.

11 MR. BABB: That would come back to the
12 Committee as well as the Park Service recommending that
13 there are going to be the core samples and the Committee
14 would discuss this in terms of funding, time frame.

15 MR. O'QUINN: Where does the Federal Highway
16 come into this? Because I don't think this committee
17 has the technical capability to decide whether or not
18 those technical investigations need to be conducted.
19 And with all due respect, I don't think you do, either.
20 I think that's why you have to rely on FHWA.

21 MR. KILPATRICK: Part of the thought, if I
22 -- and I'm going to go back just a little bit. The
23 initial retaining wall inventory report was not
24 performed by Federal Highway Administration. It was
25 performed by a private professional consulting

1 engineering firm. So we have a fairly high level of
2 confidence in that, okay, but the public didn't.

3 So the way that we approached it was, well,
4 let's not spend good money after money that we felt was
5 already spent well, and let's have the MK do an
6 independent verification of the data we have and then
7 come back, like Fred said, and say, gee, whiz, we have X
8 level of confidence in this engineering report.
9 However, we think we need to go, gee, so technical here,
10 here and here and you folks would have the ability to do
11 that.

12 MR. BAKER: With the support of the Highway.

13 MR. KILPATRICK: Federal Highway will be our
14 consulting engineer, number one, to help us do estimates
15 of time and materials to negotiate with MK. So, yes,
16 they are involved in the whole process.

17 MR. O'QUINN: We're thinking on just one
18 element in the engineer studies, and I think that goes
19 throughout the entire thing, whether that's traffic
20 analysis or whatever it is, they're your quality
21 controls as far as technical stuff, to review what your
22 prime consultant's doing, and that's the way it's
23 supposed to be.

24 MR. BABB: And let me use one other example
25 that Jack Gordon and some other people talked about. We

1 know an awful lot about those walls both from an
2 engineering standpoint as well as fabrication and
3 condition. But what MK will be bringing back to us is
4 recommendations on whether that's enough or whether they
5 need more detail or whether they really want to field
6 check it because they don't trust the information for
7 some reason.

8 MR. BROOKE: And the third point, which I
9 was really pleased to see in here, John said that those
10 studies are three years old. You refer to latest and
11 greatest, best technology in here. I don't know what
12 the state of the art is these days, but they're in there
13 with x-rays and so forth that they didn't have the
14 ability to do three years ago.

15 So I'm pleased by that, and I hope that is
16 followed through, that if there is new technology out
17 there, that it's used and I guess I would expect them to
18 use what's available.

19 MR. O'QUINN: Now there's two major areas we
20 talked about -- retaining walls and guard walls. There
21 are other parts of this that are going to come out --
22 pavement condition, whether or not we're going to have
23 additional pull-outs for capacity and additional parking
24 facilities and those types of things. It's on the
25 fringe of getting our historic friends nervous over

1 here.

2 But there are things that are going to be
3 involved in the study with regard to analysis and
4 evaluation and recommendations coming out beyond those
5 two major geotechnical types.

6 MR. BRASHER: Isn't there like 10 or 11
7 things that we've identified? After they go through and
8 do the basics they may come -- MK may come back and say,
9 yeah, we agree or don't agree, but they can also say but
10 we suggest that you also look at this area and this
11 area.

12 MR. KILPATRICK: I want you to think about
13 the scope of work. I mean, that's pretty far out there
14 on the limb for a government agency to do that, because
15 we generally like to know what's up front. And so
16 that's how we are trying to arrive at a method for this
17 group and independent consultation with MK to come up
18 with where we need to go.

19 MR. BABB: What we're saying is, if we agree
20 on what we want MK to start with, in other words, let's
21 just say hypothetically you agree with us that we want
22 that independent evaluation of the reports that are done
23 and then their findings and recommendations of where we
24 go from here, then we would make sure that would be
25 covered. And that's the first task we would do. And to

1 me, I think that's very, very important right now. And
2 then their recommendation on where we go from there
3 would be, to me, the deliberations the group really
4 needs to have input into.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Where are you on the green
6 sheet? That first task?

7 MR. KILPATRICK: B1 and B2. Concurrence on
8 that, yes. That's our first direction for this first
9 task.

10 MR. O'QUINN: Where are the other
11 engineering items identified?

12 MR. BABB: We're coming to that. Let me
13 just finish this, okay, because we're going to come to
14 that. Then, if you go to "C", it's more or less the
15 same situation. And, again, that was our best scope on
16 what we thought for the economic or socioeconomic. It
17 really hasn't been reviewed by MK's staff or their
18 technical experts, so obviously there's input there.
19 But, again, we think that starts with input and making
20 recommendations with the consultants.

21 MR. JACKSON: Would you be explain what each
22 of these items means to you?

23 MR. BABB: I'll try. I need help from --
24 because we had -- the person that helped us put it
25 together was an economic expert, so I'll try to go

1 through them and John and others can help out here.

2 The first one is the economic analysis of
3 the areas in Glacier and Canada, meaning the local area,
4 and how they -- pretty obvious, I guess, how the
5 inter-businesses effect would be affected by what we're
6 doing there. And then sort of look at banding on how
7 that changes as you go out for a radius from the Park
8 itself.

9 MR. JACKSON: Do you mean all businesses or
10 some business?

11 MR. BABB: John has something to say, too.
12 But I guess that gets down to the key decision, as I as
13 a lay person in economics, is, do we do that just like
14 you said, by general business type as example or do we
15 really gather that information, if all 17 of you folks
16 had a business, and do we go talk to each of you
17 individuals as a business and try to get that level of
18 information?

19 MR. JACKSON: And if I'm an engineering
20 consulting business and not involved in this project,
21 would you bother asking me questions about my business
22 because of the spinoff effects of the project? I mean,
23 those are some of the things that I'm curious about.

24 MR. KILPATRICK: I guess we're looking for
25 feedback on that, because we're not economists. I mean,

1 that first element gets down to pretty much a
2 micro-level. Honestly, we don't know if that's too
3 much, too little, and we're looking for some feedback
4 from this committee as to where do we go.

5 MR. JACKSON: Do you intend to go to each business and
6 survey them and ask them business questions about what
7 they do and how much they sell their products for and
8 how much they make and who they hire and what they pay?

9 MR. GASKILL: I talked to Jean Townsend --
10 or she actually talked to me about some of her ideas as
11 to what she had heard, and it's obviously a secondhand
12 knowledge of what she sought, and now it's my turn to
13 represent that. But she kind of expressed to me that
14 there seemed to be interest in having a little more the
15 Committee take on in not necessarily identifying the
16 impact to a business but an impact, say, West Glacier or
17 to Kalispell, that type of thing, as opposed to the
18 overall area there was some interest in that.

19 And as long as I'm at it, she also gave me a
20 couple of requests that would be very valuable to her in
21 order to follow up that type of questions and issues,
22 and that would be questions to everyone on the Committee
23 on what their particular socioeconomic issues are or
24 what they might talk to. So I might hand out that so
25 you can fill it out at some point. So that's her

1 thought.

2 MR. BAKER: Again, "C" would be the same as
3 the engineering study. It would be going to MK, to
4 their socioeconomic division to go through that and say,
5 okay, these are the basics that you've asked us to look
6 at. However, in example item one, we think that item
7 one you need to include this or this or this or this.
8 Am I right?

9 MR. KILPATRICK: We'd like some of that same
10 feedback from you folks -- tourism, economics viewpoints
11 -- so that we get off on the right foot so that we're
12 giving MK the direction that is required to provide you
13 the information you need to make that decision.

14 This is a kind of a side note, on this
15 Townsend one, of questions I asked her during the
16 interview. Have you ever gone back to the committees
17 that you have done those analyses for and verified what
18 you did was right or not. And her comments was, yes, I
19 have just recently done that.

20 So I was trying to gets some idea of her
21 reliability of information and her predictions. But
22 what we're looking for is that same feedback, from you
23 as well as MK, so that we do the right thing.

24 MR. BROOKE: A little bit of a comment and
25 probably a question hidden somewhere in the comment:

1 When the businesses that were potentially going to be
2 affected by the first idea that came -- or the draft
3 plan that came out in the notion of closing the road and
4 there was economic impacts associated with that that the
5 Park had projected based on various studies and ideas
6 and concepts, that was one of the things that really got
7 people going, is they said your numbers are way off,
8 they're way low. And that's about as much as we can
9 tell you, is they're too low.

10 I guess my question is, we go out and we do
11 another study and we come up with a different number,
12 maybe bigger, so then what? What is the impact of
13 that? Is it because we have to analyze the economic
14 impacts based on NEPA and we have to do alternatives
15 based on those kinds of economic impacts? Is that what
16 we're doing with those studies?

17 MR. JACKSON: I'd like to take a crack at
18 that, the other part about -- was these alternatives.
19 Now, let me just take a couple of -- suppose if we
20 directed the construction season through plowing,
21 allowed the road to be open two months a year; just as
22 an idea that would be an alternative.

23 And a second alternative might be to have it
24 open three times a year but letting traveling half way
25 each day. And each of those would have an impact on the

1 related businesses, I think. And in those cases it
2 would be important to balance which one of those had the
3 greatest impact and on how the construction costs varied
4 between the two of them. So I think that's why you'd
5 wanted to have that kind of information, to kind of help
6 them make the right kind of decisions. So that's the
7 first thing.

8 Then the second thing is, the next one says
9 something about mitigation. And I presume that means
10 some kind of business assistance and what do you mean by
11 that. But I think that's what it means, and I think in
12 order to do that you have to have a baseline of how
13 businesses are doing before you start to talk about
14 mitigation. And that suggests -- and I might also add
15 that I think some businesses won't get too hurt,
16 depending on the traffic flows. In fact, some might do
17 better, and I'm not sure they would be the same
18 candidates for mitigation in those actions.

19 So I think once you get into mitigation,
20 then you've got to worry about who should get it and how
21 much and under what circumstances, what should trigger
22 that. And I think you have to have good information for
23 that, too, if that's what it means.

24 MR. BABB: Is there a way to interpret
25 programs or personal services or whatever might be to

1 actually keep the people here and have a drawing card.

2 MR. BAKER: Again, we can make those impact
3 comments; right.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: In terms of specifics, as I
5 understand it, is we're going to have this more general
6 document now and we're going to get recommendations from
7 MK. We will then discuss their recommendations and at
8 that point we can give them specific recommendations on
9 additional studies we think ought to be included. Is
10 that right?

11 MR. BABB: Exactly.

12 MR. O'QUINN: Going back and looking at what
13 was item one and two, one was talking, looking at what
14 information you have and making recommendations. But
15 two actually starts work. It starts developing
16 alternatives. Now, is that in your first task package?

17 MR. BABB: No. In other words, that would
18 be part of the recommendation, and as we sort of hinted
19 around, is when they come back with the recommendations
20 we look at those recommendations in regard to how we
21 have this defined, and obviously whatever decisions are
22 made from that discussion, this would be modified. And
23 let's say, hypothetically, number two backs
24 alternatives. Then we'd go ahead and write the next
25 task order or ask MK to begin that task.

1 MR. O'QUINN: I would think this committee
2 would be very proactive. I think the local people here
3 have very good insight on suggestions that could be very
4 helpful to MK and in developing alternatives to be
5 evaluated.

6 MR. BABB: Yes. I would also agree that
7 when we talked this morning about doing scoping, now
8 that would be their input and where we go from now and
9 also sharing the findings and recommendations from their
10 independent analysis of existing data.

11 MR. O'QUINN: And you're talking probably
12 about September time frame on that, I'm going to guess.

13 MR. BABB: We were pushing it again to being
14 that May time frame to get their analysis done and
15 recommendations done by that time.

16 MR. O'QUINN: Wait a minute. I thought May,
17 you were getting recommendations.

18 MR. BABB: Part of that is laying out the
19 whole sequence in regard to how we approach the job.
20 That was my definition.

21 MR. O'QUINN: Again, what I understood was
22 one of the things that would come out of their May to-do
23 list would be the whatever and then say they need to
24 fill up alternatives just like here. You've then got to
25 turn around with our input and give them that task

1 package to begin.

2 MR. BABB: Yes.

3 MR. O'QUINN: So once they start developing
4 these alternatives, that gets the public involved in the
5 process, gets us back and going, and they're not going
6 to be doing that by May.

7 MR. BABB: No, they're not going to be doing
8 that by May. Let me explain how I see it. In essence,
9 they'd go and evaluate all the reports on this
10 socioeconomic and engineering. They would come back and
11 say here's how we feel about that resource information,
12 good, bad, what other things need to be done. They'd
13 further come back and say, based on that, here's how we
14 see the sequence that we talked about here today in
15 March, how that modifies that schedule, how that
16 modifies that scope.

17 And what I'm saying on top of that, if the
18 scoping occurs at that time, then we can share with the
19 public those findings or recommendations and maybe
20 dovetail the two processes so that we're getting
21 everybody's input in regards to how we proceed from
22 there.

23 And I really don't know how detailed MK's
24 recommendations may be. They might identify other
25 things that we might have to do with resource or other

1 extreme, geez, it looks pretty good, we don't need to do
2 much.

3 MR. O'QUINN: What I would do is come back
4 and tell you what additional studies you need and then
5 give you an approach to how to do the work. And that is
6 where two is going to come in. Then at that point they
7 get authorized on a scope of work, you get an agreement
8 and start the work, so that sometime after that that
9 these alternatives start to be developed. Which I'm
10 suggesting you're talking about the September time
11 frame.

12 MR. BABB: You're right. I'm sorry. I
13 misunderstood you.

14 Somebody else have a question?

15 MR. BAKER: The main time frame, once we get
16 back from MK their suggestions and alternatives, this is
17 what we feel you should do? Are you saying that we as a
18 committee should involve the public at that point to
19 give us some feedback so that then we can take in what
20 we've heard and then make our recommendations based on
21 if we want to do this extra?

22 MR. BABB: I'm not sure. But how do I
23 answer that. What I'm saying is, if we really believe
24 -- and you're going to talk about this later under
25 Craig's schedule. But if we really believe we want to

1 start the compliance process and decision process, then,
2 in essence, during that time frame, maybe roughly, maybe
3 a little faster, that's where we may be doing scoping
4 with the more general public. So that information will
5 be more of less coming together as the professional
6 recommendations in regard to the data, and there's an
7 opportunity to coordinate those as a key decision
8 point.

9 MR. KILPATRICK: I think there's another
10 element to that, though. You guys have the ability to
11 communicate directly with the public and receive
12 comments from the public, and there's a lot of ways you
13 can achieve that. And I think Craig will probably
14 address that through some of their website abilities,
15 through newspapers, through soliciting some comments
16 back from the public on what direction the committee is
17 looking at going.

18 That kind of comes back to some of the
19 Chairman's role on how you folks decide to communicate
20 with the public. You may want to do an interview that
21 says here's what we're doing, here's what we are looking
22 at and we want your public feed- back, and get it that
23 way. So I think there is a lot of ways you can address
24 the public outside the process.

25 MR. O'QUINN: The only place I think that

1 we're different on it is, I don't see how, until we give
2 the consult or you give the consult a slip of work and a
3 contract to start the next phase, you're going to start
4 your formal scoping process. It would be after that
5 that you would start, after they get the next task is
6 when you start the normal scoping process, start some of
7 the public meetings as part of their developing
8 alternatives.

9 But it wouldn't be in that time frame when
10 they are trying to get a list of projects between now
11 and May that additional studies that need to be done.

12 MR. BABB: I think that's a great example of
13 what the Committee would like to see happen, then.
14 That's the type of information that we need. I don't
15 know how everybody else feels. I think that's right
16 on. They're the type of answers we need or parameters
17 to work within.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other comments on
19 Barney's observations?

20 Probably wouldn't be looking for public
21 input until, at least, we hear back from MK the end of
22 May on what additional studies they recommend.

23 Any other thoughts from Committee members?

24 MR. BAKER: What's going to happen is we're
25 going to be sitting in front of a public forum and we're

1 going to be saying, well, we haven't figured that out
2 yet, that information isn't here yet or we're still
3 waiting for that.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: They don't have anything to
5 react to.

6 MR. BABB: So we'll go that way, then.

7 Going through the last portion of it, the
8 "D" and "E" needs a little more work. Under "D,"
9 obviously we have to update, after all that's happened
10 since we wrote this original draft, and provide a little
11 meat to that.

12 Under "E," again we've wrote more of a
13 detailed scope for transportation and visitor use, but,
14 in essence, it would follow the same format as we
15 discussed with the other two, at least in my opinion.
16 We would be assessing those documents that we have done
17 on transportation and MK making some recommendations on
18 what we do next.

19 If you look at the next one, which is
20 "Project Schedule Roles and Responsibilities," I don't
21 know what I did when I put that chart together. I would
22 never use that. But what I tried to do this morning is
23 simplify that so that we have some key milestones, and
24 then, ultimately, as we do the individual task orders
25 that's where we would put the specifics down on schedule

1 and how we are doing that. So each task order is sort
2 of an amendment to this type of document.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You mean you think you've
4 revised this? Is that what you're saying?

5 MR. BABB: I think I need to revise it because I don't
6 think people would use it and we would be changing it
7 all the time because it's too detailed. I think there
8 has to be some more general parameters and give them,
9 the contractor, as well as yourselves and us, a little
10 bit of flexibility so that -- we have certain milestones
11 are due by certain times, but how we get there, there's
12 a little flexibility in.

13 MS. KREMENIK: Could I just ask for a
14 clarification? Under "E" where you've got the
15 Transportation, Visitor Plan and Environmental Impact
16 Statement, wouldn't it be clearer to break those two out
17 since you've already started the ball rolling on the
18 transportation portion?

19 MR. BABB: I agree. Good point. And I
20 guess that's another key decision, not to decide now,
21 but in regards to, generally, do we make it -- well, I
22 guess what we'd be saying is we wait for MK Centennial
23 to decide what level of compliance might be needed, and
24 that all we would be saying here is we know you have to
25 do compliance but we still have it separated out.

1 So we'll do that. We'll drop the EIS but
2 make sure everybody knows we have to do compliance.

3 MR. KILPATRICK: Just kind of a note on the
4 schedule, one of the formats that we might discuss with
5 MK is using a timeline bar chart format so that it's
6 graphical so we can get an idea of how we're tracking
7 resources; what the milestones are; what the critical
8 path is that we need to follow, so that you have good
9 feedback as to, if one of those project elements falls
10 behind schedule, we'll know whether it's going to impact
11 our end dates, and using some real project management
12 tools.

13 MR. SHIREMAN: It's not necessarily a bad
14 thing to have this level of detail in the project
15 agreement that you're seeing now, because it gives you a
16 better understanding of how some of those individual
17 tasks might be formatted. And you might want to look at
18 that list and identify those things that you see as high
19 priorities, from the need standpoint, and highlight
20 those and identify those things that you think you're
21 going to need information on early in the process or
22 when you're going to need those, so that the individual
23 task orders can be written with that in mind.

24 MR. BABB: Good point. The next one dealing
25 with warranty or commitment, that tries to get a handle

1 of how we modify a scope. And what that in essence is
2 saying is, anybody can make a suggestion to the overall
3 general scope we have, and it tries to define a process
4 that we go about in getting concurrence and agreement on
5 that scope. And what it says -- and probably however
6 you guys decide to work with us, how we're going to
7 interface will have a bearing on how this section is
8 finally written; we'll probably modify it.

9 But, in essence, it says that anybody
10 desiring a change gets that to me, and then it's my
11 responsibility to work with the other key players to
12 make sure there's buy-in on that change and people know
13 the ramifications of that change. And that's, in
14 essence, what that says. And obviously when you're
15 working with a committee that has 17 members you have to
16 figure out if that's going to work or what else might
17 work to achieve that. But the bottom line is try to
18 make sure everybody's on the same page and nobody's
19 surprised.

20 The last part, "Other Participants," we have
21 the two decision people, and within the Park Service
22 with a magnitude of job like this, the Regional Director
23 is part of that ultimate decision along with the
24 Superintendent. So that's why you see two people
25 shown.

1 We then, like we said this morning, have
2 taken those people that we think as of right now have
3 the most importance in regards to getting this project
4 out the door. Under the core planning and design team
5 -- and we might not have all the people, but they are
6 the ones that we've identified that are really the core
7 group. And you'll see the National Park Service and
8 you'll see that there's five people listed there.
9 They're more or less all the Glacier, except the last
10 one, which is Ed Tafoya, and we're using the contracting
11 process through the Denver Service Center, so Ed Tafoya
12 is our contracting officer. And I'm the contracting
13 officer's representative, or the COR. And so, in other
14 words, between the two of us we're the ones that provide
15 the direction to MK Centennial and negotiate with MK
16 Centennial. And that's what Rick was talking about
17 earlier today and yesterday, that's our process in
18 contracting and that's the way it's set up now. And so
19 anything we ask MK Centennial to do or negotiate with
20 them, has to go through those two individuals.

21 Then Dick Gatten is the coordinator for
22 Federal Highways and responsible -- as Barney was
23 saying, if we need some technical expertise or something
24 else, he's responsible for bringing that to the table
25 from Federal Highway. But he's our point of contact

1 with Federal Highways.

2 Then we listed Bauman as the principal
3 responsible for doing more or less the same thing with
4 MK Centennial, being the overall orchestrator or
5 coordinator for the consultants.

6 And then it comes to you folks where we have
7 everybody listed, and this is a hard task, I think.
8 Maybe you guys will come up with a great simple way to
9 do it. But how do we take your body and develop that
10 interface with this group of people? Do we take one of
11 you? Is that the chairperson's responsibility to work
12 directly with us? Do we go with committees like our
13 subcommittees, like John and Rick were saying, where we
14 go by product or something?

15 But, in essence, how do we plug you into the
16 process and make sure there's a continuum there as
17 opposed to just the two or three meetings that we have,
18 because we would really like to maintain that dialogue,
19 and I think you guys would, too. We don't want to just
20 come to a few meetings and have you review things. We
21 want you, hopefully, to roll up your sleeves and really
22 help us and be in some of these brainstorming sessions,
23 et cetera.

24 And so that's another key decision.

25 And then, ultimately, the last column were the other

1 participants and consultants. As an example, MK
2 Centennial has a whole series of consultants but we have
3 to go ahead and have them on this list, also.

4 And that's pretty much what we have here. And,
5 again, the next task is to decide what we want to do
6 from this and write those task orders with MK Centennial
7 so they can continue to move forward. I hope that
8 helps, or if anybody else wants to add, go ahead.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any questions for Fred?

10 MS. KREMENIK: I have one more question
11 under Scope. When they start the road, will MK be doing
12 that study? Does that need to be added to the scope
13 section?

14 MR. BABB: That's a good question, too. We
15 do plan to add that onto the scope. And as of now,
16 we've contacted the Denver Service Center. They cannot
17 do it. They've helped us develop a scope for that which
18 we have to incorporate into this. We've contacted some
19 of the consultants that they recommended. They are also
20 filled up. We've talked briefly with MK Centennial.
21 But, yes, we plan to talk to them about doing that on
22 Friday when we get into the scope.

23 And probably we would do something similar
24 there. We would show them what we have done so far and
25 we would show them how we envision doing that job and

1 that -- and we're just saying, Jack, the format that we
2 follow in cultural landscape or historic reports; see
3 whether they buy into that and then come back and
4 recommend the time frame on what it takes to do
5 something like that and whether we have enough money.

6 MR. BROOKE: You asked about the
7 communication, and I notice without exception all the
8 members have an e-mail address. And I'm curious how the
9 members feel about trying to, as you say, roll up your
10 sleeves and work on this thing and communicate by using
11 that media, if it's realistic or not. It's very
12 realistic to me. In fact, I like that kind of stuff
13 because I don't have to play phone tag and deal with
14 phone calls.

15 So I guess it's a general question to the
16 committee, if that is something they'd utilize and
17 whether it would be effective in this way.

18 MR. DAKIN: I'd prefer that, too. And I
19 wonder if we couldn't figure out some way where a
20 question developed, Fred, you as project leader thought
21 that there's a matter that needs to be run by the
22 Advisory Committee, and then in consultation with Randy
23 would say, yeah, that's something we should have all the
24 members give us an opinion on and then electronically
25 try to navigate that. It's so convenient. It's cheap

1 and it doesn't interrupt everybody's schedules, and I
2 think we could really make it work.

3 I also like the idea of a secure Internet
4 connection somewhere where we could talk back and forth
5 about questions that were raised to us. I think four
6 years from now this will be how everything's done, and
7 I'm not afraid to give it a try now.

8 MR. BABB: I think the one key thing in
9 regard to doing that, is I think that's fine. But the
10 tough thing is we're asking a question, and -- using the
11 example that was given -- we need input, we need to see
12 whether this is a good idea, is how then, as Rick said
13 before, how do we consolidate that opinion in a fairly
14 fast time frame so that we keep moving.

15 MR. DAKIN: My other question is, are we in
16 any way not doing things public enough.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: That's the question I was
18 going to mention at this point. Keep in mind that all
19 of your meetings and all of your recommendations need to
20 be subject to discussion among the Committee and open to
21 the public. So if you went with a mechanism that was
22 not a face-to-face meeting in terms of that discussion
23 point, you would have to consider how the public
24 involvement and the public attendance could be
25 formulated.

1 Now that does not mean -- and I'm dealing
2 here, or we're all dealing here, with legislation that
3 predated the establishment of electronic transmission
4 and communication. There may be some opportunities for
5 you to consider, for example, establishment of
6 electronic reading rooms, of threads-of-chat-room kind
7 of process where you could come into a central location,
8 allow for that information or that conversation to be
9 published in an electronic format.

10 But you do need to consider that in terms of
11 the continuing process of making recommendations, formal
12 recommendations back to the Park Service.

13 MR. KILPATRICK: I might suggest having MK
14 at least illustrate for you their abilities in those
15 fields.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Before we go with Craig, it
17 seems to me that we have two different issues here that
18 we have to decide on. It sounded to me like Fred was
19 suggesting sort of a list of people that were going to
20 be in fairly regular consultation on this project and
21 he's got people noted for the Park Service, the Highways
22 and MK.

23 So then the question is, who from our
24 Committee or is the whole Committee going to be involved
25 in real regular consultation. What are your thoughts?

1 MR. BAKER: A possibility may be that we
2 have two distinct areas, it seems, as we're dealing with
3 this program, one of the engineering aspect of it and
4 the other is socioeconomic aspect. It could be looked
5 at of setting up two small committees of individuals
6 whose primary interest is in the socioeconomic aspect of
7 it, people who have background in that. And
8 additionally same with the engineering side of it. They
9 could be the subcommittees that could be working with
10 the groups that are established.

11 The way of communication could be both
12 through e-mail to the other members of the Committee
13 from those subcommittees -- but maybe we should be
14 establishing -- to get to the public input end of it,
15 maybe we should be researching setting up a web site
16 where people who want information on what's going on can
17 be updated on a weekly basis on a web site. Because at
18 least we're attempting to get it out into the public
19 domain.

20 That's not to preclude that we have public
21 meetings, because we should, but at least any ongoing --
22 or even update the web site once a month or whatever.
23 At least it will get it out there.

24 But those two separate committees could
25 insure that you're focusing on the two areas, but

1 everybody's getting input.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any thoughts on Brian's
3 suggestion there?

4 MS. PAHL: I think it's a good one. I think
5 there are going to be some pieces of the conversation
6 you can do electronically and some require face-to-face
7 because you change your mind based on comments you hear
8 from other folks. So I think we also need to maybe
9 prioritize the level of decisions, those that can be
10 handled with conversations over the phone and through
11 e-mail, and those that really are significant enough
12 that they need to be deliberated in a face-to-face
13 setting.

14 MR. BABB: May I just add one thing? I
15 think what Brian said is right, but I think you might
16 even want to look broader. We are going to be looking
17 at, like, the landscape or the historic report. Which
18 one does that fall into, or do you want something
19 separate? We're not going to fill out the public
20 involvement right now, but a few months from now we're
21 going to be doing the scoping. Do we want to do the
22 same thing, where there's a smaller group that we really
23 work with in regards to setting up and running the
24 public involvement program?

25 MS. PAHL: I actually think the historic

1 goes with the engineering. And I'm concerned with them
2 being separated, actually.

3 And the other question I have for you is on
4 your consultant in cultural resources. And I have this
5 terrible feeling that your cultural consultant's an
6 archeologist. Not that I'm opposed to archeology, but
7 when you have the same person's name listed under
8 history, archeology, anthropology, I have this feeling
9 that that person is back on his archeology. Is that
10 correct?

11 MR. GASKILL: Names we have on there was
12 when we originally put the team together and we asked
13 our consultants to give us a name and we kind of went
14 through those names and put some names down. Since
15 we've put that together -- and we need to update that
16 list -- they've given us all these names of people that
17 really are more appropriate for this than what we
18 originally had.

19 In fact, Kathy McCay was here, and I didn't
20 even realize she was on the list. But the real cultural
21 person that we would like to put on this is another
22 person from Washington State, I think would be too far
23 to bring him in for this. So what we can do is get a
24 list of, actually, all the people who were on there.

25 MS. PAHL: That would be terrific. If

1 you're going to have them do the historic road study,
2 then the person that's actually doing that is --

3 MR. GASKILL: We actually had two firms that
4 did this work a lot so we'll get that list from both of
5 those firms.

6 MS. PAHL: You've got your historic people
7 and you've got your historic people.

8 MR. BABB: Can I just add one thing to that?
9 That's a good example. If you see something that you
10 think needs to be added to the team, that's another
11 thing we can do. And using the cultural landscape
12 thing, Jack Gordon's found out there's a local firm, and
13 maybe Jack remembers the name -- HRA that has done those
14 type of reports and they're right in Missoula. And the
15 feedback that we've got is they've done excellent work.

16 Again, we can ask the AME whether there's a
17 way that we would like to try to go with one of blank X
18 amount of firms.

19 MR. GASKILL: And we have added firms in the
20 past to our team to fill areas that we really thought we
21 need as things came up.

22 MR. BROOKE: I really like Brian's notion of
23 a web site. And I don't know if it's realistic or not,
24 but in terms of the public involvement issue, I could
25 envision that here's where the Committee is presently or

1 here's where the project is presently, here is a
2 question that was posed to the Committee, here has been
3 the Committee's response, so it's all out there and you
4 can access it, you can read it. Having the public
5 comment further on that is probably a technical thing in
6 terms of volume that I don't tend to understand.

7 But the other issue that Brian raised, I do
8 have a concern about is in terms of split committees and
9 splitting the engineering from the socioeconomic. I
10 have a concern with that, in that may have happened
11 before and may be one of the reasons we got to where, at
12 least, I didn't want to be. And I think those have to
13 be pretty carefully integrated, and if one gets too far
14 ahead or behind the other, you can you start losing some
15 of that integration. Because what you do in the
16 engineering is directly going to affect the
17 socioeconomic side.

18 MR. KILPATRICK: That's one reason why we
19 picked one full-service firm, so that we would have that
20 integration.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we still need to
22 address the notion of how the group is going to
23 communicate with our committee in a manageable way. And
24 I wonder about this citing -- I'll just toss it out for
25 your thought. But we have David over here, is kind of

1 our economist and Barney is our engineer and Barbara is
2 our historic person. I'm wondering if maybe we don't
3 pick a subcommittee consisting of those three people, or
4 something like that. That would not be separating out
5 the different specialties or interests, and yet it would
6 give a more manageable group to communicate with on
7 behalf of our committee. And those seem to be the areas
8 of expertise that we would want to have having the input
9 more regularly.

10 I just toss that out for your thoughts. Any
11 suggestions or comment on that?

12 MR. JACKSON: I think that some people have
13 strong interests in the economic analysis and that that
14 could be a subcommittee. There could be other people
15 that have strong interests in the engineering analysis
16 and that could be a subcommittee, too, just as a
17 separate idea.

18 And I think that to put the three experts
19 together will just feel cozier, and then other people
20 will wonder what we have been up to the on the
21 Committee. So I think it's better to be straight and
22 get the people that are concerned with what's going on
23 with economic analysis in the past kind of huddle and
24 come up with some recommendations and then come back to
25 the committee with those.

1 And I would think that we could do some of
2 that by e-mail, but we should save it all and forward
3 all that to the Committee. That seems like a reasonable
4 way of doing it.

5 MR. O'QUINN: I'm a little uncomfortable
6 with the subcommittee structure, because local interest
7 is a definite important part of this, and it's kind of a
8 fabric that's got this thing going. And if we are
9 talking about using e-mail, you can put all the
10 addresses in there and hit the button one time and
11 they've all got it. That doesn't mean that everybody's
12 got to respond, but everybody's got access to the
13 information. And if they've got an interest in it, they
14 can spit their two cents' worth in. If they haven't,
15 they don't have to do anything.

16 But I kind of like the idea, as remote as
17 this thing is anyway and as few meetings as we're going
18 to be having, keep information forwarded to everyone,
19 not to say that you've got to react to everything that
20 comes across your computer screen.

21 MS. SEXTON: Could I add something to that,
22 that if that is done, there's revised information, some
23 in great detail, some not so much, that summaries be
24 provided so that as we screen through that information,
25 look through it and we can read a summary and say, oh,

1 I'd like to look at this more in-depth, that people can,
2 or if you have a particular interest you can look at it
3 in depth. But, at least from my standpoint, it would be
4 very helpful to have summaries of information that come
5 out, because I don't think we're all going to read
6 everything.

7 MR. BABB: What we have when we have those
8 people underlined that are sort of the key, is part of
9 their responsibility is communicating within their
10 division and consolidating comments. So when we form a
11 committee, let's just say we follow that scenario where
12 there's three or four people that forms that committee,
13 they are going to have a role of trying to consolidate,
14 trying to provide input, trying to consolidate
15 comments. So they will have some tasks the same as the
16 other ones of us that are underlying.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I gather we're saying
18 we don't like the subcommittee notion.

19 MR. BROOKE: I would join in that. Kind of
20 joking around, but I tend to agree with Barney. That's
21 kind of the neat thing about this committee, is it's
22 sort of wide cross section and if we have an interest in
23 something we can jump in, and if not -- I'm going to
24 listen pretty carefully what the economist says, but I'm
25 also going to pick up on what somebody else might say

1 that he hasn't thought of.

2 MR. DAKIN: I kind of think that as I tried
3 to imagine how these various scenarios might play out --
4 you used a word earlier, Barney, that kind of stuck with
5 me, and that's micro-management. And I'm not sure that
6 this committee either needs to or ought to be quite
7 concerned with this process in such detail as we seem to
8 be thinking we ought to be. We have all these people
9 that as taxpayers we -- professional park people,
10 professional engineers, professional everybody that
11 we're hiring to go out and get this data and everything,
12 and I don't really feel either the need or the desire to
13 need to check on them all the time.

14 I'm trying to imagine something that they
15 would need us to resolve in the next three to four
16 months and frankly can't come up with that. If we spent
17 our remaining time here getting comfortable with what
18 they were going to do before we had our next meeting X
19 number of months down the road and just simply were kept
20 up to date with new material as it comes in, that's
21 adequate for me, frankly.

22 MR. BAKER: Maybe I should just explain this
23 split subcommittee a little bit further. Maybe this
24 will allay your fears of it.

25 When you have a group as large as this,

1 there runs the risk of people, not that are saying I
2 didn't get that piece or I didn't get that information
3 or I didn't quite understand it or whatever, it happens
4 all the time. And all I was saying is, if you split
5 this into two small subcommittees -- it doesn't have to
6 be three or four. Let's start simple, just do it with
7 two. And the engineering side, sure, there's going to
8 be different people -- historical, et cetera. There
9 would be one person on that subcommittee who would have
10 the underlying -- it would be the key person. Okay?

11 In other words, we would have two people
12 that would be sitting with your committee -- or with the
13 Committee, and it is the responsibility of that -- we'll
14 call it the mini-chair of the subcommittee, to e-mail
15 all the rest of the members of the Committee what they
16 are talking about. Because when you deal in
17 subcommittees and you have light people discussing light
18 subjects, the synergies sometimes come up with stuff you
19 wouldn't have thought of otherwise.

20 And that's the only reason I said that. In
21 the socioeconomic you could get four or five people from
22 different aspects, local or far away or whatever, and
23 they start brainstorming, coming up with stuff, I don't
24 think you would generally get that in as big a group as
25 we have or just off an e-mail sending us information.

1 That's the only reason why I suggested that.

2 MS. KREMENIK: It was suggested you could
3 send the teams as you need them to address issues; if
4 you feel you need to, as chair person, call on
5 engineering expertise and take people from the
6 Committee, that you could use your discretion to call
7 that group and report back to the whole. It doesn't
8 seem at the moment we have a need to establish that at
9 this time. Perhaps we just leave that on the books as a
10 recommendation we can call a task team.

11 MR. GASKILL: We had thought about this
12 before in terms of the rest of today and tomorrow, that
13 there were a number of tasks at hand that we thought
14 probably needed to be accomplished by the Committee.
15 And we had thought that we could probably form some sub-
16 groups to actually form some tasks for the task
17 committee. And that's still something you might want to
18 think about and maybe test how well the subcommittees
19 work.

20 MS. KREMENIK: It's a little easier if you
21 got your task at hand and you know who all is on that
22 group.

23 And if I could just add one more point on
24 communication, I've got e-mail and all the other
25 electronic gadgets. I think the committee would want to

1 put something on the books at this point that outlines
2 maybe newsletter or some other kind of snail mail
3 communication, as we move into more of a complex arena;
4 that we are going to get requests for information that
5 are not in that electronic format, so we at least have
6 it on the books right now. This is a suggestion.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What about Jayne's
8 suggestion, then, rather than going --

9 MR. McDONALD: I would make a motion to
10 bring forth Jayne's suggestion for a vote.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Second.

12 MS. SEXTON: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Discussion?

14 MR. JACKSON: Consensus.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All of those in favor of the
16 motion say aye.

17 (All say aye.)

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What we will do then is we
19 will assemble ad hoc groups as needed when a question
20 comes up, depending upon the area of endeavor.

21 MR. BABB: So does that mean for now, in
22 essence, you're the person that's underlined as who is
23 the point of contact unless you guys decide you need
24 separate committees?

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes.

1 All right. Now, if we could finish up with
2 this communicating topic while we're on it, what is the
3 preferred way to communicate with the Committee? Is it
4 e-mail? Is that everybody's preference? Anybody that
5 does not like to communicate or does not want to
6 communicate by e-mail?

7 MS. KREMENIK: Could I ask you where the
8 communication would come from? Is it from you or from
9 your support staff? We've just had a lot of problems
10 with servers and things like that. They need to make a
11 non-response among the Committee members that they
12 weren't interested in what you're sending out as opposed
13 to having received it. Just to make sure that there's
14 some check on that.

15 MR. DAKIN: It would be a lot to ask Randy
16 as Chairman to be responsible for anything at that
17 level. I really think that if there's some kind of
18 communication that needs to be sent out, that I'm
19 assuming Fred and Fred's staff would be at Randy's
20 disposal to do that.

21 MR. BABB: I think what we've said is we
22 want to see what MK has to offer.

23 MR. GASKILL: I just want to hear some of
24 the things that are out there that we are volunteering
25 to do.

1 And MK thinks that we actually do pretty
2 good on our web pages, but we've learned from data that
3 they actually do much more than what we do, which is
4 really state-of-the-art technology from the web page
5 development design.

6 And we talked about this bulletin board, the
7 ability to have a site out there that everyone on the
8 Committee could access that site and pass information
9 back and forth, which is actually web site. Or there
10 would be an additional layer that would allow access by
11 everyone on the project team and an additional on top of
12 that that will allow access by everyone in the public.
13 And there could be different layers within that so just
14 by typing in your name and your access code you could
15 get to whatever layer you need to get to.

16 So those are all technologies that are
17 certainly available. There is a problem with e-mail
18 that sometimes you don't know whether it goes to you or
19 not, but the web page, as long as you have access to the
20 Internet you can get onto this web page.

21 MR. O'QUINN: Can you link that to the
22 Glacier National Park?

23 MR. GASKILL: We had talked to Glacier
24 National Park, and I believe they said that would be
25 appropriate to do that.

1 Just about any type of technology
2 capabilities that are out there today, we have the
3 ability to provide that for you.

4 MR. BAKER: If we're going to use e-mail,
5 most of the software today there is a down-loadable
6 Adobe 4.0 PDF format where you can add attachments, put
7 them back and forth. Could they have access to that?
8 Because if he wants to send some documents like 20 pages
9 in PDF format, that's the way to send it. And if
10 everybody can get on to that, this stuff would fly
11 great.

12 MR. GASKILL: That PDF Adobe, they provide
13 that free of charge, the actual readable program, so
14 everybody could have access to that. MR.

15 O'QUINN: That would work right, any reports that you
16 were sending out, like he said, that were 10 or 15 pages
17 or just short stuff, you can do it with attachment or
18 documents.

19 MS. PAHL: What format would it be coming
20 in? Would it be Word?

21 MR. GASKILL: That's actually a format
22 itself. You can't actually edit the PDF. We could also
23 send it in a Word format or Word Perfect format; DOS
24 format. I'm sure it does Macintosh format as well.

25 MR. DAKIN: There's nothing wrong with just

1 getting stuff in the mail, too. So actually you can sit
2 in your easy chair and read it, you know. Most of the
3 stuff would have to be all printed out. I can't imagine
4 that we could have to be in that much of a rush that we
5 have to synchronize all our text.

6 MS. KREMENIK: I guess that was my concern,
7 that there was a notice that went out, something that we
8 needed a response from the committee to make a decision
9 on by e-mail or to send something back, that we had some
10 mechanism to make sure that everyone had received that
11 and was able to communicate back.

12 MS. PAHL: Are we actually going to make
13 decisions electronically or just comments
14 electronically?

15 MR. SHIREMAN: You need to be very careful
16 about the decision process without the deliberation of
17 the Committee.

18 And I think that one of the things the
19 Committee needs to think about tomorrow or later on
20 today is sort of a general statement on what you feel
21 are the parameters around which you think that MK
22 Centennial and the Federal Highway and Park Service can
23 receive prior to providing you with additional
24 information on when you need to come back, when you need
25 to be together to make those major decisions. And I

1 heard several people talk about the issue of
2 micro-managing and some of the other concepts. We need
3 to get in your minds a fair perspective on what it is
4 that's going to drive you to come together to make some
5 decisions.

6 MR. MEZMARICH: Along with Jayne's comment,
7 a couple ideas that we can do to insure that this
8 e-mail's received come to mind. One is to have
9 something on the web page that's updated periodically
10 and lets us know that something has to be done, or just
11 the simple thing we do with the kids, the buddy system.
12 We're all, it looks like, on different servers with
13 maybe one exception. We could pair up and have somebody
14 that we're assigned to maybe just open our mail and fire
15 off one page, that you see the e-mail is to the
16 Committee, and if they didn't get it, they would let us
17 know.

18 MR. SLITER: It seems to me that unless
19 somebody is just receiving an e-mail and kicking back
20 and reading it and then letting it go off like water off
21 a duck's back, there's going to be interaction between
22 all of us via e-mail in discussing whatever it is that
23 has just come out. I mean, I don't see these e-mails as
24 being things that come out every day or every week, so
25 if we get one it's going to generate some discussion

1 amongst us.

2 And I guess the only way that somebody would
3 be completely left out of the loop is if, A, they didn't
4 have anybody contact -- well, first of all they didn't
5 get the e-mail, and second of all, not one other member
6 of the Committee contacted them to establish a dialogue
7 over it.

8 So I think that the possibility of somebody
9 getting an e-mail or not getting an e-mail and nobody
10 noticing is fairly remote.

11 It's no different than getting a package, an
12 envelope in the mail. If you're on vacation you're not
13 going to get your mail out of the mailbox, either.

14 MR. BAKER: Your discussion or suggestion of
15 a bulletin board is a good one. A lot of business can
16 get done on that.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Would that be through the
18 Park Service?

19 MR. BAKER: They'd have to set it up.

20 MR. BROOKE: One thing, we need to see what
21 MK can do.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Where are we at on this
23 agreement? Does anybody have additional feedback for
24 Fred as to any changes, deletions that would need to be
25 made to this agreement, "B" or "C" in particular?

1 MR. JACKSON: I have some suggestions, but I
2 didn't think it was ready to go to other ideas.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's what I was going to
4 ask. How should we handle any further input with you on
5 this agreement?

6 MR. BABB: It would seem if people have any
7 additional input, is probably e-mail that to us or to
8 me. And we'll take those comments, in essence, try to
9 incorporate them. But really we won't be making
10 wholesale changes to that until after we get MK
11 Centennial's feedback. But it would be real important
12 to document any ideas that people have now so they're
13 not lost.

14 MR. JACKSON: This part goes right to the
15 heart of this committee's work, and that's to suggest
16 alternatives. And if you're going to close that out
17 now, you're closing out the heart of this committee, and
18 I think you better open it up.

19 MR. BABB: We're not closing off the
20 alternatives. When MK Centennial comes back then we'll
21 reopen this. They're going to come back and give us
22 future directions and we're going to be talking about
23 alternatives between now and when we say, the fall
24 sometime. So it's sort of an open book, at least that's
25 the way I look at it. We're not going to send this out

1 for approval or anything. We're going to hold it.

2 But again, it will be updated and document
3 all of the discussions we've had, and if people have
4 other ideas we'll try to figure out a way to document
5 those.

6 MR. JEWETT: I think the point David was
7 getting at is, that we would like to talk about the
8 scope you've identified before MK comes back to you.

9 MR. BABB: I apologize. Because that's on
10 your list to talk about the scope, right, in detail?

11 MR. GASKILL: It's now on the Committee's
12 list to talk about.

13 MR. BABB: I'm sorry. Between now and when
14 we leave. I'm sorry, David. I didn't understand.
15 Thanks.

16 MR. DAKIN: Fred, there are a few -- I keep
17 looking at page nine, as you say, over detailed
18 schedule, and that's the sort of thing that will really
19 help me get my feet on the ground. But there are some
20 things that can be put in here, right; first of all,
21 that you're expecting, for example, verify existing
22 data. We're going to put a May deadline on that.

23 The engineering study and the socio-
24 economic study are a given because they're mandated in
25 the charter and you have estimated time frames for

1 those. So we could fill in some of those blanks.

2 MR. BABB: That's a good point. If people
3 generally agree on the schedule that we talked about, or
4 whatever comes out of this meeting, we can go ahead and
5 update this. And maybe Rick had a good idea, maybe we
6 do leave the detail because when we come back together
7 it may be a good way to discuss it so we don't lose
8 anything.

9 But yeah, Bill, we can go ahead and do that.
10 That's a good idea.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you want to go ahead with
12 that this afternoon or do you want to sleep on it and
13 talk about specific changes to the agreement tomorrow?

14 MR. DAKIN: I really wouldn't want to get
15 involved in a lay person discussion of when a deadline
16 could be met for some sort of engineering report. But
17 it would sure be nice to get the ones you really could
18 predict onto this sheet, especially when we're going to
19 move into some kind of forecast of future meetings.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I was thinking about
21 the input and data that Tony wants to give on the text
22 of the agreement. Do we want to try to dive into that
23 this afternoon?

24 MR. JEWETT: What tasks do you think we need
25 to complete before we adjourn tomorrow?

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Actually we need to get
2 through this list here, and giving him input on this
3 agreement is one of those things. I think that's one of
4 the primary things we need to do before tomorrow. And
5 we've handled on how we're going to communicate with
6 each other. We need to talk about what we want to do in
7 terms of soliciting and receiving public input into our
8 process. We need to do some prioritizations. I think
9 those are the primary things we need to accomplish.

10 And we need to be available for public
11 comment if there is any by 4:30 this afternoon. I don't
12 know if we have time enough to deal with this this
13 afternoon.

14 MR. GASKILL: No one signed up for public
15 comment this morning.

16 MR. SHIREMAN: That doesn't mean that
17 somebody couldn't come in in a few minutes.

18 MS. PAHL: Are those the only tasks?

19 MR. SHIREMAN: Those items that are on the
20 back of your agenda are the items that the Park Service,
21 Federal Highways and MK Centennial have identified. You
22 may wish to expand that list, and that may be something
23 you brainstorm a little bit this afternoon or tomorrow
24 -- are there things that we are missing that you think
25 are critical to the success of this project that have

1 not yet been identified.

2 MR. JEWETT: And you're talking about the
3 topics from 11:15 to 12 today?

4 MR. SHIREMAN: The Committee general session
5 addressed key topics and how do we proceed on vision so
6 forth. Does that answer your question?

7 MR. JEWETT. Yes, it does. A follow-up one
8 is, how do we want to allocate our time between now and
9 tomorrow afternoon to get that done. Maybe we ought to
10 organize ourselves with the time remaining today to do
11 that.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there any items in
13 addition to the items you see on this list that the
14 Committee feels we need to discuss or would like to
15 discuss tomorrow?

16 MR. BAKER: I just wanted to say that with
17 regard to the scoping in the green pages, I would feel
18 more comfortable if I could think about it a bit tonight
19 and come up with some questions tomorrow and maybe have
20 a real good session tomorrow, and maybe we could clear
21 off some of these other ones today, any that are left.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We need to talk about the
23 agreement. I think we've handled communication, vision
24 and objectives, general information and issues. I'm not
25 sure what that one means, either. What did you mean by

1 that one, Fred, by this general information issues and
2 opportunities, second item?

3 MR. BABB: If I remember, the general
4 information was, didn't you receive enough from what we
5 talked about over the last day and a half. That's the
6 information.

7 MR. GASKILL: A little bit more than that.
8 Have you received enough information, do you know what
9 information is out there and do you know how to get that
10 information. And the second part, do you have
11 information from your perspective or background that you
12 could provide to the project that would be beneficial to
13 it, and if so, how would you provide it here.

14 MR. BABB: And then the issues that we were
15 saying is the issues that we have identified in this
16 document and what we have on the agenda, are they the
17 issues that we should really be addressing and tackling
18 as a partnership, so to speak, as I remember it.

19 And then we spent a lot of time about, well,
20 there's issues but there's also opportunities and what
21 are those opportunities that we want to capitalize on.
22 And what I would use and what I've heard is people
23 talking about marketing in a general sense.

24 MS. PAHL: We talked communication
25 internally; we talked public input. I don't think we

1 talked communicating externally.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So we need to have more
3 discussion on information and opportunities tomorrow.
4 And then we need to finish discussing the project
5 agreement, project priorities, public participation,
6 process schedules.

7 I think we need to deal with those issues
8 tomorrow. So maybe the thing to do is just kind of do a
9 bit of an agenda for tomorrow's meeting.

10 Are there any other things other than the
11 items on this list that people think should be added to
12 talk about tomorrow?

13 MR. SLITER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if --
14 maybe it's under objectives and criteria, but I think we
15 should revisit the -- I think at some point we're going
16 to want to revisit the relationship between this
17 committee and its work and the NEPA process and how
18 we're going to initiate, or whether we're going to
19 initiate right away, NEPA, and get to work on an
20 environmental document. Because I strongly feel, and I
21 think there are others on the committee that feel, that
22 if we don't take that task hand-in-hand with what we
23 think the committee is up to, that we're setting
24 ourselves up for some -- as Barney puts it, a slippery
25 slope. So I'd like to discuss NEPA at some point

1 tomorrow.

2 MR. JEWETT: I was just going to say that I
3 agree and I had just slotted that in the public
4 participation discussion and we should make that an
5 actual imperative agenda.

6 MR. SHIREMAN: Only something you had asked
7 earlier about a review of the Federal Highway's
8 legislative process, and there is an opportunity to
9 have Dick Gatten give you an over- view of that if you
10 want to.

11 MR. BAKER: I had a mention here. Maybe
12 this would come up tomorrow under the socio- economic
13 end of it. But is there any material available
14 currently in the Flathead on what future plans there are
15 for the Highway 2 corridor right through at East
16 Glacier, what is going to be happening around East
17 Glacier, any road realignment south of the canyon.

18 I would be very interested to see what's
19 coming on schedule in the next ten years, because a lot
20 of that's going to have a big play on what we're looking
21 at.

22 MR. SHIREMAN: Could we have John talk just
23 real briefly about that? We did have recent meetings
24 with Montana Department of Transportation and he can
25 provide you with a little bit of information.

1 MR. KILPATRICK: What we should do is get
2 you a copy of what -- it's the STIP, State
3 Transportation Improvement Plan. And some of the
4 projects that are out on the horizon there are the Essex
5 Bridge. They are working on the NEPA documentation for
6 that to replace that bridge; Bad Rock Canyon corridor.
7 Highway 89 is beginning their scoping process on
8 improvements to that that as well.

9 That process is ongoing now. I'm not sure
10 when their construction is slated, but that State
11 Transportation Improvement Plan will give you guys a lot
12 of information.

13 Some of the transportation studies that are
14 going on right now are Eagle Transit for the Flathead
15 Valley area. That is a partnership that we've been
16 trying to cultivate. When we get ready to do our
17 transportation plan we have to look outside the
18 boundaries of the Park so we will be coordinating
19 regionally.

20 MR. WHITE: Just for the information of the
21 board, there's a corridor study on Highway 89 from
22 Browning to Hudson Bay Divide. The Montana Department
23 of Transportation hired a consulting firm to do this and
24 it's a two-year study.

25 We are having public meetings next week, and

1 if anybody's interested we are going to have one in the
2 area and they will put on a presentation. And presently
3 they are looking for public comments on that road.

4 MR. JEWETT: An agenda I'd like to suggest,
5 it seems repetitively an issue that's come up is the
6 need for funding in order to do other types of studies
7 and projects. Clearly, what the message was to me that
8 I kept hearing from the Park Service was, we'd sure
9 rather have you guys ask for it instead of us.

10 So what would be useful for me, I think,
11 rather than making decisions on that, it would be useful
12 to have an inventory on what the potential needs are in
13 terms of financing to complete some of these studies and
14 where the decisions occur and what our role might be in
15 helping secure this.

16 MR. BAKER: Just to add onto what Tony said,
17 every -- at least the Park Service up in Canada,
18 they've all got wish lists, and they're varied and
19 sometimes it's really thinking outside the box a lot of
20 times. But I would like to know if the National Park
21 Service in Glacier does have that wish list of things
22 they would like to go out there and get but they have
23 not put it on the table because they know that the
24 funding is not in existence right now, which I think is
25 kind of tying into what you're after.

1 Is that available? They're usually tucked
2 away in layers of the management plan and they're hard
3 to get. With regards to the transportation, what we're
4 talking about here.

5 MR. KILPATRICK: Just the secret plan? I
6 think that we've pretty well laid out what we needed in
7 this document. A lot of those things aren't funded
8 right now -- or partially funded I'll say. I guess
9 that's something I'd have to really think about and
10 discuss it.

11 For instance, one thing that would come to
12 mind is, we've got a project in under our Intermountain
13 Region priority listing for Federal Lands Highways
14 funding for an additional three million dollars to do
15 priority work on the railroad. That funding is slated
16 for 2004. The fact is, it's doubtful we'll get that
17 money because it's out past the Federal Lands Highways
18 Program funding cycle. So we may not get that
19 through.

20 That's one thing coming to mind, just look
21 at the road corridor itself. But I think that we've
22 pretty well put everything out on the table.

23 MR. SHIREMAN: I want you to think about
24 wish lists and in a very positive sense in terms of
25 going back to the general management plan which

1 identifies, after much consultation and involvement with
2 the public, that not only the Park Service but the
3 public's understanding of what should be done at Glacier
4 National Park, and you should take that document as
5 being a broad discussion of the wish list.

6 What John is saying in terms of the roads is
7 exactly right. We have requested funding that has not
8 been approved yet, so you have in place the next step in
9 terms of the wish list for construction on the road.
10 You have in place before you the wish list in terms of
11 those additional studies -- the transportation study,
12 the information that we provided you on the commercial
13 services plan and all of its pieces, the need for some
14 additional environmental studies that would go to the
15 EIS and in general that EIS or that environmental
16 compliance that needs to go on with the development of
17 the long-term rehabilitation.

18 So I think we've given you pretty much the
19 broad-based definition of that wish list for the time
20 being.

21 MR. BAKER: I guess what first comes to mind
22 is, John, in your mind what is an appropriate
23 maintenance budget on an annual basis for that
24 corridor?

25 MR. KILPATRICK: I'm only hesitating to

1 answer because I would hate to hamstring you guys into
2 what you think it should be, because you have a
3 professional consultant here that could maybe help you
4 develop some of those costs with a more defensible
5 background.

6 If I was to just give you an answer off the
7 top of my head, I'd say it could be anywhere from one
8 and a half to three million dollars a year. Could be
9 more, could be less. I know it's under funded now.

10 I really hate to hamstring you because I
11 think that that might be a question -- when you look at
12 the complete project that you're doing here, that that
13 might be something that you ask MK to help us develop so
14 that it is an independent basis for maintenance on the
15 highway and it's not coming from the government
16 employee.

17 MR. BAKER: I was just kind of asking you
18 now.

19 MR. KILPATRICK: He'll cringe at this, but
20 you go to the National Academy of Science and they'll
21 tell you you need three percent of the cost of the
22 facility to maintain it annually, one to three percent.

23 MR. SHIREMAN: I'm going to make John
24 cringe. From the standpoint of looking at that
25 particular road and looking at the types of need there

1 and recognizing that it's sort of at the far end of the
2 cost of operations and maintenance, and I think you
3 could probably double that figure, make it five to seven
4 percent, someplace in there, in terms of the cost of
5 operation.

6 MR. KILPATRICK: If you just said three
7 percent on Academy of Science and you're looking at a
8 hundred million dollar value road, you're looking at
9 three million a year minimum. So I would prefer that
10 that question perhaps be directed to MK and let them
11 provide you a definitive or comprehensible answer for
12 you.

13 MR. O'QUINN: As long as you got the mike,
14 in your discussions with Montana DOT, was there any
15 discussions about the scheduling of this project versus
16 any construction they would have like on the bridge on
17 2?

18 MR. KILPATRICK: That is something that
19 we're just engaging in. To be really honest, we've had
20 a terrible relationship with Montana DOT because parks
21 tend to operate in isolation. And we have, in the last
22 eight to ten months, made some real efforts in improving
23 that relationship, and that is something that we really
24 need to do. I hope that that might be one element of
25 doing a regional transportation plan that might look out

1 at a five to ten-year period on what types of
2 construction.

3 MR. O'QUINN: Well, the point is, if they're
4 already doing an environmental document on the bridge,
5 they might have a longer lead time than you do. It's
6 not too early for somebody to be engaged in the
7 construction scale in which yours might be, because to
8 have that under construction and this under construction
9 at the same time, you can just hang it up. It would be
10 a disaster.

11 MR. KILPATRICK: We have engaged in that
12 conversation already and intend to keep them informed so
13 that we don't have a train wreck.

14 MS. MOE: And that was one of the comments
15 that the State made on the general management plan, was
16 that we need to be in conversation with both the
17 engineering part of it so that that sort of stuff didn't
18 happen.

19 MR. BROOKE: Going back to Don's comment,
20 it's pretty significant what they're talking about
21 because they're talking about scenic byways, making it a
22 showcase highway with bike paths on the side of it. So
23 89 is not going to be a small project. And if the two
24 of them intersect, I'm going south for the winter -- for
25 the summer.

1 MR. BABB: I have two wish lists to add to
2 sort of what Rick said. One is the visitor center or
3 discovery center which has a direct bearing on
4 Going-to-the-Sun Road and Logan Pass. And the second
5 thing is one you've already talked about, there's no
6 funding in for marketing information or anything like
7 that. That also has a direct bearing on the road as
8 well as the visitor experience.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything else that people
10 want to have added to the agenda for tomorrow? The
11 items I have are talking about what we're going to do
12 about the NEPA process, additional information, issues,
13 opportunities for discussion, external communications,
14 input on the project agreement, what we are going to do
15 about public participation, and then additional
16 discussions about our schedule from here out.

17 Anything else?

18 MR. DAKIN: We're going to have some kind of
19 a short presentation on the appropriation process from
20 Federal Highways?

21 MR. SHIREMAN: If that's what the committee
22 would like to do.

23 MR. DAKIN: Maybe that would be a topic we
24 have before we go home, just to save time.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We've got a motion to ajourn

1 and we got a motion that we take up the highway
2 process.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: Technically we need to stay
4 here at least until 4:30 to honor our committment to
5 public involvement.

6 --o0o--

7 Discussion commenced regarding feedback on
8 what to do tomorrow and also make out the Advisory
9 Committee's recommendations to go to the Park Service.

10 MR. SHIREMAN: All right. At this point
11 it's a little after 4:30. I just need to make a general
12 request. Are there any individuals in the room who wish
13 to make a comment to the Advisory Committee?

14 (No comment.)

15 MR. SHIREMAN: I'll ask again. Is there
16 anyone who wishes to make a public comment to the
17 Advisory Committee?

18 (No comment.)

19 MS. NICKERSON: I just want to make one
20 little comment about the socioeconomic studies, that you
21 start looking at it, you don't know which one comes
22 first. Because if you have a number of engineering
23 alternatives that suggests different closures and
24 whatnot, sometimes your questions that you need to ask,
25 do you want to do another survey of visitors and their

1 behaviors and that sort of thing? You might need some
2 more information about engineering and closures before
3 you can ask visitors or do you ask visitors and then go
4 -- this is something that I want you to think about,
5 which comes first.

6 I don't have an answer except that last time
7 we did the economic study there was already an in-place
8 questionnaire that was completed, and many of the
9 questions that were asked were not appropriate ones the
10 alternatives were looked at and we couldn't use those
11 questions. It's just something that you need if you're
12 going to ask visitor behavior questions we might need to
13 know more of what direction they're looking at in terms
14 of the actual traffic closures and that sort of thing.
15 It's just a comment. I don't have an answer.

16 MR. SHIREMAN: Other public comments?

17 MR. WHITE: I have a -- all I have is
18 testimony from Blackfeet Tribe. I was given it
19 yesterday and I was to catch the chairman, have him sign
20 it. I didn't, but I missed him, so I've got some
21 testimony without his signature. I don't know if I wait
22 until I get that or maybe read it today.

23 MR. SHIREMAN: I think it would be fine to
24 read it today.

25

1 MR. WHITE: Well, it's official testimony
2 of the Blackfeet Tribe on the Going-to-the-Sun Highway
3 construction project. As chairman of the Blackfeet
4 Tribal Business Council and on behalf of the Blackfeet
5 Tribe, I thank you for this opportunity to submit
6 written testimony before the Going-to-the-Sun Highway
7 Advisory Committee. It has been well documented the
8 Blackfeet people continue to recognize the historical
9 and legal relationship with Glacier National Park and
10 to feel a special attachment between the historic
11 lodges and facilities there in need of improvement.

12 We'd once again like to state for the
13 record our available resources to assist in any future
14 improvements in the facilities or highways within the
15 Park system that are being considered for possible
16 construction or repair. To put it simply, we'd like to
17 be considered as a resource in any discussions that
18 would center around possible employment of our people
19 and utilization of construction materials from our
20 reservation to do the necessary improvements that
21 maintain the integrity of the Park as we know it today.

22 I'd also like the Committee to consider
23 using parts of the Blackfeet Reservation that is
24 adjacent to the Park to be used for operation and
25 construction staging areas. Blackfeet have been a good

1 neighbor all these years and we would appreciate an
2 opportunity to participate in the future of the Park.
3 We believe it is the neighborly thing to do.

4 Thank you again for this opportunity to
5 submit official testimony and we are quite confident
6 that Mr. White will serve as a good representative for
7 the Blackfeet Indians.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other public comment?

9 MR. SHIREMAN: Hearing no further general
10 comments from the public, I will adjourn the meeting
11 until 8:00 tomorrow morning.

12 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35
13 p.m. until 8:00 a.m. tomorrow.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Table of Contents	
2		
3	Thursday, March 2, 2000 -	Page
4	Committee General Session	340
5	Jean Townsend - Socioeconomic Impacts/ Issues	503
6	Committee General Session	508
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	Public Comments -	
19	Sharlon Willows	526
19	Cesar Hernandez	533
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 The third day of the first meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to
3 order at 8:00 a.m., March 2, 2000, by Rick Shireman.

4 He talked about the great day yesterday and
5 thanked everyone for their attention and patience as
6 they were all provided with the information on the
7 Going-to-the-Sun Road and what activities are planned
8 for the next few months and the next few years. He
9 yesterday in focusing in on getting things done.

10 Mr. Shireman went into a little recap on
11 some of the information and preliminary decisions that
12 the members had come to reach during yesterday's
13 process. This included a selection of their Chair by
14 unanimous vote, which was Randy Ogle.

15 Secondly, that they discussed and expanded
16 the key topics that the Park Service, Federal Highways
17 and MK Centennial had provided the agenda in terms of
18 those topics in areas for discussion and decision and
19 covered all of those, at least in a preliminary
20 standpoint, and expanded upon that list.

21 They also reached some preliminary
22 agreements on internal communications within the
23 Committee and identified that they are very interested
24 in working through electronic transmission of
25 information. Also that he heard an underlying interest

1 in making sure that there was a backup process for that
2 electronic communication, specifically that they were
3 going to communicate individually via phone, via
4 messages to each other as they work through the process
5 of transmitting information between their official
6 meetings. He stated that he also heard at least one
7 person say that there's nothing wrong with good
8 old-fashioned mail.

9 He stated how they had reached a final
10 agreement on the concept of establishing ad hoc or
11 task-oriented subcommittees, that they are not
12 particularly interested in establishing longstanding
13 committees, but as the need arose you set up a system
14 for tasking certain parts of the overall committee with
15 dealing with those tasks on an ad hoc basis.

16 They had discussed and reached what he
17 believed was some preliminary consensus on the project
18 agreement. There seemed to be a fairly general
19 agreement that the project agreement presented and
20 discussed yesterday met many concerns with the
21 additions that they began to add yesterday, and he said
22 they had tracked those and will incorporate those
23 additions as they finalize that project agreement. But
24 he also heard that they needed a little more time on
25 that particular project, on the project agreement

1 today, in order to flush out some of the areas that
2 were not completed.

3 He also stated he heard some preliminary
4 consensus there in that they're moving forward on the
5 general aspects of that project agreement.

6 Also identified were those items for
7 today's agenda, those things that were needed to
8 cover. He then discussed each of those items as being:
9 More time for discussion in a general sense, the
10 development of information needs, and took that to be
11 primarily those information needs that you would expect
12 between now and your next meeting, and some additional
13 detail on what exact types of information they would
14 require; some additional discussion on compliance
15 process and NEPA; some development of public
16 participation; the project agreement, the scope of work
17 within that project agreement, need to finish that up.

18 He stated that we do have some time with
19 Dick Gatten for presentation on the funding process and
20 the Federal Highway's legislative requirements for
21 receiving funding for Going-to-the-Sun Road.

22 They had identified a need to get some more
23 information on funding levels and the overall funding
24 requirements for continued management and
25 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road; some

1 scheduling requirements, how you are going to move
2 forward and what kinds of activities do you need to
3 schedule as a committee and how does that schedule work
4 in with the schedules for the project in terms of what
5 the Park Service is doing, Federal Highways is doing
6 and the consulting firm, MK Centennial.

7 Finally, he said they had made arrangements
8 for the video on the opening of the Going-to-the-Sun
9 Road to be shown at lunch. He said they had moved two
10 television monitors into the lunchroom.

11 The final thing that was identified
12 yesterday was a preliminary agreement, they felt as a
13 committee, that the Park Service needed to begin the
14 process of environmental compliance as soon as
15 possible. He stated they will work on that. They need
16 the Committee to come back to that and determine
17 exactly how they would like to identify that in their
18 recommendation.

19 He then asked for any additions or
20 additional information of which there were none.
21 Mr. Shireman then gave a brief definition of his
22 perspective of consensus

23 MR. SHIREMAN: Consensus is that process
24 whereby a group who carry, who hold, a wide variety of
25 opinions, of ideas and of abilities and skills, come

1 together to craft a vision for the entire group that
2 every individual in the group can support and stand
3 behind. This is not an easy job to do. But I saw with
4 your group in the last two days the skills and the
5 willingness and the ability to come to consensus.

6 Consensus, in the greatest sense, is the
7 ability to bring those differing opinions and ideas
8 together and to look for a solution or a set of
9 solutions that is better than any of the single
10 solutions that any one person in the group started out
11 with. So if you can keep that in mind, if you can keep
12 the idea that you're looking for a better way of doing
13 things, better than what you had originally envisioned
14 and you can come to that, you have reached
15 consensus. And I'm looking forward to seeing how well
16 you take that challenge in the next day.

17 With that, I'll turn the meeting back over
18 to Randy and let you begin your deliberations.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks, Rick. In looking
20 at our list, we need to put these items on the agenda
21 in some that makes some sense. Here is the order I'm
22 suggesting. Thought maybe we'd start with Dick Gatten
23 talking about the highway legislation process and then
24 talk a little bit about what the NEPA requirements are
25 and what our input is on that, and then move into a

1 discussion of the project agreement and input on that,
2 and then move on to the communication issues, both our
3 external communications as well as public input and how
4 we want to encourage that; and then talk about funding
5 needs and scheduling after that. And probably at the
6 end of the day we should have a little recap from,
7 perhaps, Craig as to where we've come during the first
8 three days. Does that sound all right?

9 MR. DAKIN: I had a brief moment of clarity
10 as I was driving home yesterday brought on by a couple
11 of the topics that they discussed. One was the need
12 for kind of a long-term maintenance plan for the
13 facilities once they're reconstructed.

14 And I was just talking with Jack Gordon
15 this morning and came to the realization that an
16 operating protocol for that snow plowing operation,
17 even though it was in the works 10 or 15 years ago was
18 part of the cultural resources management plan, was
19 never finalized.

20 I wonder if you would allow me after lunch,
21 after you've seen the video, to have a few moments to
22 just discuss some of the concerns I have about the
23 relationship of the way you do the spring opening to
24 the longevity of those cultural resources. And I do
25 think that maybe we could, if I can express my concerns

1 well enough, require that part of MK Centennial's
2 assignment would be to develop a snow plowing protocol
3 for the road designed to make sure that the activity
4 there does as little impact to the masonry resource as
5 is possible. Okay? It's a minor thing, but I kind of
6 think having MK Centennial be concerned with that early
7 in the operation might be wise.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Sounds like a good idea.
9 We'll be talking about what additional information
10 needs we are going to be requesting from MK Centennial,
11 and I think that would be an appropriate time to bring
12 that up.

13 Other thoughts?

14 All right. Dick, would you mind giving us
15 a overview of the road legislative process, the Federal
16 Highways?

17 MR. GATTEN: I'll try to quickly summarize.
18 Before 1982 before road repairs were minimal and any
19 money that was expended came from the Park's annual
20 operating budget. In 1982 Congress passed what they
21 called the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, and
22 that provided the first federal funding for federal
23 land highway program projects, and that includes the
24 Park Road and Parkway Program; they call it PR&P. And
25 NPS, in a partnership with the Federal Highway

1 Administration, established the road improvement
2 program. And since then in the Park I believe we've
3 had eight projects totaling over \$20 million that has
4 rehabilitated about 20 miles of the Going-to-the-Sun
5 Road.

6 Most federal programs are funded annually.
7 The difference here is, for the transportation, they go
8 for five or sometimes a six-year period. The Surface
9 Transportation Assistance Act was for five years. Then
10 in 1991 they had what they called ISTEA, and that
11 stands for Intermobile Surface Transportation
12 Efficiency Act of 1991. That act was for a five-year
13 period, maybe six. And now in 1998 law was passed that
14 was called the TEA21, and that stands for the
15 Transportation Equity Act. And that's summarized in
16 this booklet here. It guaranteed for surface
17 transportation, all types, \$198 billion, which equates
18 for a six-year program, \$33 billion a year.

19 If you imagine a pie here, the Park Road
20 Federal Lands Highway Program of which the Park Road
21 program is a part, it's just a little sliver. And that
22 little sliver isn't even that big. Park Road program
23 did get an increased level of funding under TEA21, so
24 that annually it's around \$160 million, of which they
25 kind of broke that up and part of it is for what they

1 call Intermobile Transportation type of things where
2 you might get creative about doing things other than --
3 like a bus system, for instance, in Denali National
4 Park.

5 The purpose for the five or six years, it
6 gives transportation agencies the opportunity to plan
7 ahead. We find that the average large type of a Park
8 Road project takes about four years to go from the
9 scoping stage through the project development stage,
10 which includes the NEPA process. So it may take us
11 about four years to get to the point where we award a
12 contract.

13 As far as this transportation legislation,
14 agencies start a lot in advance of the actual update to
15 try to justify the level of funding that they want to
16 receive. There was a lot of effort by the National
17 Park Service and Federal Highway to increase the level
18 of funding the last time, and they were fairly
19 successful. I believe we were closer to a hundred
20 million dollars in the previous legislation.

21 So right now the TEA21 expires on September
22 30th, 2003, so that's three years away. They're
23 already starting to think about this. And at least two
24 years in advance agencies start to pull together
25 numbers, try to justify the need and the level of

1 funding and, hopefully, at least maintain that level.
2 If they can they'll always try to increase it. Park
3 Service and the Federal Highway Administration will be
4 working closely to try to justify continuing at least
5 that level of funding.

6 The way the process works now is that we
7 know how much money the Park Service is getting
8 annually. Now they have to decide how to program
9 projects. And they do have -- in 1998 developed a more
10 comprehensive type of a project selection process, so
11 they periodically make a call for projects. Parks like
12 Glacier National Park submit project proposals. They
13 have a process for ranking those; a committee ranks
14 them. They compete with each other based on a number
15 of factors. They call the process choosing by
16 advantage. And they end up ranking projects for a
17 several year time period.

18 If you heard mention that we went through
19 the last go-around just last fall, they called it the
20 five-year period, and Glacier Park anticipating we
21 wouldn't have enough money maybe to complete some wall
22 repairs that we wanted to do -- submitted for,
23 requested a \$3 million project and received a tentative
24 approval of that. They say tentative because they say
25 2004 we'll use that for programming purposes; probably

1 2001 or 2 they start project development. Take a
2 little bit of a gamble, but you have to plan ahead.
3 Two thousand four is passed when that transportation
4 act expires, so there's no guarantee what the level of
5 funding is going to be and whether the money's going to
6 be there until the act is in place. So that's kind of
7 a process that's followed.

8 They will periodically -- at least every
9 couple years, we try to encourage them to make another
10 call for projects, because they did a five- year one
11 that's through 2005. Within a year or two we want to
12 know what's beyond that if it takes us four years to
13 develop the average complex job. So there will be
14 another call, another opportunity to compete.

15 Over the years we've just been pecking away
16 at what's been considered to be the biggest needs, and
17 as funding gets approved we've completed projects that
18 we've talked about. Now we're in the process of doing
19 the wall repair work that's more significant, that's in
20 more immediate need, and I believe the Park DMP says
21 that we're going to continue to peck away at that and
22 ask for projects until something different shakes
23 loose.

24 This is the main way to seek funding.
25 Every transportation act has a pork barrel type

1 project. I think the last one had 500 and some odd
2 projects that were specific -- this Congressman wants
3 this, this and that. So who knows what political
4 process may be able to be used.

5 I think when Congressman Hill was here and
6 what the Federal Highway Administration was asked to do
7 was to develop a couple of alternatives for improving
8 the Going-to-the-Sun Road with a big assumption, and
9 that was that there would be unlimited funding. So it
10 was kind of implied, well, if you were going to get
11 your hundred million dollars, how would you complete
12 this road work. So if we were going to do it in four
13 years or six years or eight years how would we do it.
14 That was the approach at that point in time, and
15 whether or not unlimited funding becomes available, we
16 don't know. But that's kind of the funding process,
17 the project selection process and maybe there's other
18 techniques politically, but that's about what I know
19 about it.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you. Are there
21 questions for Dick?

22 MR. WHITE: Who do you submit your
23 proposals to?

24 MR. GATTEN: They submit them to the Park
25 Service. The Park Service Region Office makes the

1 call. And so in this case, it's in Denver; they make
2 the call; you compete for other projects within that
3 region. I should have said that. So it used to be a
4 national. The first time they did it, it was a
5 national competition; in fact, the first several times,
6 and then this last year, it was on a regional level.

7 MS. BURCH: If you have money in time, say
8 in June 2003, how soon do you have to spend? Does the
9 money have to be spent --

10 MR. GATTEN: It has to be obligated. So if
11 we award a contract September 30th, it may take two or
12 three years to complete, but the money is obligated.
13 It's not lost. You have to obligate it in the year
14 it's programmed, so we can't slip a project. We have
15 to obligate 19 -- or 2000. We have to obligate 2000
16 money by September 30th, 2001 money by September 30th
17 of that year.

18 MR. JEWETT: Why don't you explain that
19 construction we're obligated to do.

20 MR. GATTEN: When we obligate money for
21 construction, like we have \$3 million for a year and
22 we'll put together a construction package that's
23 approximately that size, we'll take bids, award to the
24 low bidder, and that money's obligated.

25 MR. JEWETT: Are you just referring that's

1 only construction dollars, all the planning and design
2 money you can carry over, and take that three years to
3 design the project

4 MR. GATTEN: Yeah. Out of that hundred and
5 60 million that we get each year, that is for all
6 support costs due. So that is planning, that's
7 preliminary engineering, that's construction
8 engineering on the job. And so I think we figure that
9 35 to 40 percent is usually spent for support costs.

10 Now that the Park Service has put a cap on
11 support costs, where we try to limit it to 18 percent
12 for preliminary engineering, we try to limit it to 10
13 to 15 percent for construction engineering.

14 MR. JEWETT: Now I'm assuming that the
15 money's allocated by the Transportation Committee, is
16 that correct, goes through in Congress?

17 MR. GATTEN: Well, there's a formula for
18 distribution among the regions.

19 MR. JEWETT: But the general appropriation
20 goes through the Transportation Committee as opposed to
21 the Appropriations Committee; is that right?

22 MR. BABB: There's two procedures. One is
23 the formula process that Dick's talking about. The
24 other, remember, he also mentioned the 500 projects
25 that are in the annual appropriations bill that were

1 special projects that came from different parts of the
2 country.

3 What you're talking about are the special
4 project funding, and that's probably -- the formula
5 process that Dick was talking about is the routine way
6 that the hundred and 60 million a year is allocated to
7 all the parks. If you want a special allocation, a
8 special appropriation, that can come through either the
9 House of Appropriations, which will work its way
10 through the Transportation Committee or the Public Works
11 Committee. Then that kind of legislation is sponsored
12 by the senators and representatives in the state and
13 it's a totally different procedure than going with the
14 formula allocation.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What is the concept at this
16 point for the dough to actually build this road when
17 the time comes? Is that going to be a special
18 appropriation request or is it going to be a part of
19 this general appropriation that Dick's been talking
20 about?

21 MR. BABB: I guess I've made the assumption
22 that in order to get enough money to do everything
23 you'd like to have done, we'd have to do a special
24 appropriation.

25 MR. SHIREMAN: That's generally the case.

1 And when Dick talked about the Park Service continuing
2 the existing process of repairs to the road in that
3 \$2.5 million that traditionally has come to Glacier
4 National Park over the last few years, that would be
5 out of the process within TEA21. Those larger amounts
6 would need to come from a special appropriations.

7 Now there is some caveats to that. Those
8 two systems are not mutually exclusive, and what you do
9 with one sometimes impacts the other. So there is a
10 likelihood that when Congress deliberates on these
11 things, that if you have proposed a special legislation
12 for Glacier National Park that could impact what occurs
13 in the successor to the TEA21. For example, the
14 legislature, the Congress has directed monies that have
15 been -- or projects that have been proposed outside of
16 that process, has directed TEA21 funds to go to support
17 those, and those have been reduced for other projects
18 and activities that were in the plan.

19 So there is a trade and balance that goes
20 on with those two processes. They are not mutually
21 exclusive. They are intertwined with each other.

22 MR. JEWETT: What's the relationship
23 between the Surface Transportation Assistance Act and
24 ISTEA and the TEA21?

25 MR. GATTEN: They're just successive acts.

1 ISTEAs was in 1991. That expired in 1998 so then they
2 update it. They revisit all the funding levels and
3 what the program's going to be. Then that expires in
4 2003.

5 MR. JEWETT: So they're essentially funding
6 mechanisms as opposed to a legislative policy, the side
7 boards, is that right, each one of those three?

8 MR. GATTEN: It's legislative but it's for
9 a five or six-year period, so it gives you an
10 opportunity to find how you're going to use that money.

11 MR. PAHL: Wasn't it really the
12 re-authorization of the Highway Trust Fund that had to
13 continually be re-authorized but ISTEAs, the
14 breakthrough was that the money would just be used for
15 highways, that they were starting to recognize there's
16 other molds of transportation and it was incentives out
17 there to have states and communities consider other
18 modes besides just using the gas tax money just to pay
19 for building highways. So that's the breakthrough
20 concept that ISTEAs was.

21 MR. GATTEN: I did want to mention, there
22 are special political ways to get funding. Senator
23 Thomas went and was successful to help Yellowstone get
24 a larger program than they would have through the
25 normal process. And so they have a program -- they

1 went in there and showed a 20-year need of a certain
2 amount of money and got a commitment to fund that. But
3 it did affect the regional amount of money that the
4 Park Service has left for the other parks in the
5 region. There was kind of a ripple effect.

6 Then I found it interesting when
7 Congressman Hill had this legislation for this
8 million-dollar study. He didn't exactly hand us a
9 million dollars. That came out of the Park Road
10 program, the regional money.

11 MR. BABB: That's the disadvantage of all
12 these earmarks, the money that comes out the back door,
13 the majority of it comes from the 160 that Dick was
14 talking about. So in essence, whenever there's an
15 earmark, normally it comes out of the Park Service
16 dollars, and that's why the Park Service is sort of
17 going to where they campaign to get extra money because
18 it's taking it from the general pot, so to speak.

19 MR. GATTEN: I don't think that precludes
20 being able to pursue some kind of a large level of
21 funding in a short time period, but it can have that
22 ripple effect.

23 MR. SHIREMAN: That's what I was saying in
24 terms of those two funding processes being linked and
25 intertwined together, that we have to recognize that

1 there can be effects on that funding that comes out of
2 the TEA21 or its successor.

3 MR. O'QUINN: A lot of it's already been
4 touched on, but ISTEPA and the TEA21, there was a pretty
5 large change in the process -- or not the process, but
6 the approach. And part of the reason was the coalition
7 of environmental groups, it's called STEP, that was
8 very instrumental in getting ISTEPA passed because it
9 pretty much hit a log jam.

10 And there's another smaller source of
11 funding, it's called Environmental Enhancement that a
12 certain percentage -- it's for historic preservation.
13 It has a loose connection to transportation, and that's
14 a very loose connection, but there are various specific
15 lists of things that can and cannot be done. I can't
16 remember all of them, but things like historic
17 restoration and rail stations are in there. And how
18 that affects or whether any of that money can be used
19 on park land, I'm not sure, but it could certainly be
20 used on projects around the Park that would be
21 supplemental to it, and you have to go through Montana
22 DOT to get access to those funds.

23 The other thing Dick touched on was
24 authorization versus obligation. Authorization is
25 what's in the bill, and that's the big, big chunk of

1 money. You don't ever see all the money. It gets back
2 in to balancing the budget. But the obligation or the
3 actual monies that are set aside that the DOT and the
4 Park Service or whatever it might be, can utilize and
5 actually spend.

6 Once a project has been set up and the
7 funds obligated for that project, it's not like you've
8 got to spend it at the end of the year or two years
9 because of the way it's tied to the project.

10 And I was going to talk about these
11 demonstration projects. That can or cannot -- it may
12 or may not come out of the Park Service chunk of that
13 money. However it was set up, traditionally that's
14 correct. There's no more money. It all comes out.
15 But each year or each time this has been passed it
16 seems like these projects have grown and grown and
17 grown. And they say demonstration projects. They
18 first started off being like unusual projects that had
19 something that was a demonstration. Here in the last
20 two bills it's been nothing more than huge projects
21 that would be very difficult for a particular state DOT
22 to set aside those kinds of monies for a specific
23 project. So basically what they're doing is stealing
24 from the neighbors through a political process, because
25 it is all coming out of the big pot of money.

1 It would seem to me that a project like
2 this that's already had the first set-up money in here
3 and got this committee going, plus the fact that what
4 we've talked about it being a model, if you will, it
5 really does set itself up to be a true demonstration
6 project because other projects will be coming up in
7 other parks as time goes on. So realistically to do it
8 in any kind of a time fashion, I'm going to guess it's
9 going to take demonstration money to do it. And that
10 needs to be in the local communities with the process,
11 they could be in position to start asking for that well
12 in advance of the next legislation.

13 MR. GATTEN: I think the bottom line is,
14 there's a standard funding process, there's other
15 creative funding opportunities that we can look for.

16 Fred asked me to remind you, too, that
17 maintenance money doesn't come out of this.
18 Maintenance of Park Roads is not eligible for funding
19 from this. That comes from their normal funding
20 process. So when you talk about getting additional
21 maintenance money, that's a different story.

22 MR. BROOKE: One comment, Barney, you're
23 absolutely right about the demonstration thing. They
24 figured early on, given the magnitude of this thing,
25 that normal process wasn't going to work and so we

1 talked with some of those folks back there. Getting
2 these guys out here to see this thing and fully
3 appreciate the magnitude of it is really important,
4 because the first whack he said absolutely no way. So
5 there's a long, long ways to go to get the kind of
6 money that this is going to need.

7 I think it's important for this committee
8 to know that there's going to be some political process
9 here that we'll, at some point, have to get involved
10 with to get this.

11 Barney, you mentioned early on in this
12 process about going two different directions or the
13 possibility of it -- one controlled, this process going
14 through Federal Highways, and one going through the
15 NPS, and that there was some differences there really.
16 And I never really heard what those were and what that
17 means if we go one route or the other. Can you
18 explain? Do you have a sense of what Barney was
19 talking about, or maybe Barney can shed some more light
20 on that? And what's typically done?

21 MR. BROOKE: I'm not sure I understood the
22 whole question. There's two ways of building a
23 highway, right, going through you guys, the Federal
24 Highway, but when you're in the Park you got to deal
25 with some Park processes, and I got the impression from

1 Barney that one was faster and easier than the other.

2 MR. SHIREMAN: Let's talk about this in a
3 general sense, in terms of the legislative process and
4 what can happen. There are really three things that
5 folks need to understand about that legislative
6 process, and it doesn't matter whether it is a road,
7 the establishment of a new park area or some other
8 process that's even outside of the National Park
9 Service. And you need to talk about authorization,
10 appropriation of funds and obligation of those funds.

11 In terms of the authorizing legislation,
12 which can come from a variety of places or, in this
13 case, from roads it will come from in the current
14 legislation, TEA21. Their needs to be a recognition
15 and an agreement to authorize the establishment of the
16 project or the activity and the authorization of funds
17 to be spent on that project. It does not necessarily
18 establish actual appropriations to fund that particular
19 piece of legislation.

20 Secondly, you need to have, once that
21 authorization's in place, you need to have funds
22 appropriated which would come out of the Appropriations
23 Committee. That's where the two processes tend to move
24 together. You can have an authorization but no
25 appropriation. You can have an appropriation that's

1 tied to an authorization, and there's two mechanisms
2 that go there.

3 The key is to making sure that both of
4 those are working together. It's not an either/or;
5 it's a combination of the two. An example where this
6 was not worked well within the National Park Service
7 was the establishment, authorization of Mohave Desert
8 as a park protected by the National Park Service. It
9 was authorized by Congress several years ago. When it
10 came to the Appropriations Committee one dollar was
11 appropriated for the operation of that new site.

12 So the key here is not to be concerned over
13 going two routes; it's to make sure that both routes or
14 both parts of the process are working together in
15 conjunction with each other to make sure that you've
16 got the authorization, you've got the project
17 identified within the authorizing legislation and
18 you've got support from appropriation to actually get
19 the money and that they're not working at
20 counterpoints.

21 Then the obligation comes in in terms of
22 how that money that's appropriated is actually spent.

23 MR. BROOKE: I think I confused the
24 question here.

25 MR. O'QUINN: When I went from

1 authorization to obligation, I skipped the
2 appropriation. That's what I meant when I said
3 obligation. That's not what I was talking about. And
4 I don't think that's Will's question.

5 The question I asked was, who was going to
6 be the leading agency. Is it going to be the National
7 Park Service or the Federal Highway Administration with
8 respect to the project development, environmental
9 documents. And the answer I got, I think, was it's
10 going to be National Park Service.

11 And the second question was, are you
12 following NAPCO or NEPA compliance or are you following
13 FHWA's road development procedures in the 771 process
14 or Is there a separate National Park Service
15 environmental document process that will be followed.
16 That was my question.

17 MR. BROOKE: And I think the answer was you
18 didn't know.

19 MR. GATTEN: Park Service follows NEPA
20 requirements, but they have a little different
21 process. And they are the lead agency in the
22 environmental process.

23 MR. O'QUINN: I understand that all federal
24 agencies have to follow NEPA, but each federal agency
25 has its own set of guidelines as to how to do that.

1 And I didn't know how the highway in a park, the Park
2 adopted FHWA's process or they had their own.

3 MR. GATTEN: They have their own, as far as
4 I am aware, and we coordinate with them, provide them
5 data that goes into those environmental documents as
6 we're developing the projects.

7 I just wanted to say that this Federal
8 Highways involvement is by legislation and interagency
9 agreement. We manage those funds. We are really the
10 agency that actually obligates them, but we are in a
11 partnership with the Park Service as far as how those
12 projects are selected and how the money is programmed.

13 MR. SLITER: I have a question, I guess,
14 for Fred.

15 Fred, I'm curious. We heard a great deal
16 on Tuesday and Wednesday about the qualifications of MK
17 Centennial and their team for the project, and I don't
18 think anybody questions their qualifications or their
19 commitment or anything like that. Something that they
20 didn't get too deep into and I'd like to explore a
21 little bit, what are the Park Service's qualifications
22 -- I don't want to challenge anybody's expertise. I
23 just want to bring it up because I don't know. What
24 are the qualifications that you have for negotiating
25 out this type of a project with MK?

1 MR. BABB: In the Denver Service Center who
2 we're using for the contracting for this particular job
3 with MK Centennial, they have about 70 investment
4 quality contracts there. That is the center that does
5 more contracting in the Park Service, probably, than
6 any other office. It is the central office for
7 planning design and construction within the National
8 Park Service. The person that they directly work with
9 in Glacier is Ed Tafoya, who is on the green list in
10 the book. He's second in charge of that whole
11 division. So in contracting I think we have probably
12 in the Park Service one of the top officials.

13 The COR contracting officer is myself.
14 I've been doing that probably for about ten years with
15 various ANE's. We have to take training; we have to
16 have that training renewed every two years in regards
17 to contracting. There's probably in the Denver Service
18 Center about 15 people that specialize in contracting,
19 and so they're all backup for Ed if he's not there.

20 We also, in Glacier itself, I think we have
21 about four people that have taken that contract
22 training that run projects. So they're also available
23 there. We have engineering service there. We have
24 Jack for landscaping architecture. We have Mary
25 Riddle, whom you met, for compliance.

1 So we're in the process of forming a
2 support team to work with MK both on a resource
3 standpoint as well as a contrast standpoint.

4 MR. SLITER: And, Mr. Chairman, if I could
5 follow up, as I understand it, tomorrow or sometime in
6 the near future you're going to start negotiating out
7 some of the more definite things of this contract; is
8 that right?

9 MR. BABB: That's correct. What we've done
10 is just like Dick said. They wrote one general task
11 order. We have a signed contract that's for a period
12 of time. You can't have a task order more than 500,000
13 or expenditure for a year of more than MK Centennial
14 and all their subs, but in their pricing and stuff like
15 that and we've agreed with that pricing.

16 Now for tasking, they write task orders.
17 We have one that's for \$30,000, that task order is to
18 attend meetings and do miscellaneous work. They
19 normally do that to start a contract simply to prepare
20 other scopes.

21 One of the things we're doing different
22 here is we're involving MK and their subs in regards to
23 scoping, scoping the actual job. Tomorrow what we've
24 planned is to go over the expenditures from this first
25 activity during this week, in essence get concurrence

1 on what that price is, and then start negotiating the
2 work or doing the task orders based on the outcome of
3 the last couple days, and then, hopefully, within a
4 week or so get some task orders that we can all live
5 with and agree with.

6 MR. SLITER: Question for Dick. Dick,
7 typically when you start out on a project like this, it
8 isn't normally going to be with somebody like the
9 National Park Service. It's typically going to be with
10 FHWA or a staff of --

11 MR. BAUMAN: Or a city or county. Usually
12 it's -- over 90 percent of our work's with some public
13 agency.

14 MR. SLITER: Right. But typically would be
15 with a road building agency rather than like an agency
16 like the Park Service.

17 MR. BAUMAN: Yeah; in one form or another.

18 MR. SLITER: Now I'm going to put you on
19 the spot, and even though everybody, they're all in the
20 room in a comfort level with dealing directly with the
21 Park Service and not having somebody like Federal
22 Highway involved, I really don't want to make it sound
23 like I'm challenging anybody's qualifications. I just
24 need to know. It doesn't seem to me that that is a
25 relationship that normally takes place without somebody

1 like FHWA being involved.

2 MR. BAUMAN: Federal Highways is like the
3 technical review resource for the Park Service, so the
4 people that live in the Park, and you the Committee,
5 are putting together the general framework of the work
6 that you want done. Federal Highways will review
7 everything that they put into the scope so there's a
8 technical check on everything we do to make sure that
9 it not only meets your requirements and the Park
10 requirements but it's done in the typical fashion that
11 FHWA contracts work.

12 MR. BABB: They work hard at Glacier, and
13 we're really trying to maintain and develop an even
14 better partnership between us. And as an example, in
15 their contract where they're doing the construction,
16 their lead, Jack Gordon, representing the Park, has
17 been involved in all those negotiations and selection
18 process. So they really try to work together, but they
19 do select a lead office normally on everything that
20 they work on.

21 MR. SHIREMAN: I think all of your
22 questions are well taken, and it's a part of the
23 project agreement that I think probably could be more
24 clearly defined, and that's in the Roles and
25 Responsibilities. And I'll throw out to the Committee

1 that you might begin deliberations on that particular
2 section of the project agreement, ask the folks who are
3 involved.

4 And you'll note on the front page of that
5 project agreement that the cooperating groups are all
6 signing off on that project agreement and are
7 considered equal partners in the success of that
8 project agreement, the success of the contract.

9 In the section under Roles and
10 Responsibilities, there's a short description of the
11 specific roles and responsibilities of the National
12 Park Service, of the contractor of Federal Highways and
13 so forth. I think that that might help to clarify for
14 everyone the exact relationship between the groups.

15 MR. BAUMAN: If I could add one last part.
16 In talking to some of you there seems to be an
17 impression that MK is also going to build this. That's
18 not a given. We have a contract to the design on the
19 project. If the project is bid, or when it's bid, I
20 think MK would like to compete with that. But MK would
21 have to compete as a regular contractor to do that.
22 There's no assumption on our part that they would
23 follow through with the construction. That's a totally
24 different thing.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't we move on.

1 MR. BAKER: A question relating back to the
2 appropriations of money. I have a big question mark in
3 my mind. I'm looking at the Park from a little bit
4 more global aspect when it comes to the highway
5 infrastructure in and around the Park, and I'm seeing
6 the Going-to-the-Sun in the Park which is funded one
7 way; I'm seeing U.S. Highway 2 on the south end of the
8 Park which is possibly funded another way, and then I'm
9 looking over on the east side to the Blackfeet
10 Reservation and all 89 and that possibly funded by
11 another group or organization.

12 And I'm wondering, are we coming to a head
13 here when it comes to people competing for funding as
14 to what gets done when or are we all going to be
15 cooperating together in a scheduled or tiered way to
16 insure that all these projects are going to happen in a
17 meaningful way?

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think that's a legitimate
19 question, and I think as we work through the process we
20 should have some coordination with the other agencies
21 to insure we know what they're doing. It's way beyond
22 the scope of this committee, I think.

23 MR. SLITER: Brian brings up a great point.
24 And I'm wondering if we should go so far as to either
25 recommend that the Committee draft a letter or

1 recommend that the Park Service draft a letter to the
2 State Department of Transportation basically saying,
3 hey, look, if we're all building roads in the same
4 basic area at the same basic time, it is going to do
5 much more to lessen the experience of the tourist than
6 if we mesh these together so that we've got some
7 planning in place.

8 And I guess I'd defer to Rick as to what
9 the proper protocol is, whether we should recommend to
10 the Park Service that that letter get drafted or
11 whether we should draft the letter ourselves.

12 MR. SHIREMAN: In fact, that has already
13 occurred from the National Park standpoint. I think
14 the group could ratify and identify that that's a
15 particular concern of the Committee, that we continue
16 to do all of our planning process in conjunction with
17 those other groups.

18 John mentioned yesterday our recent
19 meetings with Montana Department of Transportation and
20 our coordination of our projects, our proposed projects
21 with this state STIP, the State Transportation
22 Improvement Program, and we are working very closely
23 with them to try and develop those relationships, and
24 not only with them, but with the DIA, another agency
25 within the Department of Interior for the reservation

1 areas with the Blackfeet tribe and with some local
2 transportation groups. The transportation study that
3 has been mentioned in the past is anticipated to be a
4 joint cooperative effort with all of those groups. And
5 your support and acknowledging that is an important
6 process and a key factor in success for the repairs,
7 rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun Road would be very
8 helpful.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't we move on to the
10 discussion of what needs to be done for this project to
11 comply with the need for requirements. Somebody
12 brought that up yesterday, and I know there was a real
13 obvious consensus that we want to make sure compliance
14 takes place.

15 MR. JEWETT: In the interest of efficiency,
16 I would like to make a motion that the Committee
17 directs the Park Service to immediately initiate
18 whatever protocols are necessary to put us in NEPA
19 compliance and to couple that with a report to the
20 Committee on the cost of that process.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: There's a motion on the
22 floor. Is there a second?

23 MR. BAKER: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Brian, you second it.

25 Motion's been made and seconded that we direct the Park

1 Service to immediately commence NEPA compliance.

2 Discussion on the motion?

3 MR. BROOKE: I have a question for the Park
4 Service, and I think Tony's motion is timely and
5 particularly well taken. I just want to make sure that
6 we cover all the bases that it is a rifle shot and not
7 a shotgun blast.

8 The Park Service indicated that -- or I got
9 the sense from the Park Service that they knew that,
10 ultimately, this was going to come down to an EIS,
11 which I think is very perceptive when you're spending
12 over a hundred million dollar project on it, but they
13 said that is not significant to the environmental
14 impact.

15 One thing that I'm not clear about is, if
16 this Committee were to recommend and direct Park
17 Service that we do an EIS and just skip the EA, is that
18 something we can do and what are the ramifications of
19 that, and was that what the Park Service was
20 contemplating here at some point?

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will, I think that's
22 different than what Tony's motion is.

23 MR. SLITER: It goes districtly,
24 Mr. Chairman, directly toward what Will is talking
25 about.

1 MR. BROOKE: Because I might want to amend
2 that motion.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Further
4 discussion then?

5 MR. O'QUINN: I think it probably goes
6 without saying that an EIS is going to be done. And
7 there's two ways under the Highway Administration
8 process, and again, I'd like to get a copy of the
9 National Highway process.

10 You can do an EA and determine whether
11 there are significant impacts, and if you determine
12 they are significant impacts, then you do a draft EIS,
13 a final EIS.

14 The other way you can go about it, is you
15 can look it up front and say, we know that there are
16 going to be significance of a major actions, going to
17 have significant impacts, so why bother to spend the
18 time doing the EA, which you're going to use a lot of
19 information for the EA, but you'd still have to lose
20 some time and you go directly to doing the draft EIS.

21 I think it would probably be more
22 appropriate for this Committee, if we're going to try
23 to get the process started, is to tell the Park Service
24 to do the appropriate environmental document. I think
25 the record could come back and question why we said do

1 an EIS. We're trying to get to the same place, but the
2 fact that we would be making a recommendation that they
3 to do an EIS, there might be some question as to what
4 insight that we have for having them doing it.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That was the point, I
6 guess, I was getting at and what I understood Tony's
7 motion is. The motion is to direct appropriate
8 environmental compliance, and I don't, certainly, have
9 the ability to tell them what's appropriate, but it
10 seems like they, through their resources and attorneys,
11 would be able to figure out what's appropriate and do
12 it right. And that's what I thought Tony's motion is
13 getting to. But I don't feel comfortable in saying you
14 guys have to do an EIS instead of an EA.

15 MR. JEWETT: My motion is simply directed
16 at getting us on an appropriate legal track right now,
17 whatever those steps are necessary.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Compliance with the National
19 Environmental Policy Act.

20 MR. BAUMAN: Once we start the NEPA
21 process, part of that work involves scoping the
22 project. One of the issues that's going to come up
23 that we're going to need your input on is what the
24 extent of the project is. It's one situation if we're
25 merely rehabbing the road itself, but if it looks like

1 the project should also include changing some of the
2 pullouts, making modifications to parking areas as part
3 of the overall project, that really changes the flavor
4 of what the environmental impact is. And in the case
5 of just a straight rehab of the road and not doing
6 anything but the road, there may be an opportunity to
7 do an EA. But if you get into other pieces of this and
8 add on peripheral portions to the project, then it's
9 probably an EIS.

10 So telling us to start the NEPA process, I
11 think is appropriate. We'll do the scoping, we'll come
12 back to you and we'll discuss what's in the scope and
13 you can have input into that.

14 MR. SHIREMAN: Just a couple of pieces of
15 information and perhaps a suggestion.

16 First of all, there is every intent on the
17 Park Service to provide the appropriate level of
18 environmental compliance at the appropriate time. And
19 based on that, I think the wording that Tony has
20 provided is okay. There is no problem in establishing
21 the appropriate level originally as an EIS and then
22 modifying that as that scoping comes down. And I would
23 hope that the group would trust the Park Service,
24 Federal Highway and MK Centennial to provide you with
25 enough information and enough expertise that would

1 encourage you to know that we're going to adjust that
2 process accordingly.

3 But we can establish the first process as
4 an EIS and then modify it at a later date for a lesser
5 level of compliance activity if that appears to be
6 appropriate.

7 Secondly, in the wording of your motion you
8 used the word direct. I will remind the Committee that
9 you are an advisory group and would suggest that
10 perhaps a better word there would be the use of the
11 word "advise." You do need to stay within the
12 constraints of your charter and that is as an advisory
13 committee.

14 MR. JEWETT: I would amend the motion.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you accept the
16 amendment? Second?

17 MR. BAKER: Yes.

18 MR. BROOKE: Just one further point, if I
19 may. What I heard Mary Riddle say was that one of your
20 chief concerns of triggering the process was money.
21 And I understand that's the realistic approach and
22 probably a pragmatic approach. That has never bothered
23 the courts. They have always said, that's your
24 problem, you go get the money, because it's going to
25 cost a lot more now that you've started the process.

1 So it concerns me that the Park Service is
2 starting from that point. And I don't know if that's
3 appropriate for this, as odd as that may sound.

4 MR. SLITER: Quick question, I guess for
5 Rick, and we had kind of a side bar discussion on this
6 yesterday.

7 But in taking what you just stated about we
8 can get the scoping done and Dick brought up the
9 scoping. We get the scoping done and kind of trust us,
10 we're going to do the right thing here approach. Will
11 the Committee convene again and have opportunity to
12 make recommendations based on scoping before an EA is
13 started, before the determination is made that an EA
14 would begin?

15 MR. SHIREMAN: Yeah. That direction would
16 happen toward the end of your deliberations; and when I
17 say that, I'm talking about the two-year period. So
18 that if we started a compliance process and identified
19 that as an EIS, certainly you would be meeting again
20 and getting additional information in terms of what
21 that scope is going to be. Until the scope is
22 completed there's not going to be an ability to
23 determine what the particular level of compliance would
24 be, and you will be meeting before that and certainly
25 be provided with the information about those reasons.

1 I want to again clearly state that the Park
2 Service and all of the partners are intent on providing
3 an appropriate and necessary level of compliance and
4 that we look to you to advise us through all of those
5 steps in what you also see as an appropriate level of
6 compliance, but that we don't want to close the door to
7 the possibilities and the potentials that your advice
8 and the expertise of our other partners can get us to a
9 synergistic process that makes sure that that
10 compliance process is the most appropriate for what
11 we're doing. And that means, as you noted before, an
12 enhancement of visitor services and protection of the
13 national resources, and that's the bottom line.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony, can you restate your
15 motion, please? I wrote down advise National Park
16 Service to begin NEPA compliance immediately. And I
17 also heard appropriate, begin an appropriate compliance
18 immediately.

19 MR. BAUMAN: And report back to the
20 Committee on the cost of the process.

21 MR. O'QUINN: I guess I've gotten a little
22 bit confused here in the last minute or two. You begin
23 the NEPA process and then you scope the project, which
24 is correct. But at the same time we're going to have a
25 consultant doing the work. And it was brought up that

1 there's a possibility that the road's going to be
2 rehabbed, and that's the entire project. Or there are
3 other amenities that might go with it that might be
4 done at the same time if you're going to be in the
5 construction mode, such as additional turnouts, parking
6 spaces.

7 It would seem that the data collection and
8 studies that are going to be done early on, you kind of
9 need to know where you think you're going with this
10 thing from the beginning.

11 And maybe it is appropriate to, after MK
12 has looked at what they have in regard to previous
13 economic studies and engineering studies and what have
14 you. And what I'm hearing from Rick is, there seems to
15 be a reluctance to actually start the NEPA process and
16 start the scoping because we don't know what we're
17 going to do, yet we do need the scoping project to know
18 what we're going to do. And at some point that has to
19 happen, and it would seem to me earlier than later.
20 Because there's a lot of publicity about this meeting,
21 about what we're doing, that the project being started;
22 there's going to be a lot of misconception on the
23 public's part about what's going up there, what's not
24 happening. It's important to get that public
25 involvement process started.

1 I know we got a motion, but I think we need
2 to get a real clear understanding from the Park
3 Service's perspective of where this thing's going. And
4 I'm not sure I really understand, and I think we need
5 to understand one another before we leave.

6 MR. BAKER: It's kind of as if we're all
7 dancing around the fire here and trying to figure out
8 who's going to put their foot in first.

9 I'd just like a rough poll here. Is there
10 any of the Committee that does not realize that we're
11 probably going to be looking at parking situations,
12 pull-offs, rehabilitation and enhancement, certain
13 areas of the road width that may have to be expanded?
14 I'm just saying here, we have to kind of get a general
15 direction like right now within amongst ourselves of
16 what we think is going to happen here based on even
17 some of the material that we've already seen or have
18 experienced in the past. We kind of got a different
19 foot in the fire here a little bit.

20 MR. SLITER: Is there anybody sitting at
21 the table here on the Committee that believes that we
22 won't end up in an EIS? And then I'll modify that just
23 a bit to ask the question, is there anybody at the
24 table that believes that there won't be a lawsuit if we
25 don't do an EIS?

1 MR. JACKSON: I don't think the EIS will
2 preclude lawsuits, either.

3 MR. SLITER: Don't misunderstand me. But
4 it would seem that we're begging for a lawsuit if we
5 have the misconception that an EIS is not going to be
6 necessary.

7 MS. BURCH: Well, we have a conflict
8 between -- I think we all like using the word
9 "rehabilitate," but Barney pointed out that the charter
10 does say reconstruction.

11 Furthermore, if you look at a GMP there are
12 eight critical issues in the GMP. One of them was
13 reconstruction of Going-to-the-Sun Road. The other one
14 is visitor use on Going-to-the-Sun Road. And I think
15 that this Committee is not appointed to thoroughly
16 investigate or advise on visitor use of Going-to-the-
17 Sun Road. Now we have to ascertain visitor use because
18 it's going to have an impact on how we decide to advise
19 the recommendation on this project. But I don't think
20 we want to go too far.

21 My feeling is -- well, and then you come
22 back to that you're saying reconstruction. Then you
23 could add some more pullouts that would ultimately have
24 an effect on visitor use. But if you're saying
25 rehabilitation, which is not what's in the charter, my

1 understanding of rehabilitation is you would just bring
2 it back to the state that it was initially.

3 So I see a little conflict there, and I
4 don't know, legally, if we start doing reconstruction
5 and get away from rehabilitation, then are we going to
6 have to bring our guardrails up to higher height and
7 make our roads wider. I'm not clear on that.

8 But the conflict between rehab and
9 reconstruction and visitor use and reconstruction of
10 the road are where I see the rub.

11 MR. BAKER: I think reconstruction is part
12 of rehabilitation in my mind.

13 MR. JEWETT: The genesis of this discussion
14 was that it was important for the people on the
15 Committee to make sure that the actions we were taking,
16 the deliberations were legally and compatible with the
17 laws of the nation when this construction started.
18 That's where this discussion started yesterday, if I
19 remember correctly.

20 And then there was continuing discussion
21 during the course of the day about how the fact the
22 Committee's deliberations interacted with NEPA in the
23 process. My motion was simply intended to answer that
24 question now, advise the Park Service that we're
25 concerned about that, have them take the necessary

1 steps and come back to us to let us know what those
2 steps are and what the costs are going to be, because
3 we are working within a limited budget.

4 Some of these other issues are of the scope
5 and other stuff, so I would suggest maybe we might want
6 to just -- that's the point of my motion. I would like
7 to answer that motion and then maybe we can move on to
8 some other issues.

9 MS. PAHL: Just a response to Susie. Two
10 days ago Ethan mentioned that the Park Service has
11 standards that describe rehabilitation, reconstruction
12 and restoration. Quite frankly, what Susie was
13 describing was restoration, not rehabilitation.
14 Restoration is when you put something back;
15 rehabilitation is more about preserving what's still
16 there, preserving the stone -- original stone walls
17 that still exist. Everybody talked about
18 reconstruction of walls that are missing, replacement
19 of some of these avalanche walls with a better
20 barrier.

21 I'm actually hoping in response to what
22 Rick said yesterday, we can make a formal written
23 request that at least in terms of the way the project
24 is communicated to the public, change the word from
25 reconstruction to rehabilitation, that we do refer to

1 it as a rehabilitation project. If we can provide the
2 Committee with those standards we'll find a way in
3 which this project so far hasn't been described, it
4 fits the rehab standard very nicely.

5 MR. O'QUINN: One more comment on that. I
6 think once we open the NEPA process, we as a Committee
7 might think it's strictly rehab and it might be
8 reconstruction. I think the study is going to have to
9 look at some of these other issues, whether they are
10 Implemented or not, whether you're going to do
11 additional parking or not. It makes sense to take that
12 into consideration while you're doing the study and if
13 you're going to do it while you're doing construction.

14 So again, you get back to the NEPA process,
15 the public involvement process and the scoping of what
16 is the project. And the project is going to be scoping
17 with other than just us and just the Park Service.

18 And again, if you start the process that
19 doesn't mean that you're going to have to complete it
20 in a certain period of time. The schedule you put
21 together on it is the schedule you put together on it,
22 to get the process started so at the appropriate time
23 you can scope the project and then move forward from
24 there and just not leave any loopholes.

25 MR. JEWETT: That's exactly the point,

1 Barney. Just because we're asking the Park Service to
2 begin the NEPA process doesn't necessarily mean we're
3 even entering the scoping phase. What we're asking the
4 Park Service to do is say how do our appropriations
5 dovetail with the beginnings of the NEPA process. And
6 fact finding may be the first step before we go to
7 scoping. And I just want to make sure we're moving
8 down that track.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think Tony's motion is a
10 lot more innocuous than some of our comments make it
11 seem. It's just make sure you comply with NEPA
12 requirements. And we're not telling them how to do it
13 or what's required, and I don't think our Committee is
14 in a position to do that.

15 MS. MOE: I have a question, I guess, on
16 exactly what this motion is. Are we asking about what
17 is scheduled for us as well as a cost of what it's
18 going to be, or are we actually asking them to start by
19 putting together the scoping documents? You have it
20 they're supposed to begin the NEPA compliance. What do
21 you mean by begin and what's the purpose of them
22 reporting back on the cost?

23 MR. JEWETT: We're asking them to make sure
24 that our butts are covered so that after all our good
25 work we don't get sued. That's basically what we're

1 asking them. The nervousness yesterday was that people
2 weren't sure that what we were doing here today was
3 necessarily the NEPA process; that might make it
4 vulnerable. So we're asking them to put us on that
5 track.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any further questions or
7 comments, discussion on Tony's motion?

8 All right. If there's no further questions
9 or comments we'll move to a vote. All in favor of
10 Tony's motion signify by aye.

11 (All say aye and the motion passes.)

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Move on to a discussion
13 input from the Committee on the project agreement
14 additions, changes, modifications. And maybe we can
15 just start that discussion with Paul's point earlier
16 about the change you thought you should make. Weren't
17 you talking about a change you thought should be made,
18 Rick, in how to coordinate with the Highway Department,
19 making sure we're coordinating with the Highway
20 Department in here?

21 MR. SHIREMAN: There was a comment about
22 that process, and I had responded back that had that
23 occurred you were talking about seeing a letter
24 advising the Park Service.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Didn't you say something

1 about the coordination? Where were you suggesting?
2 Why don't we just start there.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: That was in the section on
4 Roles and Responsibilities on page eight. There's at
5 the bottom of the page Roman numeral III, "Project
6 Schedule, Roles and Responsibilities." There is a
7 one-liner there that identifies the role and
8 responsibilities for Glacier National Park, for MK
9 Centennial and for Federal Highways. And I just
10 brought your attention to that particular area and
11 asked if that is sufficient for your understanding in
12 the relationship between the three and if not that you
13 recommend or you advise the group to work to expand
14 those definitions of the roles and responsibilities.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Any suggestions
16 on if that language needs to be changed, made stronger,
17 tightened up?

18 MR. BAKER: On the second sentence you may
19 want to put "MK Centennial will prepare the engineering
20 study, socioeconomic study and environmental
21 assessments and any other documentation as deemed
22 necessary."

23 MR. JACKSON: What I've contracted is
24 there's usually a statement of who owns the data, and I
25 think there's going to be a lot of money put into

1 digitizing and that kind of stuff in this analysis.
2 And it should be clearly transmitted to the Park
3 Service so that it could become part of their
4 management information base.

5 MR. BAUMAN: That's in our basic contract
6 with the Park Service.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you want to beef up
8 this? What this says here, "Park staff with FHWA
9 assistance will collect all necessary resource data
10 that is currently available."

11 Is that sufficient language to define the
12 involvement of the Highway Department for your needs?

13 MR. SLITER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think
14 it would hurt to add a sentence in there about the Park
15 Service and MK Centennial coordinating with appropriate
16 state agencies to avoid conflicting projects -- to
17 avoid conflicting project schedules. State and
18 provincial would be great.

19 MR. WHITE: Maybe State and local, because
20 you have other agencies.

21 MR. SLITER: All necessary agencies. The
22 point that needs to be made, maybe it's enough that
23 we're getting it on the record. I have another
24 amendment as long as we're going to start amending
25 the documents. I got another one that we ought to

1 look at.

2 But the point that needs to be made is is
3 that we need to encourage the cooperative communication
4 between all these different agencies that are going to
5 be building roads so we don't find ourselves, as I
6 described before, all building roads at the same time
7 and destroy the experience for the people that are
8 coming to enjoy the area.

9 MR. BROOKE: It's such a valuable point,
10 especially what's going on with Highway 89. I really
11 think we need to encourage the Park Service to make it
12 part of the contract with MK Centennial that MK's going
13 to take some pretty affirmative steps, not just call up
14 the highway boys and say, hey, what are you up to,
15 let's see your schedule; that there's some pretty
16 primitive steps here that are included in your
17 direction to MK, that that's appropriate for us to do.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: As I understand what's
19 going to happen here, Fred, is you're going to do a
20 revised draft of this project agreement. Do either you
21 or Dick have any objections to any of these
22 recommendations you've heard?

23 MR. BABB: No.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: On this particular category
25 any other suggestions from the Committee?

1 MR. SLITER: Mr. Chairman, under this
2 particular heading of Project Schedule, Roles and
3 Responsibilities, I would move if that's necessary for
4 a motion here, to strike "environmental assessment" in
5 the second sentence and replace that with "appropriate
6 NEPA documentation," because it already infers that an
7 EA is going to be done, and I think we've sort of
8 determined through conversation here amongst the
9 Committee that an environmental assessment may not be
10 the first step.

11 So I'd feel more comfortable if that wasn't
12 stated in that particular paragraph.

13 MS. KREMENIK: Can we make it more simple
14 by just saying "all documents as outlined in the
15 scope"? Because I believe the section before that will
16 be outlining and we also talked about adding a
17 transportation survey and historic road survey, those
18 aren't mentioned here under roles and responsibilities.
19 So if we change that to say "prepare the items outlined
20 in the scope it would cover all the ones in the section
21 before.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You understand the point
23 the Committee's getting at?

24 MR. BROOKE: If that were made more general
25 throughout this document, we refer to appropriate NEPA

1 documents.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Appropriate documents to
3 comply with the NEPA requirements. I think Fred and
4 Dick have both indicated that they'll do that.

5 MR. BABB: My only question is whether -- I
6 thought what Rick said was we were starting with an
7 EIS, and maybe I misunderstood that. So what we were
8 going to do, we were going to do more or less what Paul
9 said, take the assessment out and put something in
10 effect we were starting with an EIS and say something
11 that that's the beginning point. If we want to do
12 something else and keep it loose, that's fine, too.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All the motion that passed
14 said was comply with NEPA requirements. We didn't say
15 EIS or EA. So if you guys think that's the most
16 appropriate thing to do, then great.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: The point here is that
18 particular sentence is confusing and that it needs to
19 be modified so that there is no confusion; that the
20 gist is that we will do appropriate environmental
21 compliance, and that's really what that environmental
22 assessment typhology says.

23 MR. SLITER: I understand that the term
24 environmental assessment in there isn't actual talking
25 about the EA. It's just less confusing if we don't say

1 that.

2 MR. BABB: My question is, are we starting
3 off with the assumption we are doing an EIS or not?

4 MR. JEWETT: The term EIS is written
5 throughout this.

6 MR. BABB: I'm referring to the discussions
7 that occurred earlier where Rick summed that up. And I
8 just want to make sure that that's the direction we're
9 still going.

10 MR. SLITER: Mr. Chairman, just so we can
11 sort of, once again, broach the issue of the
12 appropriate environmental documents, I guess the point
13 that I want to make is that I hear horror stories about
14 on the Beartooth Highway a four-million-dollar
15 environmental assessment. Well, we clearly don't have
16 the money to waste on a four-million-dollar or more
17 assessment. We ought to skip the thing and go straight
18 to the EIS because we know that's where we're going to
19 go in the end anyway.

20 MR. BAKER: What Rick was saying was, sure,
21 we can start with the EIS, we can start it off, but as
22 we go through and the process develops we may want to
23 back off because we realize we're not going to be
24 changing that much, maybe the highway's not going to
25 change at all. But at least we got our rear ends

1 covered.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other comments,
3 suggestions for this part of the agreement before we
4 move to other parts of the agreement?

5 All right. Why don't we then move to other
6 suggestions that members of the Committee might have.
7 Why don't we take a five-minute break.

8 (Short break taken.)

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Since we're losing some
10 people at noon I have had a couple of requests, number
11 one to talk about communication and public input and
12 marketing before Jane and Barbara take off, and Brian,
13 and also I would like to make sure we talk before they
14 leave about when we're having our next meeting. We
15 need to try to save some time to talk about these other
16 things before these people leave us.

17 Why don't we move to further discussions on
18 the project agreement. And we started talking about it
19 yesterday and kind of put it aside. And I know that
20 David had some thoughts and suggestions on the
21 socioeconomic scoping section, so would you mind
22 starting, David, with that?

23 MR. JACKSON: Take me a couple minutes. In
24 fact, I got some suggested word changes, and I'll read
25 those but stop and explain why I did that. And if you

1 folks can read my handwriting at the end you're welcome
2 to whatever.

3 I think the beginning part C, which is on
4 page seven, actually lacks a statement "purpose," and
5 that's critical. So I want to kind of propose that we
6 add that so that we understand why we're doing the
7 analysis.

8 And I propose the following: "Mitigation
9 of the economic impacts of road rehabilitation may
10 include but not be limited to such strategies as
11 extending the construction season, one-way traffic,
12 limiting public use for shorter periods of time or
13 possibly direct financial assistance to local
14 businesses that may be adversely affected by the
15 project."

16 So I want to stop there. And I don't want
17 to suggest that this is the only things that MK
18 Centennial should do, but I want to bury the financial
19 assistance along with other alternatives,

20 MR. BAKER: Did you say bury the --

21 MR. JACKSON: I want it as a part of, but
22 not the exclusive focus of, because I'm not sure how
23 legal it is. I'm not sure whether MK Centennial should
24 do the analysis of the legality or the Park Service.
25 It would require -- ultimately it has to be done -- a

1 set of triggers so that we would know when a business
2 was hurting and then we could in fact objectively allow
3 them access to financial funds so that there was some
4 standard rather than looking like some sort of a porky
5 deal or something. In other words, that's what I want
6 to get at without saying it quite so directly. Okay?

7 Now, socioeconomic analysis will contribute
8 to better comparison of these complex alternatives and
9 shall rely in part upon the following information.

10 So this is why we want the information, we
11 want to be able to compare the alternatives more
12 effectively. And I don't want to get into creative
13 engineering, and I think these folks can imagine all
14 kinds of ways that I can't do. But I want to throw
15 things in there to indicate the complexity.

16 1 is very similar to what's 1 already on
17 the sheet, and that is, "Detailed baseline economic
18 information about business in the Glacier Park area so
19 that rehabilitation impacts can actually be
20 estimated."

21 Now, Susie, if your business is hurt you're
22 going to have to demonstrate how it's hurt, and the
23 only way you can do that is to have some baseline
24 information that would have developed without the road
25 project. Okay? That's why we need detailed economic

1 information.

2 2, "Econometric forecasts of park
3 visitation that would occur without the project so that
4 various alternatives might be estimated, without it
5 various alternatives might be estimated."

6 We don't want to compensate businesses for
7 acts of God, such things as long snow seasons that
8 already adversely impact businesses around Glacier
9 Park. A lower level of that is Allen Greenspan and the
10 Federal Reserve. Being American, just a candle to that
11 is the Bank of Canada. Those things affect exchange
12 rates, and those things are the things we're not trying
13 to compensate businesses for, either.

14 And so we should have some way of knowing,
15 given the weather that's occurring and given the
16 exchange rates as they occur, what level of abuse of
17 use could be expected without the road, and that would
18 be a forecast. So that's why I am suggesting it
19 because this becomes like damage. The only way you can
20 assess damage is what would have occurred without the
21 event and would have occurred with the event. And I'm
22 trying to suggest a way of describing that.

23 So my second one is, "Econometric forecast
24 of park visitation that would occur without the project
25 so that impacts of various alternatives might be

1 estimated." That's the language and that's the
2 rationale.

3 Third, "Detailed models must be estimated
4 that directly link park visitation patterns with local
5 business activity so that impacts of rehabilitation may
6 be estimated."

7 Now let me stop. I think some businesses
8 will be advantaged by this, depending on where they are
9 and how traffic patterns move. And I don't think we
10 should compensate them for damages, because I think we
11 should show that they're not damaged. And I think that
12 that's the logic of this.

13 And 4, this is consistent with already on
14 here: "Detailed analysis about the relationship
15 between rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road and
16 the regional and national economy."

17 And I think they mean highways and
18 transportation economy as well. And I think that is
19 consistent with what it said. And that I would say of
20 course the development of a marketing plan, just like
21 they've said before, and then of course how the rehab
22 project fits into the local economy so as to assist
23 economically disadvantaged residents of the Glacier
24 National Park region.

25 Now the reason I say that is that, that's

1 perfectly consistent with the language that Don White
2 has been proposing throughout this meeting and it would
3 allow the creative Identification of who is
4 economically disadvantaged and how the project might be
5 tailored to help in that event. And I think that's
6 something that is a small item but not hard to do.

7 And then, of course, what I think everybody
8 understands but isn't listed is construction cost
9 estimates associated with each alternative. I think
10 that's so common that engineers don't say it, but we
11 want to know if for instance -- I'll be really wild.
12 If we cover the road for a period of time so the snow
13 slides over and and you can extend the construction
14 season, what will it cost to do that and how would that
15 impact then the local economy and tourism and so on.
16 There's a lot of imaginary things these guys can dream
17 up but I think some of them are more expensive than
18 others, and it would be worthwhile to know what these
19 cost changes will buy you in terms of impacts and
20 mitigation to the local economy. And that was after
21 all one of our philosophic statements was to be cost
22 conscious and impact conscious.

23 So I think those things will lend clarity.
24 I don't think they are radical changes from what's on
25 the sheet and I think that if I were on the other side

1 doing the consulting I would give some marching orders
2 that I think are clearer than what we have right now.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any comments on David's
4 suggestions?

5 MS. KREMENIK: Can I ask you to read number
6 4 out again? What I'm looking for is international
7 implications as well as national and regional.

8 MR. JACKSON: Yes. "Detailed analysis
9 about the relationship between rehabilitation of the
10 Going-to-the-Sun Highway and the regional and national
11 economy. And it should be international. That would
12 be fine. Regional would include you, of course, but I
13 didn't mean to ignore my friends from the north.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Could you reread the one
15 you had that addressed Don's concerns about the
16 disadvantage?

17 MR. JACKSON: "Identify ways that the
18 rehabilitation project may be integrated into the local
19 economy so as to assist economically disadvantaged
20 residents of the Glacier National Park region."

21 MR. McDONALD: I appreciate David's
22 comments and I agree with them wholeheartedly. I think
23 one area in the socioeconomic scope that I have
24 questions about is defining the Glacier area. To me
25 and the people that I'm representing and the travel

1 patterns of Highway 93 that considering the impact
2 zone, the immediate impact zone needs to go all the way
3 down to Missoula and cover most of the Flathead Indian
4 reservation because of the amount of traffic that comes
5 through our neighborhood.

6 I agree completely on the economic
7 disadvantage. I guess now we think of the entire state
8 as economically disadvantaged. We've sunk to 50th
9 beyond Arkansas, I believe, who used to have the
10 honor. That is somewhat of a tragedy to me but I think
11 we need to look at every way possible through the
12 construction, employees and everything else to maximize
13 whatever is done here.

14 So I think there really needs to be a lot
15 of emphasis on that aspect of it. Indian reservations
16 are further depressed. The Blackfeet Nation struggles
17 with that and the Salish and Kootenai are a little more
18 successful. We struggled with it quite a bit
19 ourselves. We do support everything that Don has said
20 and would like to see that realized.

21 MS. ANDERSON: And I would second what Tom
22 just said. Not only does this affect the Glacier Park
23 area and the Flathead area, all of Glacier country goes
24 clear down to the Bitterroot, down to Cutbank which
25 takes it into the Blackfeet Reservation, but it also

1 includes the east part of the state which is hit hard
2 with the economics right now. It would go all the way
3 across Highway 2. You would see a lot of effect in
4 Great Falls, Wolf Point, all the way across there and
5 also clear down into Butte, that corridor that goes in
6 between the two parks, Yellowstone Park. So it would
7 somehow need to take in that whole area, and it does
8 affect the economy of them.

9 They say that they know the day that the
10 road is done their businesses pick up, and one of the
11 statistics that's always thrown around is for every day
12 that the road is not open the area loses a million
13 dollars.

14 MR. BAKER: One thing, there's really not
15 too much to add, but I was wondering if there was some
16 way we could put into that, if they could come up with
17 some suggestions and enhancements -- I'm not going
18 alternatives, but I'm going to say enhancements -- to
19 their Interpretive Services Program, the Park Service's
20 program, there may be a distinct transfer of emphasis
21 on the interpretive programming of Glacier Park during
22 certain periods from the west to the east, depending on
23 vehicular traffic and flow, and it would be nice to
24 know what their suggestions could be for alternatives
25 for visitors on the east side and especially with joint

1 partnership with the Blackfeet. There could be some
2 really interesting things come out of this, and I think
3 that should be looked at in that socioeconomic part.

4 MR. JEWETT: A couple things, David. I
5 came in late in your discussion. There was some
6 terminology you were using about compensating
7 businesses and business loss. Could you revisit that,
8 please?

9 MR. JACKSON: Well, number 2 is mitigation
10 strategy including federal assistance, which has been a
11 fairly murky phrase all along. And it's a phrase that
12 none of us understand. But we know that it could
13 include such things as low interest loans to businesses
14 that are strapped as a result of the project. It could
15 include that. It may not. It could include a number
16 of things that are not clear. I'll be a manager, too.
17 It could include a rescission of Glacier Park fees to
18 attract people. Just as an example it could include
19 low interest loans in targeted areas that are
20 depressed. Okay? Those are some of the things it
21 might include.

22 However, in order to kind of do that, it
23 can't be something that is just a loosey-goosey kind of
24 deal. It should be something that's set up with some
25 kind of thoughtfulness so there's an ability for

1 someone to qualify for those. And that seems to me to
2 require some kind of standards for what the impact is.

3 Now let's take the most extreme case, which
4 is, I own a motel right here at the west gate, and I've
5 identified that during four months out of the year I do
6 about 80 percent of my business. I've identified what
7 my sales are. And then somebody could forecast and
8 relate that to Park visitation so that when visitation
9 starts to track with the road I can identify that I'm
10 in trouble and I can go and get some financial
11 assistance. I think that would be the only way that
12 someone who is handing out public money could do it in
13 a thoughtful and fair way.

14 So in order to do that, you need baseline
15 information. You need some kind of idea what
16 businesses would be like five years from now, and we
17 have seen them not necessarily growing in the last few
18 years. And so we would have some standard for doing
19 that. I think that part of that's the Park Service's
20 problem, but part of it is developing the database
21 through MK Centennial, to allow them to turn around and
22 do that. I think that it's a two-handed kind of
23 arrangement, that if you don't coordinate it, it's not
24 going to work right.

25 MR. SHIREMAN: You're not saying anything

1 that doesn't sound reasonable and logical to think
2 about.

3 MR. JEWETT: Well, it seems to me that as
4 I've learned more about the socioeconomic modeling
5 that's been done so far on this issue, it really comes
6 into perspective of the company MK is supposed to
7 fulfill. And I'm really interested in trying to get --
8 in having MK explore what it takes to maintain
9 visitation at current levels as opposed to doing
10 projections and doomsday projections about it going
11 down.

12 And to me, when I look at federal assistant
13 mitigation strategies, what I see is as a Committee why
14 don't we find ways to publicize this park by pouring
15 money into advertising nationally and drawing people to
16 the park so that we can maintain visitation.

17 I mean, that's sort of my direction, where
18 I would like to go, and I don't know how that
19 integrates with what your thinking is.

20 MR. JACKSON: I consider that as part of
21 the -- that's why I didn't turn around and say, these
22 are the only alternatives. I just think that the
23 reason we're here is because primarily businesses are
24 deeply concerned with the impacts of this project on
25 their livelihoods and their survival. And I think that

1 if we don't recognize that possibility, where
2 mitigation deals with that, and it could be something
3 like that.

4 And I'm not an engineer, but I'm sure these
5 folks have got experience in building roads in adverse
6 alpine environments with all kinds of imaginative
7 things that they can do to extend the construction
8 season. They can do one-way traffic. We might have
9 any number of things.

10 In addition to that, you could have a
11 national campaign as mitigation, too. That's certainly
12 the kind of stuff that I would hope that the
13 imagination takes over and rolls with in this kind of
14 extended procedure.

15 MS. PAHL: I have a question and a
16 comment. My comment is whether or not there's a
17 differentiation between visitation and businesses as
18 opposed to the role between road open and closure
19 probabilities, because sometimes those two keep getting
20 put together as one. The road being open and closed
21 seems to signify the Park is not available, and I know
22 some of the language in the charter talks about this
23 road being "the" premiere attraction in the Park, which
24 it is "a" premiere; that "the" maybe should be changed
25 to "a" premiere so people understand there are other

1 premiere reasons to be in Glacier National Park besides
2 the experience of going over this road.

3 My second comment is, I have attended a
4 meeting with Matthew Collin and David Mihalic where we
5 were talking about some things in Travel Montana
6 related to issues with the motels and whatnot, and
7 Matthew's response was that there was a sense among
8 some parks that they didn't want Travel Montana to be
9 promoting a lot of visitation to Glacier National Park.

10 And I think Travel Montana is also a strong
11 partner on the communication piece of this in the
12 notion of keeping visitation where it is and talking
13 about other things to see in the Park as opposed to
14 this idea, that no, we don't really want more people to
15 come.

16 MR. BAKER: That may be a bit of a
17 misnomer, because it wouldn't be directed to Glacier.
18 It would be a reallocation for resources to specific
19 areas which they have determined might be impacted. So
20 what you may see is an enhancement, not a reallocation,
21 but an enhancement or resources to certain areas for a
22 limited period of time.

23 And that's been done before in certain
24 areas of the country, and British Columbia was a big
25 one when they redid the Coquihalla Highway, they did

1 that exact thing and it worked like a smooth cape.

2 I fully support what Tony says. I think
3 the marketing and the marketing images that the
4 National Park Service is going to have to come up with
5 in the sayings and the messages of how we're going to
6 treat the rehabilitation of the road over the next, I'm
7 going to say, 10 to 15 years, is really important, and
8 I think we need to get those messages out now.

9 We've already been at it for five years and
10 they're doing construction every year. We're already
11 in the rehabilitation stage of the highway and I think
12 the Park Service needs to get the correct message of,
13 we are under rehabilitation of a world class renowned
14 highway. It's just part of the experience now for the
15 next 20 years. All of a sudden it starts showing up in
16 all your long-term travel planners as being, the famous
17 Going-to-the-Sun Highway is currently under
18 rehabilitation. It's a 20-year phase so expect some
19 delays or whatever. That messages might be high-
20 lighted in the socioeconomic thing.

21 And MK Centennial, they need to emphasis
22 that in their up front documents for immediate action.

23 MR. BROOKE: I'm glad to hear the National
24 Park Association take that position, especially hear
25 maintaining the visitation level is the appropriate

1 thing to do, and I tend to agree with you. Businesses
2 that are around the Park, the doomsday projections --
3 we really don't want to get into that. But it became
4 apparent to us if there was going to be tradeoffs about
5 this alternative's going to cost this much and the
6 impacts are only going to be this much, we disagree
7 strongly. It could be without appropriate kinds of
8 truly aggressive efforts, as you say, to maintain
9 those. So I really welcome these kinds of comments.

10 The Federal Assistance is what bothered me.
11 They didn't build their businesses on federal
12 assistance, really. They are business people who have
13 taken risk and worked hard and they just don't think
14 that way. And I'm afraid that that plan is maybe going
15 to cause the Park Service or MK Centennial to think
16 within that kind of box. And some of the things you
17 said, I think, are good ideas in terms of maybe keeping
18 outside the box.

19 One of the things I'd like to see, and I
20 don't know if it has to be a recommendation, but just
21 so I get it out in front of you guys to think about,
22 Rick Hill talked about this notion early on, of
23 creating enterprise zones around the Park, which I'm
24 not familiar with what all that means, but it certainly
25 has some meaning in terms of incentives and those kinds

1 of things, I believe. And it's a federal designation
2 that carries some economic wallop to it. And I know
3 that business people would be interested in those kinds
4 of things. And I don't know if that has to be part of
5 this recommendation.

6 But my point is, I don't want to be limited
7 by federal assistance, and I think there are other ways
8 to get at this thing.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Could you repeat your
10 language about the federal assistance, Dave?

11 MR. JACKSON: I think that was in the
12 beginning. "Mitigation of the economic impact road
13 rehabilitation may include but not be limited to such
14 strategies as extending the construction season,
15 one-way traffic, limiting public use to a shorter
16 period of time in the year, possible direct financial
17 assistance to local businesses that may be adversely
18 affected by the project or a number of other management
19 and engineering alternatives."

20 I mean, I wanted to put a broad view on
21 that, because I think it shouldn't be the only thing.
22 And then I think that's the most severe and difficult
23 one for anybody to kind of deal with.

24 MR. BAKER: Again, I'm going to go back to
25 what Tony was saying. I think at the very beginning of

1 that list, instead of getting into the one ways, two
2 ways, and so on, "innovative market strategies" are key
3 words and should be included.

4 MR. DAKIN: I'm very comfortable with all
5 the things that are being brought to the table here,
6 but I am worried about how much of the budget, then,
7 the socioeconomic study would take. And I wonder if MK
8 Centennial can tell me a ballpark what they estimate
9 they can spend out of our million dollars on that,
10 because as we comment about making these corridors
11 legitimate, it certainly does affect Great Falls and
12 beyond. But I'm starting to think you could easily
13 spend a billion bucks just on the socioeconomic survey
14 and I think we have to expect to operate within some
15 kind of limits there.

16 MR. BABB: Let me basically answer it
17 quickly and then I'd like to add a side bar to it.
18 We're not ready to give you an estimate. We've got to
19 look at what -- everything that you'd like to have on
20 the plate, and then our economic consultant will be
21 here after lunch. She wasn't able to be here earlier
22 this week. So it's pretty immature for me to try and
23 put a number on it.

24 I think the efforts of the socioeconomic to
25 quantify what the cost to the businesses and lost

1 revenue, if there are not innovative ways to extend
2 traffic flow and extend the season, quantifying what
3 the potential for lawsuits, helps build the
4 justification to spend money during construction on
5 unusual techniques. Doing it the way we've always done
6 it may be the cheapest construction procedure but will
7 have tremendous negative impacts on the economy.

8 So by quantifying what potential impacts
9 could be if we don't do it in different ways, that will
10 help us with the justification for a higher budget,
11 spending more money on the construction to proceed with
12 the project and make it.

13 I like the criteria that Tony had to
14 maintain, have a criteria, have a performance criteria
15 in the construction contract that they'll get a bonus,
16 the contractor will get a bonus if they maintain
17 traffic flow and the visitor level doesn't go down.
18 Make it an incentive for the contractor.
19 There's several things -- publicizing it nationwide,
20 publicizing it worldwide, putting it on the web that
21 this is going to be something you don't want to miss,
22 this part of it. But part of it is like modifying what
23 the potential loss to the communities would be. We
24 could use that as justification incentives during
25 construction so there won't be a lawsuit.

1 MR. McDONALD: Just one item expanding the
2 socioeconomic study. I'm glad Will brought this up,
3 because this is one of my pet peeves, is having all
4 your eggs in a basket.

5 As I look at the potential for enterprise
6 zones surrounding the Park, we look at all the scenic
7 highways in our community and talked about coordination
8 with Montana Department of Transportation, it's not
9 like coordination on reconstruction projects occur, but
10 it's a long-term planning and design for the parks. To
11 me to maximize the economic benefit of tourism in
12 Montana, it's not how we get visitors from Glacier down
13 to Yellowstone as fast as possible on a five-lane
14 highway. It's a matter of slowing those people down,
15 having a meaningful, scenic highway program in Montana
16 and looking at that socioeconomic benefit of a good
17 scenic highway program and diversifying what we have.
18 And I think that should be part of the study on what
19 we're doing here.

20 MR. JEWETT: Just so there's no confusion,
21 Dick, I might comment, I wasn't necessarily equating
22 loss of traffic flow with loss of visitor use. And I
23 think clearly what this socioeconomic study hinges on,
24 in my view, is the degree of which visitors may or may
25 not be impacted by the opportunities to pass through

1 the Park. And that has to be measured.

2 And then mitigation strategies need to be
3 designed to break that into, "why do people go over the
4 pass." They go over it to actually get to the top of
5 it, so they can have the experience at the top of it?
6 So what percentage of people do that? And therefore
7 how do we replace that experience or allow them to have
8 that experience in a way that produces a cost efficient
9 project that you can get through.

10 And so it gets back from my half full
11 comment is, let's fill the cup even more while having
12 an efficient project and a viable visitor experience
13 that highlights the assets of the Park and create new
14 assets in the Park in the process.

15 MR. BABB: I was maybe misstated. But I
16 was thinking in terms of visitor use, not in terms of
17 traffic counts. I think there's other ways to bring
18 the visitors to the sites that they want to see without
19 every one of them driving their own vehicle to do it.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other comments on David's
21 suggestions for changes in the socioeconomic scope?

22 MS. KREMENIK: This green document, will
23 that go to MK for the scope of their work after we've
24 had a report back to them in May about the level of
25 research that's out there, or does it go to them before

1 that?

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The way I understand this,
3 Fred's going to do another draft of this, taking into
4 account the recommendations from this group for changes
5 and we're going to get a revised draft back that we can
6 look at again before it's finalized and signed. Isn't
7 that right?

8 MR. SHIREMAN: No. This is your chance to
9 comment on the document. It needs to be presented to
10 MK Centennial and signed before they can continue
11 additional work. So that needs to be in place before
12 your next meeting.

13 MS. KREMENIK: So will we hear back from
14 them? I guess it will depend on the timings of our
15 meetings. I'm wondering if all of the things out-
16 lined here are going to be necessary based on their
17 initial scoping of what economic impact research is
18 already out there. So if there's already some research
19 on some of these areas, we're basically asking them to
20 re-perform the impact work that we already have in an
21 economic impact assessment. Isn't that what we're
22 asking them to do, is come back in May after they've
23 gone through the documentation available?

24 MR. SHIREMAN: Right. At each of those
25 points there will be a chance for a revision of the

1 document. What you're saying here is that that first
2 step is to identify what has been already accomplished
3 and then with that information and the recommendation
4 and concurrence by the Park Service and Federal
5 Highways they move forward, and the availability of
6 funding, they move forward to fill in the blanks in
7 these areas that are identified in the project
8 documents.

9 And remember that this is the general
10 document that covers all of their work. They would
11 then receive task orders specific to each step of the
12 process. And you would have input into those as they
13 move forward in the next two years.

14 MR. JACKSON: Could I suggest that what I
15 propose what's on the green sheet is not a radical
16 change. I've taken number 2, the mitigation, and made
17 it a preamble. Then I've taken number 1 and said the
18 reason we're doing this is so we have a baseline.
19 Okay? I've taken number 3, which is hard to
20 understand, look at impact created closures over ten
21 years and said really do that in a solid way so you can
22 forecast what use would be in the future without the
23 project so that you have a future expected baseline.

24 Then the national and regional implications
25 of road construction is fuzzy, but I think I've

1 included that in the larger regional stuff, including
2 Canada. I haven't changed the implication public
3 relation, managing, marketing plan and all those
4 things. In fact, you folks have inserted all those
5 into the preamble where they probably should be
6 anyway.

7 And then I've added the idea of looking at
8 how to integrate the plan and helping the economic
9 disadvantaged, which I think is a good suggestion. But
10 frankly, I don't think that's expensive, and the part I
11 proposed, which is the economy, I think I could do a
12 month, so I'm thinking a hot shot could do it quicker
13 than that.

14 MR. O'QUINN: This is a skeleton of where
15 the whole project is going. There's no money
16 transfers. When it's signed it's just an agreement
17 between the Park Service and the consultant as to how
18 the project's going to be approached. Then each task
19 that's generalized in here will be more specific and
20 give them a scope of work and negotiated price. But
21 this is just the overall skeleton we're going to pop
22 around.

23 MR. BAKER: Given the method in which the
24 changes and amendments are going in, it's difficult to
25 see what's going to fit where and how it's going to

1 look, and I personally would be more comfortable, or I
2 would at least like to see if we change documents --
3 faxed, e-mailed or whatever -- so I can have it
4 straight in my mind this is exactly what we talked
5 about. Because it's tough. It's good, but I'd just
6 like to see it, have it attached to this. We don't
7 have to have a meeting for it.

8 MR. SHIREMAN: One thing that we could do,
9 David, if you would provide that information to Dayna
10 or Debbie or Mary, they could go ahead and get that in
11 in document form and get it back to you by lunchtime so
12 you at least have that information available to you.

13 And keep in mind, and I will make the
14 commitment, we are trying to capture all the
15 information, all of the suggestions, either when it's
16 specific wording or just a general comment, the ideas
17 there with the addition of the sentence that Brian had
18 mentioned earlier for Section 7 as opposed to the
19 general comment that we need to be careful about the
20 environmental compliance.

21 And you have my commitment and the
22 commitment of the Park Service to look at those and
23 incorporate them in the review process. But we do need
24 to get a final document completed and signed so that we
25 can move forward on those parts of this task that we

1 need to have completed before your next meeting. So
2 you need to recognize that what you provide us today is
3 your input into the development of the final document.

4 MS. PAHL: I think we all knew we would be
5 learning new things when we participated in this
6 Committee, so would you indulge me by giving me the
7 definition of the word "econometric?"

8 MR. JACKSON: That's a statistical model
9 based on economic theory. Well, it would predict the
10 level of visits in this case as a function of the
11 length of the season, the weather in the area, exchange
12 rate in Canada, the level of advertising by the tourism
13 groups and larger population, things like the
14 population in -- oh, and then estimates of where the
15 people have come from so you have some notion of travel
16 cost and those kinds of things.

17 And you could probably take those numbers
18 that you have historically to bounce around and do a
19 terrifically good job of estimating what the changes
20 have been as a function of the weather and how long the
21 road was open and exchange rates and all that stuff.

22 Now the idea of that is, if we really are
23 worried about mitigating and it comes to what I think
24 is the scary part, which is financial assistance, we'd
25 be able to say in the year 2010 with the exchange rates

1 as they are, the weather as it was, so that we're not
2 compensating for acts of God, big and little God, this
3 is what the visits would have been without the project
4 and this is what they are now.

5 So if the Glacier Park Raft Company or the
6 KOA campground is on the edge of survival, we would
7 have some reason to be able to verify that and allow
8 them direct access to whatever financial stuff there is
9 on a basis that's not arbitrated but rather thoughtful,
10 and I think that's sensible.

11 MR. GASKILL: I have just one more point of
12 verification. I'm speaking on behalf of Fred.
13 Regarding this document, kind of what he wanted to
14 clarify was, this is a overall guidance document. It's
15 really for the overall project; it's not for MK
16 Centennial specifically. It's for everything that gets
17 done on this project and then the task force written
18 from that.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there other thoughts on
20 the socioeconomic part of the agreement or can we move
21 to talking about a different part of it?

22 Any suggestions on other parts of the
23 agreement? Why don't we look specifically at the
24 engineering study scope, which is B on page six. Any
25 suggestions for changes in that?

1 MR. DAKIN: Again, I wanted to just spend a
2 few minutes on it after we saw that film about the snow
3 plowing. But I do suggest that somewhere on the
4 engineering study scope, part B on page six, that one
5 of the things that needs to be redeveloped by MK
6 Centennial, but with the National Park Service, are
7 maintenance strategies, including spring opening
8 protocols that maximize the longevity of both historic
9 and non-historic features on the road.

10 And I don't want to derail our discussion
11 that had so many other things to accomplish this
12 morning about that, but would just ask that you at
13 least consider that.

14 MS. PAHL: Is it strategies or standards?
15 And it would be done and funded but also how it's
16 done.

17 MR. DAKIN: The difference between
18 strategies -- I'm looking for kind of operating
19 processes, ways that you do things that may or may not
20 give the public the best return on their investment

21 MR. GASKILL: Protocol?

22 MR. DAKIN: I certainly thought the word
23 protocol applies to the spring opening snow plowing
24 effort itself. I think strategies may be a broad
25 enough term that many things could be brought into

1 that.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are we talking long-term
3 maintenance strategies?

4 MR. DAKIN: Yes; forever perpetual
5 strategies. It's so cyclical that it would actually
6 carry you kind of through the seasons there.

7 MS. PAHL: This has to be done every five
8 years; this has to be done every year.

9 MR. O'QUINN: I think there's a recognition
10 of this, and again, if we are going back to a skeleton
11 and not detail, but when we talk about engineering
12 study I think I've come to understand that what's
13 really being talked about is the physical condition
14 studies, the physical condition of the highway with
15 regard to geology and the pavement conditions and such
16 as that.

17 And they separate that from the
18 transportation slash visitors use plan, yet the
19 transportation plan is part of the softer side of the
20 engineering study and the traffic analysis and the
21 traffic engineering aspects of it, and yet it's
22 recognized in here because they say in both the
23 engineering and transportation study the following
24 critical elements need to be addressed: parking
25 trails, comfort station, signs, interpretation, so on.

1 So I guess my understanding -- and this is
2 kind of a question for the Park Service is, there will
3 be parts of the softer side of the engineering study to
4 track engineering aspects of it as part of the
5 engineering studies, I assume. Is that correct?

6 MR. SHIREMAN: To my knowledge of what you
7 are asking, yes, that the transportation studies will
8 be part of the overall process.

9 MR. O'QUINN: There was some question that
10 the transportation slash visitor use plan was a
11 separate study from the engineering study, and I think
12 we're playing semantics. It's all data that needs to
13 be provided.

14 MR. SHIREMAN: I think that's where the
15 confusion may have come from, because it's a different
16 funding source it may be managed somewhere else.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other questions or
18 suggestions for changes in this engineering study scope
19 language in the project agreement?

20 You think, then, this language is accurate?

21 Any suggestions for changes, additions in
22 any other part of the project agreement from any other
23 Committee members?

24 MR. BAKER: On page five in the Study
25 Assumption/Parameters, on the bottom of the page I

1 would like to personally include the word "enhance."
2 The goal is to reconstruct and enhance. You may want
3 to rehabilitate. But I would like to get the word
4 enhance in there if possible.

5 MR. JACKSON: Do you want to provide an
6 enhanced quality visitor experience?

7 MR. BAKER: No. You have to have the
8 reconstruct or the rehabilitate, but I want to add the
9 word enhance, if possible. Enhance means it may
10 include a better parking area.

11 MR. JACKSON: But you're trying to enhance
12 the visitor experience, which is part of that first
13 statement on the next page.

14 MR. BAKER: Yes and no. Just up for
15 discussion.

16 MS. PAHL: At the same time can we discuss
17 using the word in this document, "rehabilitation?"
18 Reconstruction's probably in here 50 different times.
19 I would love for the reconstruction word to be replaced
20 with rehabilitation. I don't know how far you can go
21 away from the congressional languages, but if we have
22 to keep the word reconstructed, I would like to add the
23 word rehabilitation.

24 MR. SHIREMAN: I think it would be possible
25 to do something along the lines of reconstruction slash

1 rehabilitation, or rehabilitation slash reconstruction.
2 And the issue here, I believe, is that the word
3 reconstruction is identified -- and I'm interpreting,
4 so please understand this is my personal interpretation
5 -- that in the overall size and scope of this project,
6 that the level of work is going to be at the
7 rehabilitation level, that there may be parts of the
8 road single walls so that because of their condition
9 and their current structure have to be reconstructed.

10 Taken as whole, adding all of those parts
11 of reconstruction together, that our intent here is do
12 the least amount of change with the greatest amount of
13 effect. And that to me stipulates that that connection
14 between rehabilitation and reconstruction, neither one
15 is incorrect, but taken together they give a better
16 flavor of what we're trying to get to.

17 MR. O'QUINN: Back to the question of
18 enhance and/or improve or any of these other words, are
19 we being restricted in the use of rehabilitate slash
20 reconstruct such that the interpretation that's going
21 to come out of that is going to preclude any additional
22 parking or pullouts, or is that on the table for
23 consideration and study?

24 Not to say this is going to be done or not
25 going to be done. But if we're confined with such type

1 parameters as rehabilitate slash reconstruct, which
2 means no more than what you've got there right now, I
3 think we got a different study in front of us than I
4 thought we had.

5 MS. PAHL: Two points. One is that the
6 national historic landmark, you're going to have to
7 comply with Section 106.

8 Do you also understand that landmarks have
9 a higher level of that whole process of 106? So even
10 if you don't use the word rehab, you're going to still
11 -- all those questions are going to have to have the
12 input of the State Historic Preservation Office.

13 MR. O'QUINN: All of those criteria, or all
14 those laws contained have the opportunity to comment
15 and consider and say the final decision rests with the
16 agency.

17 MS. PAHL: Which is the National Park
18 Service in a national park.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I understand. Don't jump to
20 conclusions. I'm not saying we're going to do it or
21 not going to do it, but is the study going to consider
22 it and go through the proper process of 106. The
23 Federal Highway money's involved here. We're talking
24 about a lot of laws -- the endangered species.

25 But the question is, are we limiting the

1 study from the get-go to a major maintenance project
2 that's going to make no improvements for the visitor
3 use, or is that on the table for consideration?

4 MS. PAHL: One more comment on this issue.
5 If you look at a rehabilitation project like in a
6 building, what you are often finding is new bathrooms,
7 new plumbing, new electrical, new kitchens. You're not
8 talking about restoring the original features that were
9 in that building, which is more of a museum than a
10 property that is getting continued use when you're
11 trying to make it appropriate for the future.

12 So within rehabilitation projects you get
13 change, but at the same time what you're trying to do
14 is respect the existing historic fabricate of it. So I
15 still think the word rehab and the word standard do
16 apply here and can accommodate some changes to the
17 project.

18 MR. BAKER: The direct example that I'll
19 use is the loop. Okay? When they do the loop
20 obviously the turning radius is not in the safety
21 standards of today's highway construction, and it's
22 going to be broadened out to make that a safe turn.

23 When you broaden that out there's probably
24 going to some additional parking done within the
25 interior of the loop. And that's what I was getting

1 at; it's an enhancement while at the same time taking
2 into safety concerns and still keeping with the
3 historical flavor of the loop.

4 It may go outside of the boundaries to
5 comply with the safety regulations and turning
6 radiuses, but at the same time you may be able to add
7 one space or two spaces or whatever. That's all I was
8 concerned with.

9 MR. DAKIN: Deja-vu on some of this,
10 because it's exactly where we were when I worked with
11 the Park and the interface within historic preservation
12 and engineering, and the word enhance was sometimes
13 intimidating to some people because enhance is very
14 subjective -- four lanes can be an enhancement.

15 I don't mind the use of the word enhance,
16 but I'm suggesting that we can compromise right here by
17 saying within historic parameters or something, which
18 wouldn't preclude some improvements of the nature here
19 such as Barney would probably would want to have on the
20 table, at least as an alternative.

21 MR. BAKER: Hearing what Barb said it makes
22 more sense to me. There is some latitude within that.

23 MR. JACKSON: Just a question. Somewhere
24 down the road I can imagine dynamite being used. I can
25 imagine helicopters used in construction and some

1 things that will have adverse potential impacts on
2 foreign quantum. And I'm curious at what stage those
3 will be analyzed in the project and by whom.

4 MR. SHIREMAN: Obviously that will be part
5 of the analysis of the appropriate environmental
6 compliance and certainly will be contained in the
7 process. And I think that, once again, you need to
8 consider this document to be the broad brush stroke
9 agreement that needs to be general enough to provide
10 that overall perspective on the project and not too
11 defining in terms of specifics so that that will be
12 carried forward in each of the project scopes that are
13 developed out of this.

14 In terms of the questions about
15 rehabilitate, reconstruct, enhance, I think it's
16 important to read the particular sentence you are
17 talking about in total, because there are several other
18 clauses that help to define what we're talking about
19 there. We're doing work on the resource to establish a
20 condition to provide a high quality visitor's experience
21 and to minimize impacts. And if you take all those in
22 conjunction with each other, then you begin to get the
23 full picture.

24 Word-by-word analysis may not capture the
25 flavor of the entire statement. What we need to do is

1 make sure that we're covering the broad perspective of
2 what we want to do here and covering all aspects of
3 that with a sense that we've got some balance there.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there any other
5 suggestions for changes in the project agreement from
6 anybody, or with the changes that have been suggested
7 this morning? Is this acceptable to the Committee?

8 MR. McDONALD: This discussion has really
9 helped me a lot. I was somewhat concerned about
10 enhancement and expanded services. I'm a wilderness
11 man at heart, perservationist, so listening to Barb
12 talk about what may be the potential there, kind of
13 explains a little bit better to me, but I saw red flags
14 on page eight, E2, and that kind of gets back to it.

15 But talking about on number two, the last
16 sentence, "placing limits on the number of visitors
17 allowed on the road at any one time," I think this is
18 very needed. I think that anything that is an outcome
19 of this study has ramifications of the overall
20 socioeconomic course that's given.

21 So I don't know exactly how that plays in
22 the overall socioeconomic study, which one comes first,
23 if there may be an issue there that needs to be
24 settled. I believe there's a carrying capacity for
25 this roadway. I think the Park and its establishment

1 is there, and I don't think we need to crowd as many
2 people as you can on this road.

3 But it goes to me as a lender, I need to
4 know what the carrying capacity, what is the long-range
5 carrying capacity of this Park to carry visitors, and I
6 need to know where those niches are that fall into --
7 haven't been hit yet by economic development or
8 businesses. I don't want to provide a loan to some
9 business thinking there's only a million visitors
10 allowed at this park and in the future it's going to be
11 two million. I need to know two million is a
12 long-range carrying capacity of this park.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other suggestions for
14 changes on the agreement?

15 MR. JEWETT: Tom, those are great
16 comments. I guess, are you suggesting that we support,
17 that we integrate consideration of carrying capacity
18 into E2?

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think it's there,
20 "placing limits on the number of visitors allowed on
21 the road."

22 MR. JEWETT: It is, and it isn't. I guess
23 I would be more explicit. I would include in that
24 sentence "as a part of a larger analysis of the
25 projected carrying capacity of the park."

1 MR. McDONALD: I think that's open for
2 suggestion.

3 MR. SLITER: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little
4 concerned that we even would dream that we have the
5 ability to turn people away at the door, so to speak.
6 If we say that there's a capacity for two million now,
7 does that mean that if another hundred thousand show up
8 at the gate next year that they are going to be told
9 they can't come because we're over our carrying
10 capacity or at the point at which we reach the two
11 million mark that we close the road because another
12 hundred thousand or another 20 is over the carrying
13 capacity?

14 What exactly does carrying capacity mean?
15 To me that's kind of what you're saying, is at some
16 point in time we're going to place a limit on the
17 number of Americans that can enjoy their national park,
18 and that is in my mind inappropriate but I think we
19 ought to discuss that a little bit.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I would like to know if one
21 of you people want to make suggestive changes to this
22 language. I certainly don't want to stifle this
23 discussion, but we have an hour to get through a few
24 more things before we lose some important people of our
25 crew, and I don't want to get into a long-term

1 discussion now about carrying capacities and limited
2 numbers.

3 So do one of you guys want to suggest
4 changes or do you think this language is good enough
5 for the stage of this ballgame with the project
6 agreement?

7 MR. JEWETT: I'd like to hear Tom's
8 response, but we've reached our carrying capacity on
9 this topic so I would defer to moving ahead.

10 MR. SHIREMAN: What I will note is this is
11 an issue that I perceived some interesting discussions
12 coming out of this group, and then perhaps you may want
13 to schedule some time in your next meeting for the
14 concept of carrying capacity and how that would
15 affect --

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We'll have chances to
17 discuss that in the future.

18 MR. DAKIN: I don't see anything in here
19 about carrying capacity of the park or closing the gate
20 or anything. It just simply says "discussion of
21 placing limits on the number of visitors allowed on the
22 road at any one time." So I'm comfortable to just
23 leave it where it is.

24 MR. SHIREMAN: That's pretty open language
25 that can be used.

1 Randy, there were a couple of things you
2 mentioned yesterday, and I want to remind the Committee
3 what those are and make sure those are still lines you
4 want to have.

5 On page eight there was a suggestion that
6 Section E could be split into Section E and F and split
7 out the transportation visitor plan and the
8 environmental impact statement into two different
9 sections.

10 And then secondly, on page seven under
11 Section B that starts on page six, to add a section for
12 the historic road study.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah; we still want that
14 in. Maybe I misunderstood things yesterday. I thought
15 we were going to get to look at another draft of this
16 agreement. Maybe I'm wrong and that's fine. But I am
17 assuming that you're going to get a look at this record
18 and make sure that you incorporate everything that we
19 have talked about.

20 MR. SHIREMAN: We will take all of your
21 comments in general as advice on toning and development
22 of this draft.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay.

24 Are we good with the project agreement for
25 now, then?

1 MR. O'QUINN: Are we making these two
2 changes?

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes.

4 MR. SLITER: We're suggesting it.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let's move on, then, to
6 discussion about -- we had two things that we needed to
7 deal with, and I'd like to get through these before we
8 lose Brian and Barbara and Jane.

9 First of all, external discussions,
10 external communications with the public and public
11 participation. We talked yesterday about how we're
12 going to communicate internally, primarily
13 electronically, maybe other ways as well.

14 But what are your thoughts on how we should
15 communicate externally with the public on the goings-on
16 of this committee? We should deal with that.

17 MR. JACKSON: I propose that we have a
18 single spokesperson, that is, a chair. That doesn't
19 preclude us, of course, from talking with our
20 constituents about things to do, but when it talks
21 about business of the Committee and what we're
22 proposing and recommending, that we have one person
23 speak on our behalf. I think that would be the most
24 effective. And I think we have a good spokesperson who
25 knows how to choose his words and be thoughtful, so I'm

1 comfortable with that.

2 MR. DAKIN: Is that a motion?

3 MR. JACKSON: I so move.

4 MR. DAKIN: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right.

6 MR. BROOKE: If this is under discussion,
7 then, no offense to the Chairman at all. He's quite
8 capable of articulating all those things. But we are
9 members of the public; we're appointed on this thing as
10 a public committee, and I think unless we're seeing
11 something that's really inappropriate -- I guess if
12 they do, we can talk about it.

13 But I, for one, get called by the media and
14 have been called already about this thing and have been
15 quoted about it. So I guess I don't feel comfortable
16 being hamstrung. In terms of the public dialogue, I
17 think it's part of the robust public debate that should
18 go on in this thing. And certainly I carry, as you can
19 tell, some particular points of view, and I want to be
20 able to articulate those, and I think other members
21 probably do as well. So I guess I'm a little bit
22 reluctant to tie this thing down unless we get to the
23 situation later that we find that it does need to be
24 tied down because of inappropriate comments to the
25 press or the public.

1 MR. SLITER: I can appreciate what Will has
2 said. I too have already been quoted and for good or
3 for bad. But I think we need to maybe just modify or
4 suggest a modification to the motion that when speaking
5 on behalf of the Committee that job ought to be in the
6 hands of the Chair. When speaking as a member of the
7 Committee, a member of the Committee ought to be able
8 to say just about whatever they want as their own -- if
9 we're saying things on behalf of the Committee that are
10 inappropriate, that is inappropriate. If we're
11 speaking from a point of view as a member of the
12 Committee, I think that's highly appropriate. However,
13 we need to make the motion reflect that. I would be in
14 support of that.

15 MR. BROOKE: I think the other thing is
16 that we fairly burden the Chairman, that every time
17 somebody wants a comment they've got to contact the
18 Chairman, and then he's going to feel like he's got to
19 contact us, and I don't know if he wants that. I guess
20 he can speak for himself maybe.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let me just make two
22 comments. I think Paul and Will make good points.
23 Particularly, I think, we all need to be careful about
24 our communication with the public, and obviously we
25 can't restrict people's rights of free speech, so I

1 think it's important. You're going to be asked by the
2 media, no doubt, and I think it would be important to
3 couch your comments in terms of, this is my assessment
4 of things, this is my opinion, I'm not speaking for the
5 Committee. And maybe if there has to be some
6 communication from the Committee that should come from
7 me.

8 But prior to our meeting here I spoke with
9 Rick, and I think one of the things we'll try to do
10 shortly after this meeting is get out a press release
11 to communicate what happened at this meeting to the
12 public, and of course you guys would all be privy to
13 that. And then I think it would be important to couch
14 your communications in terms that are consistent with
15 that as well as your personal opinions.

16 We do have a motion on the table. I don't
17 know if there's a --

18 MR. JACKSON: I'll withdraw it if there's
19 another part we have to be modified. I even modified
20 it myself.

21 MR. JEWETT: I think all the points that
22 have been made are on the mark, but it is important, I
23 think, as a group to have a recognized principal
24 spokesperson to position our work within the community,
25 to explain what we're doing without necessarily

1 chilling the opinions of individual members. Certainly
2 part of my job, I get paid to talk to the media. Your
3 motion's fine as long as it doesn't have sideboards
4 that restrict other people. I think it's a good
5 motion.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The other thing we've been
7 cautioned on so many times by Rick here, we are only an
8 Advisory Committee. We can't make decisions. All we
9 can do is make suggestions to the Park Service. And we
10 need to make sure we don't go overboard in talking to
11 the media or anybody else that we've made any
12 decisions, all we did was make some recommendations to
13 the Park Service and that's all we'll ever do. We need
14 to be real careful not to go over that line.

15 So any further discussion on the motion?
16 All in favor?

17 (All say aye, and motion is passed as the
18 Chairman being spokesman for the Committee.)

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think your motion was
20 fine for comments on behalf of the Committee and it
21 doesn't restrict anybody from having their own comments
22 to other people.

23 Do you want to think about other types of
24 communication? The idea of a web page was brought up
25 yesterday.

1 MR. SHIREMAN: Can I just add a couple of
2 other things? Randy and I had talked earlier, and we
3 have got some additional confirmation from the regional
4 office, that any news release on the masthead of the
5 National Park Service would be appropriate for use if
6 you choose to do that, and that for all of your news
7 releases associated with the Advisory Committee, we
8 would expect that that would come out with a contact
9 point of the spokesperson.

10 And I'm sort of extrapolating that from
11 this statement that any official news releases on
12 behalf of the -- or any communications to the media,
13 official communications to the media would be with the
14 Chair as the spokesperson.

15 I just want to make sure that I understand
16 that I'm in concert with the advice of the Committee.

17 MR. BROOKE: Can we kind of modify the
18 masthead a little bit?

19 MR. SHIREMAN: I think it's quite
20 appropriate to recognize that the Advisory Committee is
21 a separate entity and truly a committee from the
22 public. And in order to do that, you know, perhaps an
23 expansion of the masthead that would identify GTSR
24 Advisory Committee or something along those lines.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't think that's

1 totally a facetious point, though, because I think as
2 this project goes down the road it may be important in
3 terms of getting dough from Congress and other kinds of
4 things to emphasize the independence rather than have
5 it look like it's just a part of the Park Service.

6 Do you have any thoughts on other types of
7 external communication?

8 MR. BAKER: I have one comment. I know the
9 National Park Service does newspaper clippings within
10 their public affairs office, and I for one would like
11 to -- they're already clipping the area newspapers and
12 the articles that come out. They have archives of
13 these. I, for one, would like to have them for us to
14 be on their distribution list for those, because, where
15 I'm at, I like to be able to hear what other people are
16 saying about what we're doing.

17 That's very important to me because that
18 gives me some sense of, we said that and we have to be
19 able to deal with that. And I feel a higher comfort
20 level knowing what's going on out in the sagebrush.
21 That includes like the Daily Interlake and the Hungry
22 Horse News. Those are all good things. Whenever we
23 get newsletters that are talking about what we're
24 doing, I think we should have a copy of that.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other thoughts on that

1 point?

2 MS. NICKERSON: We do an analysis of all
3 newspaper articles related to tours and recreation, but
4 it's only in the state, so we're leaving out your end
5 and beyond. But if I got that list of email addresses
6 I could get all of you added to it, and I know some of
7 you are already on it. But that would show where it's
8 coming up, that it is showing up.

9 Although, you know, one problem is if it's
10 a repeat, like if it was in Bozeman and then it was in
11 Havre, we don't print it again. We just give it the
12 first shot that we see it.

13 MR. BAUMAN: Late yesterday afternoon what
14 we recorded and thought we had direction on was that
15 you wanted us to set up an electronic bulletin board to
16 the Committee so you'd all be tied in. And I think
17 Barney recommended linking that to the Park web site.

18 And I also thought we had direction that we
19 set up a web site for this project that would also be
20 linked to the Park that would be public access and
21 public information and then we did back that up with
22 paper information and press releases and other
23 information, but we'd try and update that web site to
24 the public on weekly basis.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I knew we had some

1 discussion about it. I didn't know if we brought
2 closure to that discussion yesterday.

3 What are your thoughts? Is there a
4 consensus that we ought to go ahead with the bulletin
5 boards and web page? Seems to me like that's probably
6 the most logical way to get information out to the
7 public and then it would be hard to argue that the
8 public didn't have access to information.

9 MR. JEWETT: If we're talking about
10 external communications, I guess, Dick, I would say,
11 part of this communication can be dry or it can be well
12 messaged. And I would just like to suggest that as we
13 go about creating communicating tools for the general
14 public, that they're consistently messaged. And I
15 don't know if that's a part of what your tasks are, but
16 I think that the messaging should be somewhere along
17 the lines "we're open and we're better than ever." But
18 explore that and let's make it consistent all the way
19 through this project.

20 MR. BAUMAN: We have both public
21 information people on our team as well as web site
22 designers, so it will look good.

23 MR. WHITE: I guess what I'd like to see is
24 just the workings of this group and everybody looks
25 this information up on the Glacier Park web page, why

1 not just make a page on there they can update what's
2 going and keep it simple. That would be my suggestion,
3 is put it right on the Glacier Park web page, the
4 activities of this group.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think that's what we're
6 talking about doing.

7 MR. O'QUINN: I think you got a home page
8 and you're linked to a variety of things. I think
9 that's what we're talking about, is just an extension.

10 MR. BROOKE: Why don't we see what MK
11 does, and if it isn't adequate enough we can
12 communicate with them.

13 MR. DAKIN: Did we resolve that idea of the
14 clipping service? Is that the practical thing that the
15 Park can provide to us?

16 MR. SHIREMAN: Well, you would
17 think. We've done a lot of things in the hundred days
18 that I've been there, and one of them that we haven't
19 been able to resolve is the level of clipping service
20 that the Park is providing itself. We'll take that as
21 a piece of advice and recommendation and see what we
22 can do.

23 Right now now the Park is not doing the
24 level of clipping service that they have in the past
25 because of some cost and some understanding of whether

1 or not the process is providing the information in a
2 way that's timely for the folks who are involved in the
3 clipping retrieval. So we're sort of under
4 re-evaluation of that process. But we'll take it as
5 recommendation and work with you to see how best to
6 provide that information.

7 MS. NICKERSON: We have a clipping service,
8 and timeliness is a big problem. We are sometimes two
9 months late in terms of when they appeared. And if
10 that's not a big issue we could say go ahead and send
11 us anything related to Going-to-the-Sun Road even if
12 we've already received one a month earlier, and then I
13 could send it up to whomever at the Park who could get
14 it, wherever you folks want it. Because we're already
15 doing that, so I would say send us all of them.

16 MR. SHIREMAN: I would make the assumption
17 that you would be looking for those clippings specific
18 to the Going-to-the-Sun Road and the activities of MK
19 Centennial and the Park Service and the Advisory
20 Committee, so that's a fairly narrow kind of process.
21 And we can work with Dayna, who is monitoring this kind
22 of information anyway, and that may be appropriate.

23 MS. ANDERSON: Randy, as we monitor pretty
24 closely and do a lot of clipping, and if any of us see
25 an article couldn't we just forward it to the Park and

1 solve that problem? Everybody who sees it could get it
2 to the Park and they could sort it out.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: One other item I'd like to
4 interject here, is, you had talked about a newsletter
5 yesterday. There are some requirements in the
6 appropriate compliance processes that require written
7 notification and abilities to provide information to
8 the public in a document or written format. So you
9 might want to consider identifying how you want to deal
10 with the newsletters.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I wonder if, with this web
12 page and bulletin boards and things -- we are only
13 going to be meeting a couple times a year anyway -- do
14 you really need a newsletter? Wouldn't a press release
15 be about the same thing?

16 MR. SHIREMAN: You will need a newsletter
17 for compliance process, or the Park Service will. The
18 question is, is that something that you want to tie
19 into?

20 MR. O'QUINN: That was what I was going to
21 comment on. I think the newsletter I was thinking
22 about was something MK and the Park Service would do as
23 a part of the overall study, not a newsletter for the
24 Committee. And in that newsletter it could contain
25 information about the Committee or things we've done,

1 but it would be more of as an effective part of the
2 public Outreach, public involvement program.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I can't imagine this
4 committee having enough for a newsletter by itself.

5 All right.

6 MR. SLITER: Rick, you can probably, or
7 maybe Mary, one of the two of you can lend some
8 guidance as to the web page development, all that kind
9 of thing, do we need to publish that all in the public
10 register to make it public that we're doing those
11 things? You can throw up a web page but that doesn't
12 mean anybody can go find it if they don't know they're
13 looking for one. Is there some sort of a public
14 notification process that that type of thing is
15 happening? Is it the Federal Register? What is it?

16 MR. SHIREMAN: There are some requirements
17 for publication in the Federal Register. Do you really
18 want to get into the specifics?

19 MR. SLITER: Not really. Just bringing up
20 the fact that it may need to be done.

21 MR. SHIREMAN: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything more we need to
23 talk about in terms of external communications?

24 All right. Then the next thing on my list
25 is public participation. And that was just on the list

1 from yesterday as to how we're going to incorporate
2 public participation in this process. And I propose
3 the starting point is the sessions at the end of each
4 of our days here which are open for public comment.

5 Any thoughts on what we should do in
6 addition to that or to supplement that to encourage
7 public participation in this process?

8 MR. BAKER: I think that if our meetings
9 are going to be like for a full day, I think we should
10 have a half hour or 15-minute session in the morning as
11 well as maybe a 15-minute or half hour session at the
12 end of the meeting. But I think we should split it up,
13 because there are maybe some people that only want to
14 come for half a day.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any thoughts pro or con on
16 that? I see several nods of the head. I think it's a
17 good idea.

18 I did hear one complaint the other day that
19 we were sort of stifling public participation by
20 leaving a small amount at the end of the day. Maybe
21 the end of the morning and at the end of the afternoon
22 seems --

23 MR. SHIREMAN: Mr. Chairman, you might also
24 consider an evening session in the future, at future
25 meetings, so that might bring those folks in who would

1 not normally be able to attend during the day.

2 MR. JACKSON: To the extent that in the
3 future that might integrate with the NEPA process,
4 planning an EIS, and so on, but if we could schedule a
5 meeting with some kind of congruence with that so that
6 we were a part of that process, could be a listening
7 part of the process and could respond to comments to us
8 as well as the Park Service making responses and so on,
9 I think would help us to better advise, and so I think
10 that should be integrated. I don't know how yet.

11 MR. McDONALD: One question. I don't know
12 where the press releases -- what are the range of the
13 press releases for this Committee and everything that's
14 going on, but it would seem to me, looking at the
15 information from the research institute at the
16 University of Montana on travel patterns where people
17 are coming from, that we should make an attempt to get
18 some media exposure in Washington, Oregon and some of
19 the -- where we get a lot of people coming from, a lot
20 of our visitors coming from, we make that effort to
21 send out information to those areas.

22 MR. BROOKE: I have a question in that
23 regard. Part of MK's charge, is it not, is going to be
24 some of the public relations kind of stuff which would
25 fall under that end, wouldn't it? Park Service or MK.

1 Is that correct? The public relations part of that, I
2 would suspect that MK is charged with those kinds of
3 things, of press releases or public relations activity
4 on what Tom is talking about.

5 MR. SHIREMAN: MK's contract is to deal
6 with those things that are specified in the project
7 agreement. And the press release, certainly they would
8 advise in terms of information or provide information
9 for the press releases. But at this point the press
10 releases on the project would come from the National
11 Park Service those groups. They would not be releasing
12 information from us.

13 The web site is a deliverable as
14 identified, and the public participation program.

15 MR. BROOKE: Well, I guess, have you
16 thought this through at all in terms of, would you have
17 a person that's responsible for this as part of your
18 contract?

19 MR. BAUMAN: Yeah. Carl Schweitzer has a
20 firm in Helena, and then Tom Schilling -- Carl is
21 basically the Montana contact for drafting information
22 for the Park Service relating to press releases.

23 And then another firm is Schilling, Tom
24 Schilling, and they're a more general overall public
25 information consultant that will help us get

1 information out to other states, as Tom suggested. And
2 so we have a couple of different levels of people that
3 will be helping us with public information.

4 MS. NICKERSON: What I'm hearing are two
5 different things here. The press releases, and
6 whatnot, that come out of MK are probably going to deal
7 with their projects that they're doing. And what I
8 think I'm hearing here is that you folks are a little
9 bit concerned about how the Park addresses the opening
10 and the visitation as usual, and that sort of thing.
11 And that would not be in my thought process MK would be
12 dealing with at all, and that would be the Park.

13 Is that right, Will?

14 MR. BROOKE: That's kind of how I view it.
15 And I was trying to see if I was thinking about it
16 correct.

17 MS. NICKERSON: And then I don't know where
18 you folks fit into that. And that would be the Park
19 would have to answer that one.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is that the way you see it,
21 Rick?

22 MR. SHIREMAN: Well, the Park Service is
23 still going to be the focus for the release of any news
24 releases and appropriate external communication on the
25 overall project.

1 The project agreement requires MK
2 Centennial to provide us a strategy and tactics for the
3 process of sending out those news releases and other
4 parts of the public participation program.

5 Are you talking about the flavor and the
6 direction in providing information along those lines in
7 terms of the some of the things you've been talking
8 about, about being positive with the expansion or
9 enhancement of visitor experience and those sorts of
10 things? I'm not sure I understand.

11 MR. BROOKE: It's more complicated than
12 that. I didn't intend it to be this way. I guess I
13 had the impression, based on the green sheet, that
14 there was going to be some fairly pointed -- and maybe
15 aggressive is the wrong word -- public relations
16 efforts by MK as part of the contract to talk about the
17 road construction and having taken advice from us that
18 they're not going to be talking about closed; they are
19 going to be talking about open and opportunities and
20 those kinds of things. That is separate and apart from
21 the Park Service press releases.

22 MR. SHIREMAN: My understanding -- and stop
23 me here, anyone -- is that the Park Service would be
24 the issuing point for the news releases; that would not
25 be MK Centennial. Remember they are providing us

1 deliverables, the products that would be released, but
2 they would be under the auspices of the National Park
3 Service.

4 MR. BROOKE: And I can understand and
5 appreciate why that might be the case. But as a
6 practical matter in getting that out there, you guys
7 get treated much like politicians in terms of your
8 press releases. And it occurred to me that the third
9 parties doing some of this stuff is going to get some
10 better coverage maybe. I don't know if that's
11 correct.

12 MR. O'QUINN: My experience in doing this
13 type of project is it's much better for the client,
14 whether it be the Department of Transportation or the
15 Park Service, whoever is responsible for the project,
16 for any and everything to come out through them.
17 Because you don't want consultants speaking for the
18 Park Service, number one; and number two, the public
19 has a question when they start seeing different
20 letterheads and different masthead as to what it is and
21 who is doing it and that sort of thing. And I think
22 the credibility comes more from the Park Service than
23 it does from the consultant doing the work. They are
24 going to provide the information, but it's really --
25 it's coming from the Park Service.

1 MR. BAUMAN: Every part of this project is
2 breaking new ground and will provide much better
3 information to the Park Service than they've been able
4 to develop, because they have the limited resources.
5 As we provide that better information we've got a
6 skilled group of people on our team to do that.

7 The Park Service is going to react to that
8 positively and use it, but it will come through the
9 Park Service.

10 MR. SLITER: Very quickly just to make a
11 quick statement and see if it generates any discussion.

12 We, as a committee, were created, I think,
13 to be a conduit to the public via our individual
14 constituencies, and I take Will's point fairly clearly
15 that the Park Service does a lot of press releases from
16 day-to-day or week-to-week about different things that
17 are going. Maybe we get better coverage if we put the
18 press release on a piece of letterhead belonging to the
19 Committee and say that the Committee has released this
20 through the Park Service. I don't know if you get any
21 better coverage out of that than if the Park Service
22 does it on their own, but it gives the media the
23 distinction of, hey, this is coming straight from the
24 project, not just another press release from the Park.

25 MR. SHIREMAN: I'm not sure how to respond

1 to that because I have such a short period of time with
2 Glacier National Park. My perception is that the press
3 releases that Glacier has developed -- and I'm not
4 speaking for anything broader than that -- have
5 received in the last couple of months fairly broad play
6 in the media. In fact, I can't think of a single press
7 release we've sent out since I've been here that has
8 not been picked up by the local newspapers and many of
9 the regional numbers.

10 And the question there is, is whether or
11 not you think that that's adequate for the level of
12 information that you feel is appropriate for this
13 particular project and whether there needs to be some
14 other -- I still strongly believe that we need to have
15 the Park Service representing the information that
16 comes out officially about the activities that the Park
17 Service, the contractors that we're working with and
18 our partners are dealing.

19 MR. JEWETT: I could be wrong. It seems
20 we're talking about two different things -- one is
21 basically information dispersal and another thing is
22 broad scale marketing strategies. And I assume the
23 National Park Service wants to be an aggressive partner
24 on broad marketing strategies and MK as to how we
25 advertise what's going on here and get that word out.

1 But it needs to be the lead on basic information on
2 press releases. Is that right?

3 MR. SHIREMAN: I'd say in general, yes.
4 But the concept of a broad marketing strategies sort of
5 tightens my throat a little bit. So far everything
6 that you've talked about in terms of that market
7 process seems to be appropriate to the interests of the
8 National Park Service, that we would need to deal with
9 that on a case-by-case basis. There may be things that
10 would not be in our best interest nor would we be a
11 part of if you were talking about a marketing strategy.

12 For example, that use of Going-to-the-Sun
13 Road as a part of it, but expand it to identify the
14 alternatives or the alternative resources that would
15 direct people to some other events, activities or sites
16 within the state of Montana. Obviously we could not be
17 involved in those kinds of things.

18 MS. ANDERSON: That was one of the things
19 that I wanted to comment on, is if there would be a way
20 to coordinate Travel Montana. We do a lot of
21 publicity. There are others up here that all do
22 publicity. I think that we are all wanting to
23 coordinate the efforts of this that so we can
24 compliment whatever is coming out of the Park so that
25 we're saying the same thing but we can expand it a

1 little further. And there are ways we can do that and
2 it also saves this project some money.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: Your word of coordination is
4 the key there, that there is a recognition that there
5 are other people out there that need to be part of a
6 more general marketing strategy.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: If you could get us the
8 names and addresses of these organizations so that we
9 can get them on the list to get the press releases to
10 them.

11 MS. ANDERSON: And then going back to the
12 public comment is, is there any way with the web site
13 that we can take advantage of public comment, and can
14 that somehow be relayed if we need to address that at
15 the meetings as well, if somebody from Connecticut may
16 email some kind of comment and they aren't there to
17 come to the public meetings.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't know why we
19 couldn't. Could you give that some thought, Dick?

20 MR. BAUMAN: If we get information back by
21 email we'll respond, and we can give you summaries on
22 your bulletin boards what those responses are.
23 Depending upon the volume of public interest, on some
24 jobs we've set up an 800 number phone number and to put
25 a tape recorder on it and guarantee a call-back on it,

1 an answer to a person's question within 24 hours.

2 So a variety of things we need to explore
3 with the the Park Service. But it's very important
4 that if you put the information out and somebody has a
5 question, that it's critical they get an answer.

6 MR. O'QUINN: When you were talking about
7 bulletin boards earlier, my understanding from
8 talking yesterday, we could not have anything that was
9 a closed loop internal to this group unless we email
10 each other individually but it has to be open for
11 public review. Is that correct?

12 MR. BAUMAN: I'm not sure. I was thinking
13 that we weren't thinking of some high security system,
14 but we were thinking of a bulletin board system that
15 you'd all have a number to dial into. And I guess I
16 was assuming we wouldn't have to make that type of
17 information.

18 MR. O'QUINN: That was my first thought,
19 and then from things that Rick said I wasn't sure that
20 was appropriate for us to do that.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We will get some
22 suggestions from Dick after he consults with Rick on
23 that one.

24 Other thoughts on communication or public
25 participation?

1 MS. PAHL: I'd like to follow up on what
2 Linda said. I think when it comes time to have the
3 communication people do this kind of work, to have
4 whatever consultant working on that to do it in
5 conjunction with Travel Montana and the regional travel
6 tourism folks because they are the ones who are in
7 plenty of contact with a lot of these visitors and they
8 do put out a message to the external auditing folks
9 from the State, that maybe that market, that may change
10 their mind based on what they've heard about that road.
11 So not just who to mail a press release, to actually
12 help them craft whatever that message is, that positive
13 message.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I know Dayna wants to say
15 something about some things. Before we do that let's
16 talk about when we should have our next meeting before
17 we lose some people We're going to be getting some
18 feedback from Dick by the end of May after he
19 inventories what information is out there. He won't be
20 able to get into the Park to do any inventory on site
21 probably until late July or August.

22 So when should we have our next meeting?
23 There was talk yesterday anywhere from May till
24 October.

25 MS. ANDERSON: Just a comment. If you're

1 seriously looking at coming back in July or August
2 you're going to double or triple the cost of this
3 meeting because that is high season and the cost of
4 rooms will be high. The transportation, you need to
5 make reservations tomorrow if you were going to come
6 into this area, if you were going fly.

7 MR. BROOKE: My preference, Mr. Chairman,
8 is September, mid September.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other thoughts?

10 MR. SLITER: You're going to do it in the
11 fall, you might as well do it late enough that the
12 colors are out. Might as well make it enjoyable as
13 well as functional.

14 MR. DAKIN: Just to interject the
15 pragmatic, I think September would be ideal. If you
16 wait too late and if one of our objectives is as a
17 group to stroll along some of the troublesome parts of
18 the road, then you get to October first, you just don't
19 know. It could be a real unpleasant experience.

20 I'd like to wait until after we were over
21 the hump of the Labor Day business rush, and I really
22 feel that September is an ideal time for us.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other thoughts?

24 MS. NICKERSON: I'm just saying, the
25 earlier you have, the less likely you -- that the study

1 that you want done will be completed and available to
2 you. Just keep that in mind.

3 MR. BROOKE: What about the duration of the
4 meeting? I wonder how many more three day meetings
5 there are going to be.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't know how long that
7 next meeting might be. Now that we have gone through
8 the spin-up and gotten our feet on the road a bit, I
9 would think a day or two would be adequate.

10 MR. SHIREMAN: I think that it could be
11 open to some adjustment. What I would suggest you do
12 is identify a week, all that week and a total of three
13 days, let's start Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and
14 then let's see how the information goes. This meeting,
15 you obviously had to get a lot of background
16 information. It's possible that the amount of
17 presentation time could be substantially less or it
18 could be substantially more if there are a variety of
19 reports that are generated that you need to have some
20 feedback on. I would say probably a day to day and a
21 half deliberation is probably appropriate.

22 And if you want to get out and walk on the
23 road, that's going to be a day's worth of time to get
24 up there from Kalispell to see the road, to have some
25 conversation there. So I would say probably two days

1 at least, with that third day being sort of optional
2 until we see how the process goes.

3 MS. PAHL: Can I nominate or offer that --
4 the week after Labor Day? You all have your little
5 superintendent's gathering. That would be the Park
6 superintendents, the people we need at the meeting.

7 MR. SHIREMAN: Barbara, you're suggesting
8 the week of September 18th through the 22nd?

9 MS. PAHL: No; actually the week before,
10 the 5th, 6th.

11 MR. SHIREMAN: The day right after Labor
12 Day?

13 MS. PAHL: Or the day after that?

14 MR. BAKER: I don't think we're going to
15 have the data ready by then.

16 MR. O'QUINN: That's going to hit Labor Day
17 weekend.

18 MR. BROOKE: The people who are in the
19 business, we're going to start deflating about that
20 time, and more like the third week of September is -- I
21 mean, the weather gets more questionable the deeper you
22 go into September.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think the weather's
24 usually pretty good in September. I think it's more
25 marginal any time into October.

1 How about the week of the 25th? Shoot for
2 that last week of September, then? And we'll plan to
3 do a walk the road as part of that meeting, and if we
4 can get by with two days, great, we'll try to do that.

5 Dayna, do you want to say something about
6 housekeeping matters, i.e., travel claims, et cetera?

7 --oOo--

8 An announcement was commenced regarding the
9 Travel Forms to make sure and fill out forms thoroughly
10 with every detail and then the meeting was adjourned
11 for lunch until 1:15 p.m.

12 MR. SHIREMAN: This is after lunch in the
13 Advisory Committee meeting in Kalispell for the
14 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The suggestion was made in
16 light of this development that this might be another
17 reason to reconsider when we do the public input
18 session in the future. We may not want to set them to
19 the end of the day in the session.

20 All right. The two things that I have left
21 on my list are, to talk about any additional
22 information needs that the Committee members may have
23 that we haven't talked about already or that is not
24 already coming.

25 And then the other thing is funding needs.

1 We'll talk about that. I'm not sure how much we can
2 talk about that in light of the early stage of the
3 process we're in.

4 And then I know Craig wants to do a recap
5 at some point when we're about ready to wrap up.

6 Any other items I have missed?

7 Bill, did you want to say anything more
8 about maintenance, long-term maintenance programs after
9 the film?

10 MR. DAKIN: After having seen the movie, I
11 mean, I thought it was appropriate to talk about that.

12 But the miracle of film, you tend to just
13 try to summarize it real quickly. But the part that
14 has bothered me about the rehabilitation of the masonry
15 features there, is that probably small but a
16 significant portion of the deterioration of those
17 features can be attributed to booths that happen
18 sometimes during the spring opening. And it was
19 shocking to me to find out that the cultural resource
20 management plan that was in draft of these, in part
21 '85, '86, actually was never adopted.

22 Part of that cultural resource management
23 plan was to be a maintenance guideline that set ways of
24 doing and not doing things throughout the year, but
25 also including the spring opening. So I guess I hope

1 that what we did this morning was to include as part of
2 -- on page six, Section B, Engineering Study Scope,
3 that somehow there is going to be a post-project
4 development of maintenance strategies, perhaps with MK
5 Centennial but certainly with the Park Service, to
6 develop some protocols to safeguard these things that
7 are rebuilt so that they last as long as possible. I
8 don't really want to get into it in any great detail,
9 but I hope that somehow that was in our minutes and was
10 part of our decision this morning.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think it was to be a part
12 of the project agreement, wasn't it Craig?

13 MR. GASKILL: Maintenance is one of the
14 items to consider as your recommendation.

15 MR. BROOKE: Mr. Chairman, in conjunction
16 with that, something that we talked about yesterday,
17 and I'm curious if it's in our recommendations, and
18 that is long-term funding or endowments, or something
19 of that nature, to protect the road so that our
20 grandchildren aren't dealing with this same issue
21 again, and that maybe that become a formal
22 recommendation of the Committee at some time. I don't
23 know if this is time or not. But that we get away from
24 this taking money out of operational money and doing
25 something more than operations.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are you suggesting we need
2 to include that in the agreement or not at this stage?

3 MR. BROOKE: I guess it's a little bit of a
4 question. I just know I want it somewhere, funding
5 for long-term maintenance and preservation of the
6 road.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we have that
8 concept with Bill's suggestions from this morning.

9 Any other comments, questions for Bill on
10 the long-term maintenance issue?

11 MR. SHIREMAN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of
12 other items. You and I have talked, and I think that
13 the rest of the Committee needs to know that, one of
14 your responsibilities is, at the close of each meeting,
15 to provide to the National Park Service a written
16 documentation of your decisions and recommendations and
17 advice that you've come to. That is part of your
18 responsibility.

19 So we have started to build the rough draft
20 of a letter for you to review, and you need to decide
21 how exactly you want to do that. It includes, to our
22 knowledge, all of the items that you've included from
23 your discussions and the decision points. But that
24 does need to be sent to the National Park Service from
25 the Chair of the Committee.

1 are subject to public review and comments?

2 MR. MEZMARICH: Barney's question was in
3 regards to being able to transmit electronically, this
4 would not eliminate that.

5 MR. SHIREMAN: It would not eliminate you
6 from using electronic transmission. It would just mean
7 that those would be public comments as well.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there any additional
9 information needs that anyone would like to bring up,
10 any additional information you think that you would
11 like to see or would be helpful for the Committee to
12 have in terms of studies?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Randy, this really isn't a
14 need, but as I stated before, Glacier Country is
15 concerned enough about the publicity that's been out,
16 the idea that people think that the road is closed,
17 that we are developing a web page, as we speak, that
18 will be linked to our regular web site that talks about
19 the fact that the park is open and it's business as
20 usual.

21 But we're adding on to that some questions
22 that they can choose to answer or not answer, if the
23 road were closed would you come, those types of
24 things. And we'll have that information available. I
25 talked to Dick about it, and that's something that

1 we're doing at our own expense and we would make it
2 available if anybody is interested in that.

3 And the second thing, depending on if it's
4 approved in June by the Advisory Council, we are
5 requesting funds out of our budget to do a conversion
6 study. We're right in the midst of our heavy
7 advertising from this tourist season, and we want to do
8 a conversion study at the end of the summer to find out
9 if our advertising is working, are these people coming,
10 and add to that some things about construction, the
11 road, those types of things, that we'd certainly like
12 some input on.

13 And, again, we would make that available to
14 MK Centennial and to anybody that wants it; just an
15 offer if that's approved that that would be available.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other information needs
17 along those lines anyone else thinks we should ask
18 for? Otherwise we have all the information we need for
19 our purposes?

20 One of the things we had on our list for
21 yesterday was funding needs. It seems to me it's
22 probably a little premature because we haven't heard
23 anything from MK Centennial on cost estimates for
24 projects and this and that, unless I misunderstood what
25 that item was about.

1 charter. And if I gave the perception of advising the
2 Committee that they had a role outside of what the
3 charter says, I misspoke myself.

4 You need to look at the charter and see
5 that your responsibilities are solely as an advisory
6 group to the National Park Service. So what my intent
7 there was to, if you so chose, to advise and recommend
8 to the National Park Service a list of those unfunded
9 needs and additional studies be developed and presented
10 to you for consensus and support. Not that you could
11 take a role outside that advisory process in working
12 towards the actual funding of those.

13 MR. JEWETT: Let the record show that,
14 right, I missed the point. So maybe it would useful
15 that you didn't advise us. Maybe you could tell us a
16 little bit about what some of that stuff is.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: Do you want that now or as a
18 future item on the schedule? I think we've identified
19 those things that we know are gaps in the process, and
20 I think that it's now up to the National Park Service
21 in conjunction with the other partners to more fully
22 develop that and bring that back to you at the next
23 meeting.

24 MR. DAKIN: Is there a written budget or
25 accounting of how this million-dollar appropriation is

1 pre-allocated? Asking if there is a written document
2 how the million dollars for this phase of this project
3 is at this time allocated out, how it's budgeted, how
4 much of it's going to go to Centennial, how much of
5 it's going to be applied to the studies, how much of
6 it's dedicated to the Committee meetings.

7 MR. BABB: It's not in one place. That's
8 part of our task that we have to do, is we have to
9 spell out and budget that by various functions. But
10 that will be in the revision of the green document, at
11 least the first cut of that. And it will probably be
12 broken out by committee staff and professional services
13 and then the task orders will be written on what we
14 have for professional services.

15 MR. SHIREMAN: The one item that has been
16 identified as a starting point was the 97,000 a year
17 for the support and operation of the Committee and the
18 cost of running the Committee's meetings and the
19 support staff from the Park Service.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything else on funding?
21 Wasn't there some discussion yesterday
22 about providing us for a budget for this Committee?

23 MR. SHIREMAN: In terms of the break-out on
24 that, yeah. Those were the numbers that I had read off
25 to you right before lunch yesterday.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I was talking about a
2 proposed budget for Committee meeting sometime today.

3 Anything else? If not, we've accomplished
4 everything that we had on my agenda, and we could move
5 on to the recap, unless there's something someone else
6 has.

7 MR. JACKSON: Some of that stuff I proposed
8 has been typed up so we can look at it carefully. And
9 I may be wrong, but I think we just saw the consultant
10 come in and disappear again, so I think she's here. It
11 would be good to talk about that while she's here and
12 she may have some good ideas that of course I hadn't
13 proposed. And we could make that part of our final
14 report if we get that crystal clear. So if we want to
15 do that sometime this afternoon, that would be fine,
16 too.

17 MR. GASKILL: I'll go through this recap of
18 what we've learned today and if there's anything I've
19 missed, let me know and I'll put that in and you can
20 have a chance to ask Jean Townsend questions.

21 What I've learned, Dave's recap, actually
22 the first item I had down was on funding. And then in
23 terms of funding, there's a couple different areas of
24 funding. There's a special project administration
25 funding. That's the new start funding. In terms of

1 this funding it would be kind of special appropriations
2 funding. That's a separate pot of money from the
3 formula funding, which is where most National Parks
4 Service funding comes in. It appeared to be most
5 likely that if going to be able to get funding from
6 this road, that would be probably from one from these
7 special project administrations.

8 There was a motion passed, which is up on
9 the wall, says "Advise the National Park Service to
10 begin appropriate NEPA compliance immediately and
11 report back to the Committee on cost of process." That
12 was passed unanimously.

13 And then there was a number of discussion
14 items and then recommendations that came about on the
15 product agreement and scope.

16 There was various ones under Section E,
17 which is under the coordination roles, which had to do
18 with how we coordinate with the team itself, making
19 sure MK will prepare appropriate engineering and, I
20 guess, the appropriate studies as necessary. Who
21 actually owns the documents? I think you want to put
22 that in the scope as well.

23 Section B, wanted to recommend that we
24 provide some maintenance strategies for the project.

25 Under Section A there was discussion about

1 reconstructing or rehabilitating. I think the
2 recommendation was to provide both those words,
3 reconstruct and rehabilitate, and also include enhance
4 within the historic parameters.

5 Section E, we wanted to split that actually
6 into two different documents; right now the
7 transportation plan and the historic road plan, now it
8 has to be two separate documents. Want to add the
9 historic road study a separate document.

10 There was a motion to have one spokesperson
11 passed, and that would be the Chair of the Committee.

12 There is advice in terms of communication
13 to provide a news clipping service to the Advisory
14 Committee, to provide a web site for the public, to tie
15 that to National Park Service to Glacier National Park
16 web site; to have a bulletin board for the Committee
17 for internal communication that would be available to
18 everybody; to have a newsletter -- that would be as
19 required -- have a newsletter that's available for the
20 public. And then in terms of public comment, to
21 consider having midday public comment in addition to
22 the late day public comment and also consider evening
23 public comment for those who can't attend during the
24 day.

25 A couple other suggestions on public

1 comment, one was to provide public comment on the web
2 site; another one was to allow public comment on a hot
3 line or 800 numbers, they referred to it.

4 There was a request to coordinate the
5 marketing and public information and involvement
6 information with other organizations such as the
7 tourist bureaus. There was a discussion of having the
8 Advisory Committee provide press releases. I didn't
9 hear a conclusion on that, so that might be something
10 you want to finalize. Maybe there wasn't a conclusion
11 on that.

12 Then there was a decision to have the
13 meeting during the week of September 25th, and the two
14 agenda items that would be discussed would be a tour of
15 the road and a preliminary presentation of the study
16 results that have been completed to date.

17 We did talk about information needs today
18 or this afternoon. Really the only thing that came out
19 of that was to be some survey information from the
20 Glacier Visitor Bureau. And in terms of funding needs,
21 Committee requested budget information, which is
22 actually being typed up and copied right now.

23 That's what I have down.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think there was an issue
25 on press releases. I understood that we were going to

1 be issuing press releases from time.

2 I guess that part of the question was
3 whether it would be on separate letterhead from the
4 Park Service, but I think Rick said it would probably
5 be on Park Service letterhead but would be a press
6 release from the Committee.

7 MR. SHIREMAN: That's right. And we have
8 the administrative assistance for the actual production
9 of that subject to the Chair's approval and under that
10 person's name.

11 MR. BROOKE: The handout we just got in
12 terms of what we did, on page two, item six, "Need to
13 analyze ways to maintain correct levels of visitation
14 during construction," I think that word was "current,"
15 was it not, not "correct," "current levels." It's
16 current; right?

17 MR. JACKSON: I think that was actually
18 Tony's point. Yes, it is current.

19 MR. DAKIN: On that same page, number
20 eight, I think if Barbara was here she would want to
21 remind you that we, I believe, decided to
22 reconstruct/rehabilitate/enhance within the parameters
23 of the historic preservation laws have on the
24 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

25 We brought reconstruct to be included,

1 rehabilitate. Brian wanted to include enhanced but we
2 ended up that discussion by saying that we enhanced the
3 parameters within the historic preservation.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Item 10 on that page, I
5 thought we decided to not talk about carrying capacity
6 at this time.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We definitely decided not
8 to talk about carrying capacity at this time. So
9 strike number 10.

10 MR. O'QUINN: Also I thought that item E,
11 the transportation plan and visitor plan, was going to
12 be separated and broken out from the Environmental
13 Impact Statement and these numbers were going to be
14 adjusted accordingly.

15 MR. SHIREMAN: And what I had done was
16 handed Mary this item and so she had both the list of
17 items that were from David, the additional sections,
18 and she knows that that's in there.

19 MR. O'QUINN: That is just editing; it's
20 not added to.

21 MR. SHIREMAN: Right. It's just edited.

22 MS. MOE: I guess I've got a question on
23 number three throughout. They're just talking about
24 rehabilitation, and yet if you look at the other ones
25 we're talking about reconstruction slash

1 rehabilitation. And I think it gets back to, we need
2 to be consistent throughout the whole document.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It seems to me we need to
4 use both terms consistently throughout, don't we?

5 MR. SHIREMAN: So what I'm hearing from the
6 group is to check the entire document and substitute
7 rehabilitation/reconstruction/enhancement for any
8 places that identify reconstruction.

9 MS. MOE: Or rehabilitation only.

10 MR. SHIREMAN: Or rehabilitation only.

11 MR. GASKILL: But enhancement was going to
12 further clarify the enhancement within the historic
13 parameters per Barbara.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We have to comply with the
15 historic requirements, anyway. We don't have to say it
16 every time in the document.

17 All right. Are there other comments on
18 this memorandum which will -- after it's modified this
19 will wind up being a statement from our Committee as to
20 what we did with this first meeting.

21 MR. McDONALD: Item number three and number
22 one, again I'd like to try to define the Glacier Park
23 area. If we could define that in some of these
24 baseline studies. This is just too general for me.
25 With respect to Committee members, that we band the

1 territories, define what that territory is right now
2 that design these studies.

3 MR. JACKSON: I think that's part of the
4 spirit of the first point in that socioeconomic
5 analysis, and as it's amended it includes that idea of
6 banded activities which would affect, fine or layer or
7 look at diminishing areas of importance in terms of
8 economic activity to Glacier Park so that we have some
9 focus about where the highest impacts were occurring
10 and where they dissipated.

11 I think that's the idea, if I'm not
12 mistaken, of the first one. And what we actually
13 proposed to do with that, is simply change a few of the
14 first words in that sentence and then retain the rest
15 of item one so that's in it. And that would, in
16 effect, be a way of defining the region.

17 We have heard tourism people that say that
18 there's impacts on the east part of the Rockies here
19 that extends to Missoula and beyond and, of course, to
20 Canada and whatnot, Southern Alberta and the like, so I
21 would expect that that would be -- in fact, the purpose
22 of that first part is to, in fact, define the region.

23 MS. MOE: I think, too, Tom, this is the
24 general framework. They're going to be negotiating
25 what specifically their studies are going to include

1 and how it would be more appropriate in that, depending
2 on what costs and things that they can come up with.

3 MR. DAKIN: I felt that our deliberations
4 were pretty broad in that regard, but maybe could we
5 simply alleviate Tom's concern there by saying the
6 greater Glacier Park area, which certainly implies that
7 it's not tightly confined within any boundaries? It
8 certainly goes beyond the immediate areas around the
9 park.

10 What would you see, Tom, as a way to make
11 sure that your concerns are included?

12 MR. SHIREMAN: Could I make a suggestion
13 here? Item number four on the second page identifies
14 that the Glacier area needs to be defined. That was
15 one of your recommendations that MK Centennial come
16 back with some description and exactly how that would
17 occur. And there is already some language in the
18 document that talks about banding of the areas in
19 broader and broader scales so as the distance gets
20 further from Glacier National Park.

21 So I think you're covered, that that term
22 is something that you're concerned about and that, in
23 the document to MK Centennial, that needs to be further
24 defined and that you'd have the chance to come back and
25 review that definition.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are you all right with
2 that, Tom?

3 MR. McDONALD: Yeah, I am. I've been
4 involved with a lot of these things, and if you're not
5 really clear about something it can just be forgotten
6 about, so you lose it completely. So I think we can
7 accept that the way it is. I didn't see that on the
8 other page, so that does help me.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there other comments
10 or suggestions on this sheet?

11 MR. JEWETT: I'm looking at the preamble,
12 David. I don't want to necessarily get into a long
13 conversation about this, but to me preambles are just a
14 broad statement that go into more specific goals, and I
15 see a bunch of specific goals in here. And I don't
16 want to raise any hackles on one specific goal, but it
17 seems to me that all the economics models that we've
18 seen so far has tens of millions of dollars lost in
19 economic entities. And the preamble seems to say that
20 we will commit ourselves to discovering ways to
21 reimburse those costs.

22 MR. JACKSON: No. That word is headed on
23 the language on the green sheet, and it's simply
24 enumerated to identify that it's perhaps one
25 possibility, by no means the only one. But it was

1 don't think that's necessarily possible. If you, for
2 instance, use one-way traffic half the day, one-way
3 traffic the other half of the day, we change visitor
4 patterns. If you, for instance, allow only three
5 months of traffic in the summer to extend the
6 construction season, you'll change visitor patterns.
7 And if, in fact, you spend a lot of money to bring in
8 more tourism, you're going to change visitor patterns.

9 MR. JEWETT: Take the word pattern out.
10 Take number of visitors, replace that. Okay?

11 MR. JACKSON: I don't think that's
12 necessarily the same thing, either. How about length
13 of stay?

14 MR. JEWETT: Visitor days.

15 MR. JACKSON: Within the park or outside?

16 MR. JEWETT: The point is, is that will
17 people come to the park if you reach out to those
18 people in the United States that don't know about the
19 opportunities and reach out to them aggressively as a
20 mitigation strategy.

21 MR. JACKSON: I think that's certainly an
22 alternative. How many will you spend and will you
23 spend?

24 MR. JEWETT: Those are the questions.

25 MR. JACKSON: What would you expect to get

1 from it?

2 MR. JEWETT: Let me finish. What I see
3 happening in the mitigation strategy here -- and maybe
4 I'm misreading it; that's why I'm asking you the
5 questions -- is a commitment to take certain actions
6 and certain steps based upon certain premises, the
7 premise being that there's going to be a huge economic
8 impact to the area. Am I wrong about that?

9 MR. JACKSON: I think that that's exactly
10 why we're here.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't think it's accurate
12 to read this as any kind of a commitment to do
13 anything. I think this is going into this agreement
14 for possible studies to address issues does seem a
15 little more specific than needs to be for a preamble,
16 but I don't think we should read any commitments in
17 this language.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Tony, if I understand what
19 you're saying, is that we might accept that the road
20 construction average is going to be done could have an
21 effect on the number of people that are in Will's
22 campground. But a mitigation effort to be a proactive
23 marketing scheme by the Park Service to bring people
24 into the Park, not just to go over the road, but the
25 other things that are here, and that the numbers that

1 are in his campground are the same, that even though
2 there was an impact in construction then there's not a
3 measurable economic impact from his standpoint.

4 MR. JEWETT: I think that's exactly the
5 point I'm trying to get at, Barney. It seems to me
6 most of the economic studies must have assumed that
7 there's going to be less people coming to the park --
8 must have, I guess, because that's the only way it
9 could happen in order to have that much less money
10 here.

11 My point is, why don't we look at ways to
12 bring the same number of people to the park.

13 MR. O'QUINN: The eventual fall is, that if
14 people think the road's disrupted, the road is closed
15 and quote, unquote, the Park is closed, the next thing
16 that follows is there's going to be less people in the
17 Park. So if some mitigation effort is not undertaken
18 or some proactive action is not taken to bring people
19 into the area, that's probably true. That's the way it
20 seems to me.

21 MR. JEWETT: And that's my point only.

22 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think it's a point
23 well taken by giving it the first point in this list.

24 MR. O'QUINN: The patterns may change; they
25 may be doing different things, but the greater sum is

1 hopefully going to be about the same if the Outreach
2 effort works.

3 But I think Dave's point is, if you don't
4 have some baseline data, then after you get into the
5 construction or post-construction and people start
6 coming in and saying woe is me, what are you going to
7 measure it against? That's the purpose of the baseline
8 data, not necessarily that you're going to go out with
9 a big bucket of money and start handing it out, but
10 it's to have some information so that when people start
11 coming in, if they do, you will know somewhat whether
12 they're legitimate or not.

13 MR. JEWETT: And, David, I think you're
14 right on on the need to get baseline data. What I'm
15 saying is that we ought to start on the premise of
16 trying to keep the same number of people coming rather
17 than getting the baseline data based on less people
18 coming.

19 MR. JACKSON: It seems to me that when you
20 start analysis of the premise with no change, you're
21 not doing much analysis. I'm told that the tourist
22 businesses on the east side are already planning to
23 increase their capacity because of change in traffic
24 flows. We just heard someone come in here and worry
25 about paving the North Fork Road, which is, of course,

1 adjacent from the Park, and I would assume the
2 Polebridge store would do better where they have them
3 working with the Sun Road shut down. There is going to
4 be changes in patterns even with the same number of
5 visitors. I think that's just the way it is.

6 So I'm suggesting -- and there may be some
7 winners in this and some losers, and that's the way
8 things work. So what I'm suggesting is we ought to
9 have some base to look at alternatives. Let these
10 folks dream up the alternatives. The one of financial
11 assistance on our green sheet, it's been now surrounded
12 by a variety of other alternatives so it doesn't stand
13 out as the only thing.

14 And we now can talk about what other things
15 might be done besides that, including, of course, as
16 you suggested right at the top of the list, innovative
17 marketing strategies, okay, to maintain or even enhance
18 visitors' and attendance level. That's fine with me.
19 I don't mind that at all.

20 And incidentally, marketing was down there
21 on number seven, I think.

22 MR. SLITER: I think that the patterns that
23 David is talking about are very important, and it
24 brings up a good point with Mr. Hadden's testimony the
25 other day. If we have the same number of people using

1 the greater Glacier area but we may be diverting them
2 away from areas such as West Glacier and, say, St. Mary
3 or that area, then they're going to be going someplace
4 else, hence, a different visitor pattern. Okay.

5 So mitigation may mean a lot of different
6 things. It may mean financial assistance in the St.
7 Mary or West Glacier areas. I'm not crazy about the
8 idea of doling out dollars to maybe meet impacts, but
9 at the same time mitigation also may mean we need to
10 look at some dust control on the North Fork Road.
11 Mitigation doesn't necessarily have to mean economic
12 mitigation. We might find that it means some
13 environmental mitigation, I think.

14 So I think that the traffic pattern
15 analysis needs to be an integral part of this.

16 MR. JACKSON: I might also say that
17 nationally visits to wilderness areas have peaked,
18 started to drop. It's probably a function agent of the
19 American population, older people don't climb rocks as
20 much as younger people do. And I have had to wonder
21 whether the decline in recent years in visits to
22 Glacier is not in a sense related to that because
23 Glacier is a different kind of park than Yellowstone,
24 why, in fact, visits are continuing to increase.

25 So I'm not sure whether it's exchange rates

1 or other things like that why that pattern is in
2 place. This is happening before any road project and
3 it started really about 1991, before anybody even
4 talked about the road. So I think we ought to
5 understand that, too, for example.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other comments on this
7 issue or other changes that should be made or additions
8 that should be made to this memorandum regarding what
9 we have done?

10 MR. JACKSON: There are a couple of
11 corrections, if I could. And I just glanced quickly.
12 Marketing strategy should be followed by a comma; the
13 next line, public strategies by a comma, that should
14 separate it; strategic innovative marketing strategies,
15 comma, extend the construction season, comma, and so
16 on. Limiting traffic to use a shorter -- it should be
17 "limiting public use to a shorter period of time." So
18 that might be a shorter season instead of closing it.
19 Might be, for instance, two or three months in a year
20 or it might be opening July 1st, or something. Those
21 are alternatives.

22 That may be adversely affected, the second
23 "B" should be out of there in that sentence. Then
24 number one, the way I intended it was, "detailed
25 baseline economic information about businesses in the

1 Glacier Park area so that rehabilitation/mitigation can
2 actually be estimated," and then include all the rest
3 of number one which has the banding and all that kind
4 of stuff in it.

5 So that's the reason we're doing that, is
6 to actually give us baseline stuff so we can actually
7 look at costs and so on.

8 And then second, number two was econometric
9 forecasts, and the reason I said that was that people
10 could forecast any number of ways, but I would hope
11 that it had the kind of things that we mentioned in
12 it. Then three, as I see it is the way we left it, and
13 four is the way we left it and so on.

14 And the purpose of this, which is number
15 three on the green sheet which was there, is actually
16 covered in number two. So I want to recognize -- all
17 I'm trying to do is make this clear. Number four,
18 which is on the green sheet, is included in number
19 four, so it's just rephrased it. Number five is
20 included in the way in one, two and three, because I
21 think that the econometric stuff would look at the
22 impacts of closures in the last ten years or more.

23 Then retain number six, seven and eight and
24 nine, which are the green draft as before. So we're
25 not proposing to take those out or eliminate them.

1 It's just that that was changes, additions and
2 clarifications, I think.

3 MS. BURCH: I think this is great
4 suggestion for all the things to study. But I just
5 wonder if under this preamble part on item three, would
6 this paragraph be just as effective if we changed
7 "mitigation" to "mitigate" and changed that sentence to
8 say "mitigate the economic impacts of road
9 rehabilitation," period, and then not list all those
10 items, because they do suggest as though we've already
11 started to think of alternatives and right now we're
12 trying to be as open-minded as possible.

13 You could even keep the following sentence
14 and say "the following information will contribute to
15 socioeconomic analysis." I think maybe at this stage
16 saying less might be better than rather going into this
17 detailed list.

18 MR. JACKSON: I appreciate that. And I
19 thought it was a good idea to use small terms because
20 that was part of the charge of the Advisory Committee
21 back in the proposal, so I didn't want to ignore
22 anything, although I wanted to recognize their
23 creativity and that, suggest that we're going to do
24 them all. In fact, that's why I extended them beyond
25 the idea of financial assistance rather than leave it

1 sit there. Okay? If they're taken out we understand
2 why and that's cool.

3 MR. DAKIN: I'm wrestling with it a little
4 bit, too, and I kind of came to the same idea as Susie,
5 because it seems to kind of unbalance the document. We
6 don't have a preamble to the engineering study; we
7 don't go into so much detail. So it's useful to see
8 these things written out, and now I have a better sense
9 of what the intent was. And yet I don't see anything
10 in David's paper that's really not just a fleshing of
11 the concepts that were on the original proposal.

12 I would just like to pare it down a little
13 bit so it doesn't look like the socioeconomic study is
14 the most important part of this whole project. It
15 should be kept on a plane with the engineering study.

16 And I agree, I think maybe saying less at
17 such an early stage is probably in our best interests.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other comments on
19 Susie's --

20 MR. SHIREMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think you
21 need to go back to the original green document and
22 recognize that the original concept was the development
23 of the mitigation strategy. And the way this is worded
24 now is talking about mitigating economic impacts rather
25 than developing a strategy.

1 I would offer a replacement on that first
2 sentence if you're interested. But I just want to draw
3 your attention to that change that you've drawn, and
4 you're sort of outside the original scope of the
5 project agreement. What I would suggest as a
6 possibility would be something along the lines of
7 "develop" or "development" of a "mitigation strategy
8 for road rehabilitation reconstruction impacts that
9 will be designed so that the net economic impact of the
10 Going-to-the-Sun project on the surrounding areas is
11 zero or positive." And then you can include these,
12 may include but are not limited to the list of.

13 MR. O'QUINN: I would think that that's an
14 alley we can go to. I think "going from zero to
15 positive," we might want to say "minimize."

16 MR. SHIREMAN: What I've been hearing from
17 the Committee is that there's some interest in assuming
18 that on average the economic effects or the economic
19 stability of the region is not impacted by the
20 Going-to-the-Sun Road project because of the other
21 alternatives and incentives and processes and strategy
22 that are being developed to cover those, that there is
23 a net effect that is not noticed in from an economic
24 standpoint during the construction of the road
25 reconstruction/rehabilitation/enhancement.

1 MR. BROOKE: Mr. Chairman, it strikes me
2 that what we have got here is a core or something that
3 works, namely one through ten. I think people seem to
4 be pretty happy with that and we're in one of these
5 "paragraph remorse," I guess, on number three in the
6 preamble. And I think the stuff that David has come up
7 with really captured what we had concerns about in
8 terms of other information that we wanted in one
9 through ten.

10 And so maybe less is better for number
11 three in terms of something short, sweet and simple.
12 And I don't tend to have that in kind of three words or
13 less kind of deal. "Mitigation of economic impacts, if
14 any."

15 MR. JACKSON: How about something like
16 that, "mitigation of economic impacts will be realized
17 by the creative identification of alternatives that
18 will stabilize the local economy?"

19 Now, when I said that, what does it mean?
20 If there's a big kick in the pants to the tourism
21 industry and another big boom in the construction
22 industry and the same people don't transfer from one
23 industry to the other. So I'm telling you that you
24 have to be real careful about how you say these things.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, you're going to have

1 the same thing by developing mitigation strategy
2 without getting into specific examples of what may
3 include, which I think is what Susie and Bill and Rick
4 are saying.

5 MR. JACKSON: How about "maintain the
6 vitality?"

7 MR. O'QUINN: I think this is all the
8 intent. But, again, let's get back to what this is.
9 This is a skeleton that's going to be built on. And I
10 think if this is all written down and the consultant
11 has it and understands it, that's a thought process
12 that might help develop in the scope of work, but I'm
13 not sure that it needs to be in this specificity in the
14 so-called green paper.

15 MR. BROOKE: How about that? You said the
16 word development mitigation alternatives. Development
17 and mitigation alternatives and the following
18 information that development information that may be
19 helpful for the development of those mitigation
20 alternatives.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Develop a mitigation
22 strategy, put a period there, and then just go down and
23 pick up with socioeconomic analysis?

24 You want to make that in the form of a
25 motion? How does that seem to people?

1 MR. JEWETT: Where did you want to put
2 that, Will?

3 MR. BROOKE: Do it like we used to --
4 strike the first paragraph and replace it in its
5 entirety with the following.

6 MR. DAKIN: Why don't we just look at the
7 green document, and C2 says "mitigation strategy." And
8 we can certainly insert the word develop in front of
9 C2.

10 And then I think all of David's six points
11 kind of go in kind of this elaboration: numbers one
12 through six on the green document and what Barney's
13 saying this is skeletal. Certainly that nobody
14 mentions baseline data here in the green document.
15 Obviously that's elemental economics and will assume
16 that anybody's going to do that whether it says it here
17 or not. But if you feel it needs to go in there, it
18 probably goes in number one. That's what I'd like to
19 see to get this balanced.

20 First, we are going to do a detailed
21 economic analysis of the areas near Glacier, the United
22 States and Canada. We've taken care of -- a lot of
23 thought has gone into this draft. And then, in number
24 two, develop mitigation strategies including federal
25 assistance. And I really think that brevity is beyond

1 the scope of Barney's --

2 MR. JACKSON: Park Service people that try
3 and implement rules sometimes are hounded by obtuse
4 words. And I would expect that if I were on the other
5 end of a contract and I said, mitigation strategy
6 including federal assistance, I would wonder what I was
7 supposed to do.

8 I think we'd be smart to be precise and to
9 give the analysts some good direction, because if it
10 comes back and they don't answer the questions we want
11 answered, then we can't do anything but blame
12 ourselves. I think our analyst is at the end of the
13 table. Do you have any comments?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: I have lots of comments, but
15 I'll wait until you're done here.

16 MR. JEWETT: I was hearing a fairly common
17 thing starting with Barney and moving around the table
18 and trying to keep it simple, so I was just going to
19 echo what they said.

20 But, David, I think you've come up with
21 some really great, specific ideas of directions here,
22 and I don't see this discussion as we'd move to keep
23 the scope simple as rejection or elimination goes.
24 What I see is you've encapsulated some very important
25 directions that need to be best directly to the Park

1 Service and MK as our advice on what they should
2 consider as they move forward by keeping the scope of
3 work simple.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. To bring this
5 thing to closure, am I hearing we'll make this briefer
6 at the beginning of number three, develop a mitigation
7 strategy? Was that what you said, Will?

8 MR. BROOKE: Yeah. That's where I was
9 going, but I kind of sidetracked there because I like
10 what we've got here in terms of one through ten.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So then we would strike out
12 the rest of that sentence and just pick up with
13 socioeconomic analysis will contribute to a better
14 comparison, et cetera? Keep one through ten and insert
15 that into paragraph C on the green sheet? Is there a
16 consensus for that?

17 Okay.

18 MR. SHIREMAN: You're going to, in part C
19 of the socioeconomic scope, change this preamble that's
20 on the white sheet to development of mitigation
21 strategy, strike the rest of that sentence, go down to
22 "socioeconomic analysis which would lead to a better
23 comparison," et cetera.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And just follow the rest of
25 this on down. Except that in one here, it was going to

1 be "rehabilitation/mitigation can be actually
2 estimated."

3 MR. O'QUINN: One more thing. I know that
4 it was said that the intent was to separate "D" into
5 the "Transportation Visitor Plan and Environmental
6 Impact Statement" into two paragraphs "E" and "F." And
7 even though you're planning to do it, I think I want to
8 bring that to your attention; not try to break it down,
9 but just suggest that it be broken into two parts, on
10 page eight, item E.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah. Add that to the
12 letter?

13 MR. O'QUINN: I think that should be in the
14 letter, yeah, just for the record.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay. Add that in, Rick?

16 MR. SHIREMAN: Add Section D. The first
17 one is add the scoping for the historic road study and
18 then the other one is split item E into "E" and "F"
19 between Road Transportation/Visitor Plan and
20 Environmental Impact Statement.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Now this just seems to
22 address changes in the green sheet. Is this a document
23 you need from us just supposed to be limited to changes
24 in the green sheet, Rick, or is it supposed to be more
25 comprehensive about other things that were discussed?

1 MR. SHIREMAN: This should cover all of
2 your recommendations, and what we attached here was the
3 things that you had done today. There's a couple of
4 others that were up on the sheet and we can add those
5 in to whatever you sign.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So you don't have a draft
7 of everything that's supposed to be in the green sheet.

8 MR. SHIREMAN: Other than what you've got
9 up on the table. We've been trying to capture things
10 as you've been talking.

11 MR. O'QUINN: So we're going to add some to
12 this?

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

14 All right. If we add in the decision that
15 Craig mentioned plus these items, does that cover
16 everything that we need to report about from this
17 meeting? Can anybody think of anything that's left
18 out?

19 All right. We'll go with that.

20 Maybe this would be a good time to have our
21 new guest introduced and maybe hear from her.

22 MR. GASKILL: I did introduce her before,
23 she was here yesterday when I was introducing the MK
24 Centennial. Jean Townsend.

25 Some of her background experience, projects

1 she's worked with, and a couple things I might have
2 missed. She's worked 29 years in the field; she's got
3 a Bachelor's and a Master's degree in Economics, also a
4 real estate broker in the state of Colorado. I talked
5 about the types of projects she's worked on and
6 econometric models for the various projects.

7 So with that, Jean Townsend is here to
8 hopefully answer some of the questions given how much
9 she's been involved with this meeting so far.

10 MS. TOWNSEND: First, I apologize for
11 getting here at the tail end of your meeting. I had
12 some prior commitment I couldn't get out of. But I
13 will read the transcript, and I will miss that great
14 southern accent in the transcript.

15 I'll be managing the socioeconomic impact
16 portion of the analysis and will be joined by some
17 wonderful folks. The first is John McKean, who is
18 associated with Colorado State University, somebody I
19 have worked with for about 20 years or so. And John is
20 a national expert in input/output models. He has
21 worked on a number of models for me. And he is so good
22 because he can tailor these relatively static models to
23 measure localized impacts in an outstanding way. He's
24 just a great person. But his job will be literally
25 working on the input/output model.

1 We're also joined by Paul Polzin with the
2 Bureau of Business and Economic Research. And Paul
3 will have the lead effort within the University of
4 Montana. The University of Montana is going to assist
5 in the survey research portion of this work. I
6 anticipate and hope that we'll be able to do some
7 original survey research in the area, not only visitors
8 but also very importantly the business community and of
9 the residents. And then Paul will be joined by Norma
10 Nickerson, who you've met earlier this week.

11 I had a chance to review a number of the
12 studies -- of the prior studies that have been done on
13 this project, and I think relative to the earlier work
14 that has been done, I would anticipate that this work
15 would be more detailed and more specific and tailored
16 specifically to the issues that we need to address.
17 And I hope you had a discussion on issues, on
18 socioeconomic issues, and I heard a lot of them this
19 afternoon.

20 And, in addition, did you all receive a
21 form to fill out on -- there's a form in your packet
22 asking just in another way, another slice to help us
23 understand social and economic issues that you think we
24 ought to address, whether you agree with the issue or
25 not. I don't care whether you personally agree with

1 the issue. I think it's really important to get all
2 the issues on the table.

3 One of the first pieces that I would like
4 to do, which will be enormously helpful in the analysis
5 but I think helpful in a broader way as well, and that
6 is take from your deliberations, take from the earlier
7 work, take from the forms that you're going to fill out
8 and we will prepare an issues paper. Doesn't answer a
9 darned thing. It simply itemizes or lists the issues.
10 And I would, if I may, like to then share that back
11 with the Committee.

12 And if any of you feel like -- oh, yeah, I
13 forgot about this issue, let's add to it, this is the
14 time to get specific so that no matter how many
15 iterations we have to go through, what would be
16 enormously helpful is to have a written statement best
17 we can do collectively of the issues that ought to be
18 addressed.

19 Also, relative to the other studies that
20 I've had a chance to read, the studies are classic
21 economic studies and they measure a lot of things in
22 dollars. I would like to, in addition, measure things
23 in people, measure things in numbers of businesses,
24 measure things in real measures that people can relate
25 to, not just measure things in millions of dollars or

1 tens of thousands of dollars or whatever. Sometimes it
2 doesn't have a very obvious and direct feel. But if
3 you can measure it in terms of seasonal jobs, measure
4 it in terms of number of businesses, that can have a
5 more real feel to the whole analysis. So that's a way
6 that the piece might be different.

7 I caught a little bit of your remarks about
8 expanding the geographic analysis area. Actually what
9 was on my mind is, that was on my mind. But what was
10 on my mind, as well, was learning if the impacts in
11 Kalispell are the same as or different from the impacts
12 at St. Mary's and other places. So not only get broad,
13 but I want you to get more specific, because I don't
14 know right this second whether the impacts are the same
15 in different local communities.

16 Also, if you have a million-dollar impact
17 on a very small community it might be devastating to
18 have a million-dollar impact in a larger community. It
19 may have the wherewithal to absorb that and more job
20 opportunities, et cetera.

21 The third thing that I wanted to mention --
22 and I really prepared these remarks before coming here
23 -- and that is the piece that I enjoy the most is the
24 mitigation piece. I look forward to the so-what
25 piece. You do as fine and detailed analysis as you

1 can, measuring, quantifying, describing the
2 socioeconomic impact piece. To me, the work that has
3 real value is working on the mitigation tools and
4 techniques. So relative to the other pieces I really
5 look forward to that piece and getting quite creative.

6 And in other jobs that I have worked on
7 I've learned that the mitigation answers are really
8 already in the community; really, people locally have
9 the best answers. And if we have just excellent
10 outreach techniques in the community and give people an
11 opportunity to not only talk about what concerns them
12 but to talk about what in their judgment might be
13 solutions, that a lot of times those gems of ideas may
14 not be articulated very well, but the wonderful ideas
15 often come from the community.

16 But it will be our job and your job to be
17 looking at those mitigation tools and techniques,
18 sifting between them and among them and deciding what
19 seems to be the most worthwhile here.

20 So those are just some preliminary thoughts
21 that I have, with one addition. And that is, I am
22 extremely available. I want to talk to you
23 individually. I want you to talk to me individually.
24 You can reach me by fax, reach me by phone, reach me by
25 email.

1 And almost in this very first part of the
2 work where we're defining issues is, I need you the
3 most now and I need you the most at the end when we're
4 looking at mitigation ideas. So it's really over the
5 next month or so that defining these issues and
6 defining them as specifically as we can will help frame
7 the analysis. And I guess I can't over-emphasize that
8 piece of the work.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks, Jean.

11 Any questions for Jean or anything that
12 anyone would like to comment on?

13 MS. BURCH: Are we going to get contact
14 numbers for -- I know all of our addresses are out, but
15 I'd like to fax my report back in a day or so.

16 MS. TOWNSEND: I don't know. I'm sure
17 we're all very accessible.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other questions for
19 Jean?

20 Jean, thanks for joining us. We appreciate
21 it.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Question in general about
23 that, not Jean specifically, but in general about the
24 Committee members contacting the contractor and/or the
25 subs. I thought we said we are going to go through the

1 Park Service.

2 Now, you know, as individual members, if we
3 have something to add or suggestions, it's one thing to
4 do it as comments or planner or transportation person
5 or whatever, but that needs to be very clear that
6 that's just a suggestion; it's not coming from the
7 Committee if we're doing that. I think we need to have
8 some real definition about who all we should be
9 discussing what with.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I agree with that. We
11 talked the first day, I think, and that seemed to be
12 the impression, is that we needed to filter all of our
13 communications through the Park Service.

14 Now that raises a question. This
15 information sheet that had been passed around asking
16 for feedback, does everybody need to send them to the
17 Park Service before sending them in to Jean?

18 MR. SHIREMAN: If you have done your
19 homework and can provide those to us, we will
20 facilitate the transfer from you to Jean. And I think
21 the issue here is very pertinent in terms of the
22 development of the contract and asking for
23 information. But what you're doing here is providing
24 information, and I think that that provision of
25 information, not direction, not advice, but provision

1 of information, is something that the public can do as
2 a part of the process.

3 Now, certainly the Park Service would like
4 to be a part of that and see that the information is
5 provided. But that could be done in a variety of ways,
6 for example via the web page that you've identified
7 that will have access back and forth.

8 So if you've provided that information in a
9 format that gets it to the attention of the Park
10 Service and to the attention of MK Centennial and that
11 is information and not direction or advice on the
12 direction of the entire Committee, then I think that
13 that's okay.

14 MR. O'QUINN: That was exactly my point. I
15 would like to have the opportunity, not as a
16 representative of the Committee, but as an individual
17 that now has a good deal of interest in the project how
18 it comes out, to have dialogue as long as the
19 understanding is that I'm not giving direction but just
20 dialogue.

21 And I think a good thing that you said, but
22 most of what we're doing today is email. And you as
23 well as whoever you have designated as well as MK
24 produce a carbon copy of that information. I don't
25 want us to get hung up in the contractor process or the

1 bureaucracy to the point we can't function, but at the
2 same time we've got to be careful not to exceed our
3 authority.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So I gather if we are asked
5 for information or we can supply it directly to MK as
6 long as MK understand that the Committee has no
7 authority to give them any direction, ask them to do
8 anything.

9 MR. SHIREMAN: That's right. They're going
10 to be looking at attaining information from a variety
11 of places, and you individually are members of the
12 Committee but also members that represent some other
13 party. So from that standpoint that provision of
14 information, I think, is a viable and recognizable way
15 of dealing with the process.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That seems a lot better
17 than that first motion of having to filter everything
18 through the Park Service.

19 MR. SHIREMAN: Keep in mind that
20 information is information, advice is advice and there
21 are two different things there. If you are in doubt
22 you do need to go back through the contact for the
23 National Park Service. And in that case I'll just
24 remind you that the project manager is Fred Babb.

25 MR. SLITER: In the Committee giving

1 information to the team or to the rest of the team is
2 one thing. Sometimes we'll probably find that there
3 are members of the Committee that would like to do a
4 little research to formulate suggestions for
5 recommendation for next meetings, things like that. To
6 what extent are we allowed to fraternize with other
7 members of the team to gather information?

8 And I don't want to be calling and asking
9 Dick or Jay or Craig a question that's going to cost
10 the study dollars to produce the information. I need
11 to go find another way to do that research. But on the
12 other hand, if there are simple questions that need to
13 be asked, I kind of go along with, let's keep the
14 bureaucracy in check attitude that says, if I want to
15 call Dick or Jay or Craig and ask them the fairly
16 simple question. I don't feel like I really want to
17 call Fred first. Maybe I should call Fred first
18 because he'll have the answer.

19 But that's just an observation that I think
20 when we're gathering information for our own use what's
21 the proper chain of command to follow.

22 MR. SHIREMAN: I don't want the process to
23 be too overburdening on the Committee, but I also don't
24 want to lose the issue around the contractor working
25 for the National Park Service, and I think each of you,

1 we're going to trust you folks to recognize that we
2 have some fiscal responsibility here and that each of
3 you needs to take that responsibility very seriously as
4 the Park Service does and think long and hard about
5 what you're asking, and if it appears to you that it's
6 going to be something that is going to take a
7 significant amount of effort or time, then that might
8 be something that you want to talk to Fred about first
9 and insure that this is not going to jeopardize or
10 expend finances or time that are needed for other parts
11 of the project.

12 And in talking with all of you, I think
13 that you fundamentally understand that and will be
14 careful and good citizens in terms of your roles on the
15 Advisory Committee to exercise good judgment.

16 We also will ask MK Centennial and again
17 will monitor the process to make sure that the flow of
18 information is appropriate. Certainly if the Committee
19 sees that there is a need for information, you
20 definitely need to talk with the Park Service and voice
21 your concerns about that to make sure that we're
22 getting that in a way that it's going to be good
23 business.

24 I go back to the concept of the web page
25 and the ability to get information out not only on a

1 one-on-one basis, but in a format that will allow more
2 of the folks to share that information so, for example,
3 the same question that Paul, that Jane -- depending on
4 who you're look at -- is asking is not the same that
5 Susie, that Will and that Linda are all thinking about
6 at the same time. The one question may be legitimate
7 and very easy to answer. The same question asked 17
8 times may take quite a bit of time.

9 MR. BABB: One other suggestion that might
10 help, is remember the green we are underlining sort of
11 the key contact, and you guy have a key contact, too.

12 Paul, you have a question, you think that
13 sort of falls under Park Service, again, I'm assuming
14 it's not money and time; right? And maybe you call me
15 and I'm responsible for getting that person back
16 together again so you don't bother the people that are
17 doing the work in the case of MK. You would call their
18 contact, who is now Dick, and do that type of thing and
19 maybe that could streamline it a little bit.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Have we
21 clarified that one well enough?

22 MR. SHIREMAN: I have the estimated costs
23 for this meeting and I'll distribute this at this
24 time.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do we have anymore

1 questions for Jean while she's here? Is there anything
2 else that we need to cover as a Committee for now?

3 If not, we could probably take a break and
4 reconvene at 4:30 for our public input.

5 MR. SHIREMAN: I believe Craig might want
6 to do little bit of close-out.

7 MR. SHIREMAN: Then what I'd ask you to do
8 is reconvene at 4:15 and we'll do about 15 minutes from
9 the Park Service on the new projects of discussion.

10 MR. DAKIN: We found three or four mistakes
11 in the first draft. Maybe we should reconvene about
12 quarter to four. That gives us about half hour break.

13 (Meeting adjourned at 3:20, to reconvene at
14 4:00 p.m.)

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We can reconvene. We have
16 a couple of items to deal with before we get to our
17 public comment session.

18 First of all, one item that we discussed
19 yesterday and that we didn't really deal with today
20 when we were talking about communication, our next
21 thing that's going to be happening in this process is
22 that MK Centennial will be inventorying the existing
23 studies and coming back with some recommendations for
24 additional studies toward the end of May. And since we
25 aren't meeting until September, we want to get their

1 recommendations to the Committee and then have feedback
2 from the Committee as to what additional studies the
3 Committee feels should be conducted. So I want to just
4 communicate with how best to do that. We will probably
5 electronically get the recommendations from MK
6 Centennial to everybody by email, but then how do you
7 want to give me your feedback? Do you want to just get
8 that back to me and have me communicate it to MK
9 Centennial or do you want to have, perhaps, electronic
10 meetings or how do you want to do that. Any thoughts?

11 MR. DAKIN: Well, remember, we had
12 reservations about the virtual meeting as regard to not
13 living up to our requirement to be public enough. I
14 would be comfortable with using you as a focus for
15 feedback. And I really think that that report, the
16 directives here give enough memorandum and enough
17 guidance to the National Park Service and to MK
18 Centennial they pretty know all the things they need to
19 go after. But just in case we wanted to emphasize
20 something, I would suggest that filtering that back
21 through you is the rational way to go.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Any other
23 thoughts?

24 That's satisfactory with me and I think
25 that would be sufficient if the Committee does want to

1 have input. But MK Centennial's been here for our
2 entire meeting. They know what the thoughts of the
3 Committee members are in terms of data and additional
4 information, and I would think we could communicate our
5 feedback to them in that fashion, if that's acceptable
6 to the Committee.

7 Any other thoughts? Anybody object to
8 doing it that way?

9 All right. Then we'll do that. When we do
10 get the report and the recommendations from MK
11 Centennial, if you can get that to me either through
12 the Park Service or however you want to do it, I'll
13 disseminate it out to the Committee members and get
14 their feedback and get that back to you.

15 All right. Now, we have in front of us a
16 draft and a memorandum that kind of summarizes what has
17 taken place here in our first Committee meeting in the
18 last three days. I hope you all have had a chance to
19 review it, and ask if you have any additions or
20 corrections that need to be made to this draft
21 memorandum.

22 MS. ANDERSON: On number ten on the second
23 page, it still says "carrying capacities."

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You're right. That should
25 be taken out. Delete number ten altogether. All

1 right. Other?

2 MR. DAKIN: Number two in defense of the
3 English language, let's not optimize road improvements
4 in an optimal manner. Maybe "coordinate improvements
5 in an optimal matter."

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think "coordinate road
7 improvements in an optimal manner." "Coordinate with
8 other federal, state provincial and local road agencies
9 to." Got "coordinate" in there twice now.

10 MR. DAKIN: To organize or to schedule.

11 MR. JACKSON: Or to cooperate according
12 with federal, state, provincial, and so on, road
13 improvements in an optimal manner.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We were talking about
15 scheduling. I think the idea was that we didn't want
16 to be having several projects going on simultaneously.
17 So it seems to me the concept of scheduling would be
18 most appropriate to get back what we were getting at.
19 So I'd say "schedule."

20 All right.

21 MR. MEZMARICH: We had a lengthy discussion
22 earlier about that language in regards to an innovating
23 marketing strategy, and now we have number seven as in
24 the draft the green paper which says "a marketing plan
25 and associated implications must be developed."

1 Are we comfortable with removing, after
2 much discussion "innovating marketing strategy?" Look
3 on page two, number five. We've added that "allows the
4 development of a marketing plan to assist businesses
5 expected to be hurt adversely impacted by the
6 project."

7 And then we have number seven. When you
8 move down below to number ten it says, "retain numbers
9 six, seven, eight and nine to the draft," and number
10 seven refers to the marketing plan.

11 And it seems that we talked a great deal
12 about trying to remove the negativity which we now have
13 in number five with that adversely impacts language,
14 and we have lost the "innovative marketing strategy."
15 And if my impression was wrong, please correct me.

16 MR. MEZMARICH: What I would propose is
17 that we go to number five that begins at, "allows the
18 development of a marketing plan, and I'll read this to
19 you. "Allows the development of a plan to," and then
20 insert "identify innovative marketing strategies to,"
21 and then back to plan. So it would read, "Allows the
22 development of a plan to identify innovative marketing
23 strategies to," and then I'm inserting "promote more of
24 the areas of Glacier National Park." And strike the
25 rest of that sentence.

1 And then I would suggest also that we
2 strike seven from the draft.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Strike seven.

4 MR. MEZMARICH: Strike seven from that
5 list.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Which says, "Eliminate
7 number three.

8 MR. MEZMARICH: No; down further, number
9 ten. Number ten on your white paper says retain six,
10 seven, eight and nine. Scratch seven from that.

11 If you're referring to the green paper,
12 yes, we would be eliminating seven. Would you like me
13 to read one more time? This is number five on the
14 white paper. "Allows the development of a plan to
15 identify innovative marketing strategies to promote
16 more of the areas of Glacier National Park."

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any comments on that
18 language?

19 MR. DAKIN: I think that's what we're
20 working on. I suggest we even eliminate the word
21 "allows" and change that to "develop a plan."

22 MR. MEZMARICH: I would concur with that.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. So then why
24 don't you read it with your change.

25 MR. MEZMARICH: "Develop a plan to identify

1 innovative marketing strategies to promote more of the
2 areas of Glacier National Park.

3 MR. JACKSON: Just have a question. Would
4 this go ahead with the consulting firm now even if
5 there was not money to do the rehabilitation/
6 enhancement/reconstruction work on the road, or would
7 this be a suggestion to them to how to develop such a
8 plan?

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, this is in the study
10 we're talking about in here.

11 MR. JACKSON: This is not the marketing
12 plan itself.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Seems to me that language
14 gets at what we were driving at.

15 MR. SHIREMAN: Could I ask for a
16 clarification? In the wording that you've now
17 identified, are you intending to limit those marketing
18 strategies only to other areas of Glacier National Park
19 or surrounding areas of Glacier National Park?

20 My question is, is it limiting to just the
21 areas within Glacier National Park or the areas around
22 Glacier National Park?

23 MR. O'QUINN: Question. My understanding
24 was that what you had said earlier was that from your
25 standpoint you could market the Park but not the

1 private areas around the Park. Now the tourist
2 industry want to market all of Northwest Montana. So
3 be it. That's greater.

4 But as far as what you and your consultants
5 are doing, can you do more than what's in the Park?

6 MR. SHIREMAN: The marketing strategy could
7 include other areas but someone else would need to take
8 the lead in doing that work for those areas around.
9 But you want to have that coordinated marketing
10 strategy for both the park and other areas.

11 MR. O'QUINN: That was my understanding,
12 that we are a coordinated effort. But as far as this
13 study is concerned, our part of it would be the
14 mitigation of the impacts of the change in traffic
15 patterns and construction to how like other areas of
16 the park, which would be your part.

17 MR. SHIREMAN: I'm asking the question so
18 that we're sure.

19 MR. DAKIN: I appreciate your question.
20 And I kind of think it should be more than just the
21 Park area, because if you read that, literally you're
22 talking about taking 200,000 people and encouraging
23 them to go into the North Fork, Cut Bank Creek. We
24 don't want to be confined like that. So maybe Lowell
25 could expand a little bit.

1 MR. BROOKE: I think, Mr. Chairman, the
2 other thing in terms of, potentially the people that
3 are most affected are obviously the ones closest to the
4 road in here, and they're going to misread that what
5 you're trying to do here is maybe even increase that
6 impact by saying, well, the road is under construction
7 so go here or go there, go to other places in Glacier.
8 Still come to Glacier but go to these other areas, and
9 really that's wrong. I don't think that's your
10 intent.

11 Wonder what happens if you put a period
12 after "marketing strategies" in your innovative market
13 strategies, period. And we're not talking about areas.
14 And we don't have to draw lines about where we are.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any comments on that
16 suggestion from Will?

17 That kind of leaves what kind of marketing
18 strategies hanging then.

19 All right. That accomplish what you're
20 trying to get at, Lowell?

21 MR. MEZMARICH: Yeah. We deferred to the
22 professionals to develop the strategies.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Everybody good with that?

24 So did you get that, Rick, for a revised
25 draft?

1 Other recommendations or thoughts on this
2 draft?

3 MR. DAKIN: I've got to ask Will here about
4 number 12. It was your idea that we could look toward
5 an eventual endowment on the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
6 Wasn't it specifically for long-term maintenance? Was
7 that the idea?

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think it was.

9 MR. DAKIN: Wouldn't it be better to state
10 what we have in mind there?

11 MR. BROOKE: I saw that, and I would tend
12 to agree, "for long-term maintenance." Well, yeah,
13 just period, "for long-term maintenance."

14 MR. DAKIN: As it reads here, it almost
15 could be read as being an alternative to a federal
16 appropriation for this project.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That was what we were
18 talking about, was long-term maintenance.

19 MR. BROOKE: So moved and amended.

20 MR. DAKIN: Seconded.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other thoughts or
22 suggestions on this draft?

23 MR. DAKIN: I really did like in number 14
24 where some genius came up with the idea of a footnote
25 to explain what we mean by "reconstruction." That's

1 the great way to do what we've talked about and still
2 make this readable.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Any other
4 suggestions on this memorandum?

5 MR. SHIREMAN: Mr. Chair, I've been passed
6 a note by one of the folks in the Park Service that
7 notes there was a recommendation from the Committee
8 that the list of inventory or the analysis of the
9 existing records and documents and studies be done as a
10 first priority in the process. Do you want to include
11 that as an item?

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we can include that
13 and include also that it would be disseminated to the
14 Committee upon completion for input back from the
15 Committee.

16 Can you think of anything else that we have
17 made recommendations on that does not appear in this
18 memorandum in front of you?

19 MR. DAKIN: Is it adequate, Rick, in your
20 opinion summarizing two days of deliberation here into
21 this much information?

22 MR. SHIREMAN: Into this list in the
23 literature?

24 MR. DAKIN: Do you feel this is an adequate
25 transmittal from this Committee?

1 MR. SHIREMAN: I think it captures the most
2 general and fairly specific advice and recommendations
3 that you've deliberated over the last three days, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Also, on that last point
5 you just brought up, Rick, I think the recommendation
6 was to have MK Centennial do you the inventory and then
7 report back with recommendations and cost estimates for
8 additional studies they deem would be appropriate. So
9 I think we should draw that language as well.

10 Any other items that anyone can think of
11 that should be included in this memorandum?

12 If not, I think that if you could provide
13 us with a revised version of the memorandum, Rick, at
14 your convenience, I think that will suffice. Thank
15 you.

16 All right. I see the hour of 4:30 is upon
17 us and we have scheduled this time on our agenda for
18 public input. Are there people in the audience who
19 would care to give public input to the Committee at
20 this time?

21 If so, would you please step forward to the
22 microphone, state your name, if you would, please.

23 SHARLON WILLOWS: Hello. My name is
24 Sharlon Willows, the Research Coordinator for Coalition
25 for Canyon Preservation, Inc., also known as Protect

1 Glacier Canyon Coalition.

2 I am a Certified Legal Assistant with
3 Administrative, Natural & Cultural Resource Law. With
4 the goal of furthering compliance of preservation law
5 the CCP has been monitoring or, quote, watchdogging
6 Glacier for 15 years documenting administrative
7 history. Suzanne will be the fourth superintendent in
8 my time. I am impressed and thrilled by her historic
9 background, and after hearing presentations of MK
10 Centennial, I am totally impressed and overjoyed by
11 their state-of-the-art, which does not otherwise occur
12 in Montana where compliance is about 10 to 15 years
13 behind, unfortunately.

14 I see we have a good mix of exceptional
15 individuals on this Advisory Council that allows me to
16 rest easier. As long as this Committee is selecting
17 historic restoration and rehabilitation, you're not
18 going to have any trouble from CCP because we have been
19 actively working to achieve this historic preservation
20 goal for 15 years.

21 Please understand we worked very hard
22 through 1998 and '99 to reverse Superintendent
23 Mihalic's secret total reconstruction plan using modern
24 five-ton chunks of Pre-Con that I believe based on FOIA
25 research was at least in 50 percent design stage.

1 We litigated the west side parking area
2 foreclosing the road at Avalanche and 1. The FONSI on
3 page 323 in the FDIS was overturned. Avalanche is a
4 famous historic and rare Cedar/Devil's club old growth
5 habitat where a massive parking lot was inappropriate
6 in that location. So you can see I am thrilled to see
7 this new change of direction. I am pleased with the
8 NPS turnaround. It is a great relief that I believe
9 could allow some, quote, tweak of rules because the
10 goals are mutual. There is no cause to sue if the
11 mutual goals are being achieved, which I believe they
12 appear to be.

13 On technical matters, naturally the CCP has
14 for years specified concern about this Advisory
15 Committee replacing early NEPA scoping. These
16 administrative activities could have easily been
17 scheduled concurrently or consecutively, I believe, but
18 I see this has been resolved by your latest memo.

19 I believe the FACA Committee itself could
20 have appeared more reasonable by allowing public
21 comment possibly occurring intermittently rather than
22 at the end of the end, based on FACA, Section 10.

23 Likewise, the CCP has been expressing
24 concerns for years that EIS should be happening. For
25 the record, under FOIA it took me 20 days to receive

1 the materials in your notebook, after the meeting had
2 commenced. Hopefully this adversarial attitude can be
3 mitigated as compliance with FOIA and other laws gets
4 to be routine and accepted. This process can be very
5 frustrating.

6 For 22 years CCP has fought to save
7 Historic Bad Rock Canyon and prevailed in Ninth Circuit
8 Court in 1980. 20 years later the MDOT is in violation
9 of that ruling.

10 There are three significant sites eligible
11 for national and historic register at Bad Rock. Their
12 decision to blow it all up would have to be revisited.
13 Our goal is to create a low speed parkway that reserves
14 the scenic and historic resources.

15 Glacier still needs to attend to scoping on
16 this and other concurrent projects such as the Walton
17 U.S. 2 development in cooperation with MDT's secret new
18 bridge relocated to sensitive Floodplain Bull Trout
19 habitat. I recently heard about this plan from U.S.
20 Fish and Wildlife Service because MDOT doesn't scope,
21 either, oftentimes. There was no scoping on the
22 Avalanche EA. I found it on display at the Park
23 library for internal review.

24 Now, on the matters before this Advisory
25 Committee I have these few comments. Number one, there

1 are some key documents missing from the list presented
2 with, quote, Park Panel Discussion on 2-29, and -- on
3 February 29, which are, the first one, 1991
4 Going-to-the-Sun Road Cultural Resources Plan, and I
5 believe the 1987 MOA with the Advisory Council on
6 Triple Arches and the Loop Walls Repair, and its First
7 Amendment of 1988 should be on the table.

8 Number two, I would advise you all to
9 obtain a copy of the wonderful document entitled
10 "Public Participation" in Section 106 review, "A Guide
11 for Agency Officials." It's by the Advisory Council
12 and Historic Preservation, February 1989.

13 Number three, your, quote, Park Panel
14 Discussion paper dated February 29 has a page titled,
15 quote, "Major Work Categories to be Addressed. The
16 only possible problematic item is, quote, turnouts/
17 parking deficiencies need to be mitigated -- whatever
18 that means, because I wasn't present for the panel.
19 Please pardon me there.

20 However, you will note that NPS, quote,
21 backed off from this plan to add new turnouts to be
22 dealt with all along Going-to-the-Sun Road in the final
23 EIS to see the preferred alternative, number A-1 on
24 page 46 to 48 on the FEIS, claiming that the, quote,
25 additional study was needed for this concept which

1 could mean big changes to the historic configuration of
2 the road, that is, potential adverse impact under
3 Section 106, could be more attractance and adverse
4 impact for Grizzly bears while creating additional
5 parking problems.

6 Number three, we spent six years on the GMP
7 EIS process with two years of that in pre-scoping FOIA
8 research, as years of NPS work went into this project
9 before it went to scoping. The FEIS adjusted its final
10 preferred alternative for preservation of
11 Going-to-the-Sun Road on page 54 and 55. Therefore, I
12 believe you can safely tier from that EIS, no objection
13 from CCP.

14 The only caution in FEIS I would admonish
15 to you is to, quote, steer clear of the new zoning for
16 Glacier on pages 23 through 44, which is more than a
17 slippery slope. It is a pit legally. There's no NEPA
18 compliance whatsoever; no disclosure of existing
19 historic zoning, no impact analysis for the changes, no
20 consideration of alternatives, all in violation of NPS
21 1988 Policies which were in force and effect during the
22 Draft EIS period.

23 Directives Order 2 changed the zoning to
24 desire future concepts scenario in May 1998 after the
25 Draft EIS went to the printers, and even so, the DFC

1 scenario was not public, if that's what that was.

2 Anyone can find a copy of the Park's
3 existing historic zoning in the 1990 or '91 Statement
4 for Management for Glacier, which I will have attached
5 to my submittal here. Glacier's historic philosophy
6 was for major development outside the Park. This
7 philosophy was changed. One month after the FEIS was
8 released last summer the hotel concessioner proposed
9 doubling the beds inside the Park with spas and
10 computers. Again, this is taking business away from
11 the businesses outside the Park which had been
12 traditionally relied upon.

13 The Park's zoning for the Going-to-the-Sun
14 Road corridor and the great lakes was changed from
15 natural or historic to visitor services, page 33. Both
16 Lake McDonald and the St. Mary's Lake are on the
17 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

18 Some examples of major problems are: Bald
19 Eagle nesting habitat on Lake McDonald and St. Mary was
20 changed from natural zone to, quote, high level of
21 visitor use including motorized craft, end quotes.
22 That's in the final EIS, page 24.

23 According to the new zoning, a jet boat
24 regatta could happen any time. Another major problem
25 is the big new chunk of visitor service zone in heavy

1 spring and fall bear habitat on lower Camas Road. This
2 is on page 32.

3 Wilderness study area was changed, quote,
4 to day use and, quote, back country zone wilderness.
5 The word wilderness doesn't exist in zoning anymore.
6 Most importantly -- and I want this underlined, this
7 next sentence, historic zones that appear on the
8 National Historic Register were completely removed.
9 That's a very serious issue, I believe. I think the
10 public has a right to know what the historic zones are
11 and that they warrant their own zoning.

12 Respectfully, Sharlon Willows.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Sharlon. And do
14 you have written copies of your comments for us? Thank
15 you.

16 Are there others wishing to provide public
17 input at this time? Sir?

18 CESAR HERNANDEZ: My name is Cesar
19 Hernandez. I'm the northwest field rep for the Montana
20 Warden's Association. Sorry I didn't have time to
21 attend the meetings for the last three days, but
22 there's a lot of other things that need to be
23 protected.

24 MWA supports the mission of this Advisory
25 Committee. MWA also supports all the protection that

1 can be afforded to the wild lands surrounding Glacier
2 National Park. We hope that this process and the
3 decision that come out of this Committee do not become
4 an impetus for fixing other roads, such as the North
5 Fork Road. Please keep to the task at hand and good
6 luck. MWA will participate as we see opportunity with
7 this committee. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you for being here.
9 Are there any other individuals wishing to
10 submit public comment today? Anyone wishing to submit
11 public comment?

12 Seeing none, we'll conclude the public
13 comments part of our meeting.

14 Is there anything else that we need to
15 attend to today, Rick?

16 MR. SHIREMAN: Mr. Chair, I think it would
17 be appropriate if the members of the Committee would
18 like to make a closing statement similar to what they
19 did the first of the day, just sort of wrapping up what
20 they have identified in just a few sentences or a
21 couple of minutes. And I'd also like to conclude with
22 a few comments myself.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you want to do that now
24 or wait until after the Committee?

25 MR. SHIREMAN: Either way.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anybody wish to make any
2 closing comments?

3 MR. O'QUINN: Yes, I do. I don't know what
4 I expected when I came out here. I really did not come
5 on a preconceived notion of what this was all about.
6 And I guess I didn't know, but I have found it very
7 enlightening. I think we've done a lot of good work.
8 I hope it's going to be beneficial to the Park as well
9 as to the consultant doing the work. I feel real good
10 about what we have done the last few days and look
11 forward to a continued relationship.

12 MR. McDONALD: I'd just like to take the
13 opportunity to thank the rest of the Committee members
14 for volunteering their time, being here for this valued
15 effort. It's been a learning experience for me. I
16 look forward to the next meeting. I also look forward
17 to providing more meaningful comments from
18 Salish-Kootenai tribes in this process.

19 MR. JACKSON: Well, I, of course, didn't
20 have a large idea of what we were going to do when we
21 started, and I think I've learned a lot about the role
22 of this Committee and how it fits into the larger idea
23 of public involvement.

24 I also kind of note and thank -- some of
25 the public comments here reflect that people care a lot

1 about Glacier who have been involved in watching
2 Glacier for a long time and have in fact a lot of
3 continuity with Glacier, which should be useful to us.
4 And I still think we have to learn how to integrate
5 ourselves into a larger public dialogue effect while
6 still doing our work.

7 I think we have a better idea about advice
8 we can give the Park about the assessment impacts and
9 so on, and I think we're on the right track that way.
10 So I think we've actually accomplished a lot now in
11 three days and it's been fun. And it certainly re-
12 invigorates my own feelings about the first time I went
13 over the road in '67, which I still remember the
14 thrill, and I'll like to see that kept there.

15 MR. DAKIN: I achieved a tremendous amount
16 of comfort with this group in a very short period of
17 time and continue to feel very fortunate to be part of
18 this. I think we made a wonderful choice in chair
19 people. I compliment you on the way you've kept us on
20 track today and actually finished the agenda.

21 It's difficult for me to believe, Rick,
22 that you and your staff don't do this every year. I
23 think this is extraordinarily well organized for a
24 first time CAC in Glacier Park. I really compliment
25 you.

1 And I really respect people for being able
2 to not get lost in their various fields of technical
3 knowledge and expertise and try to pull together so
4 that we could really get things accomplished. I look
5 forward to the next meeting.

6 MS. ANDERSON: I have to say after the
7 first day of sitting and listening to everybody I was a
8 little bit overwhelmed on a lot of technical language
9 that was being used, and I've started a dictionary of
10 all the acronyms and all the abbreviations that I've
11 heard over this in the last few days.

12 But I really appreciate being part of this.
13 It really started to make more sense yesterday when we
14 could actually talk and listen to the different faction
15 of people that are on the Committee.

16 I think one of the things that really stood
17 out to me on Tuesday when we were introducing ourselves
18 was, not only the love of Glacier Park amongst the
19 Committee members, but also as we're hearing from the
20 public, the Park is really a jewel and a lot of people
21 in this area, in the world, have a real personal
22 feeling about it. And it's -- sometimes it's a little
23 bit overwhelming to think about being responsible for
24 that or giving the advice on that, and I'm deeply
25 honored to be part of that and I appreciate working

1 with the panel, with you, Rick, and Susie and everybody
2 that we heard from, the Park and MK Centennial. I
3 really enjoyed it and I look forward to the next
4 meeting.

5 MR. BROOKE: Four score and seven -- I mean
6 really in jest to start out that way, but in part it
7 really is a historic opportunity here and it's quite an
8 honor to be on the Advisory Committee. And I had my
9 doubts about collecting 17 people and how much we would
10 get done and how well we would work together. And it
11 seems like probably all of us have been in committees
12 of much smaller size where there seems to be somebody
13 or some group of people that just makes life miserable
14 and the meeting miserable and things don't get done
15 very well. This collection of 17 people is really
16 quite extraordinary and the kind of brain power they
17 bring to it and abilities is extraordinary.

18 But the challenges that we face are
19 extraordinary, too, and not only extraordinary in terms
20 of the challenges, but the legacy that we lead, because
21 this is one of the most significant roadways in the
22 country, if not the world, and so the work we do here
23 is very important.

24 And I guess in that regard when we talked
25 about how important we considered the public comment

1 and that we were going to reformat our next meeting to
2 include public comment in the front and in the middle
3 and in the end or some combination of that so that we
4 truly do get all of that.

5 Because, again, it's important stuff that
6 we're doing here today and I hope that everybody comes
7 back with the same energy level and doesn't miss
8 meetings and continues to participate at the level that
9 they've participated in these three days, because it's
10 been really helpful to me and it's been really
11 encouraging to me where we are. I say -- a lot of
12 times you have people around here where we are today
13 versus where we were two years ago, in 1998, my spirit
14 is much higher.

15 And, again, I'm honored to be here and I
16 thank all of you for all the work that you've put into
17 this.

18 MS. BURCH: I'll be very brief. I feel
19 very optimistic after these three days. I think we
20 have a real chance of rehabilitating this road before
21 it fails, and also not destroying the local economy. I
22 hope that we have been helpful to the Park Service. I
23 think we have been. I also hope that we are reassuring
24 the public that the Park Service really is open to
25 their input and want to consider it from the very

1 beginning.

2 MR. MEZMARICH: Going with previous
3 comments, the word honor was used in our introductions
4 by many of us on Day One, and here on Day Three you
5 hear it again. I believe this Committee's honorably
6 dispatched its duties as has the leadership of Glacier
7 National Park.

8 And glad to welcome Suzanne, the staff, as
9 well as MK. We appreciate that. And I especially
10 appreciate the gracious acceptance of Randy for the
11 chairmanship of this, and I know it will be a task and
12 I know we will offer what we can to assist you.

13 MR. SLITER: Thanks, Randy. And looking at
14 the Committee's schedule I'm not sure that we're going
15 to have an opportunity to see Rick again. I don't know
16 if he'll be back to help us with our deliberations
17 anymore. But I, too, think that you've done a terrific
18 job in your short stint here and we welcome you. It
19 was a very productive hundred days so far, and I trust
20 that the next 30 or so will be just as productive, so
21 thanks for all your work, and we welcome you. You've
22 got a big challenge ahead of you and I'm sure that's
23 one of the reasons why you were chosen for the job.

24 Being a part of this reminds me very much
25 of the legislature. It's a very diverse bunch of

1 people that are all trying to work toward the same end,
2 and in this case the end is a better Glacier Park for
3 everybody.

4 And so even though we may have very
5 different ideas about how to reach that end, I think
6 that we found that we're going to work very well
7 together, frankly a lot more civil with each other than
8 I thought we might be. And I think that's great.
9 There is opportunity for good natured ribbing and
10 opportunities to get one's point across without
11 offending anybody. And I think that's going to be
12 tantamount to these deliberations. So I'm very proud
13 to be part of this and look forward to the next meeting
14 already.

15 MS. MOE: I want to say that it's been
16 great getting to know all of you, and even though I
17 missed a day. But we're going to try not to let that
18 happen again. I think that this was a great meeting
19 because it gave us all a foundation. And although we
20 have had a huge learning curve over the past couple
21 days, we've also worked where we have laid the
22 foundation now and we can hopefully build upon that and
23 the framework of the Committee on how we should move
24 forward.

25 And I also think that this is a very

1 important issue, and I think that the participation of
2 all of our diverse areas of interest is going to play a
3 vital role in the face of this endeavor.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I, too, would like to echo
5 many of the comments of our Committee members. I was
6 very impressed with the preparation and the talent of
7 the staff, very impressed with the qualifications and
8 background of MK Centennial, and it really kind of
9 restores my faith in democracy to see the diverse
10 talents and skills of a number of people who were
11 willing to donate their time to be here and work on
12 this project. And I really do think that with the
13 skills of this Committee we're going to be able to
14 provide some very valuable input to the Park on this
15 very valuable and important endeavor.

16 This has also been a very humbling
17 experience for me from a couple of standpoints. First
18 of all, I know how much I have to learn about the Park
19 and the road and all of these issues. And I've learned
20 a lot these first three days and I know I'll continue
21 to learn as the process goes on.

22 And secondly, I realized that I was the
23 only person in this room who didn't have the sense to
24 start lining up behind someone else to be the chairman
25 of this Committee. And everyone else is probably just

1 smarter than I was, so I'll be watching you guys more
2 closely. Thank you.

3 MR. SHIREMAN: Thank each and every one of
4 you for your comments and also your participation in
5 the last three days. I'd also like to give the three
6 project managers representing the Park Service, MK
7 Centennial and Federal Highways a chance to say a few
8 last words if they would like to, and that would be
9 Dick Bauman, Fred Babb and Dick Gatten. Would any of
10 you care to make any closing comments?

11 MR. BAUMAN: Over the years I've worked
12 with a lot of public groups and committees, and I'll
13 have to admit that I was sweating it on Monday because
14 I guess I was like Will, wondering how 17 people were
15 going to get together and actually come up with some
16 things that could contribute to the work.

17 And I think we've had incredible success
18 this week, and it's all based on you. You've already
19 established a working relationship and respect with
20 each other and you all represent different views but
21 you've put them out very well and you have the patience
22 to debate your issues. We can do a tremendous job for
23 you with your leadership. Thanks.

24 MR. BABB: When I came I didn't know, as
25 some of the other folks, what it would be like, and I

1 guess I just can't believe it. It's really great, and
2 I'm looking forward to the future and I think we have a
3 great challenge.

4 And fun is really important in my
5 vocabulary and I would like to add that I think we're
6 going to have a lot of fun doing our tasks. And I
7 think we have quite a challenge ahead of us. And I
8 guess I'm just really pleased with how everything came
9 out with the future. And thank you for dedicating all
10 your time these three days. I really appreciate that,
11 also.

12 MR. GATTEN: I'll repeat what Fred said. I
13 think that it's a tremendous challenge. I look forward
14 to it. I look forward to representing Federal Highway
15 as technical support to the panel and to reviewing
16 engineering information that's produced by MK, and I
17 look forward to working with you.

18 MR. SHIREMAN: There are some folks that we
19 need to thank and certainly all of the members of MK
20 Centennial and staff that have provided us with
21 excellent assistance and coordination and facilitation.
22 And particularly Craig in your skills in facilitating a
23 large portion of the meeting over the last few days.
24 Thank you very much for that.

25 I'd also like to recognize Mary Ansotequi,

1 Debbie Harvol and Dayna Hudson for their technical and
2 administrative support throughout this meeting and also
3 the time that they spent in pulling things together.
4 Thank you very much. It was great.

5 As Paul alluded, you probably won't see me
6 again, at least in your official meetings, but you need
7 to know that I will be in the background watching and
8 anticipating the outcome of your deliberations and your
9 process in providing what I perceive to be the high
10 quality of advice that you've already begun to provide
11 to the National Park Service and the rehabilitation of
12 one of our most important and historic roadways in the
13 system.

14 Early in the week you heard from Suzanne,
15 from Karen Wade and from myself about how important the
16 relationship is that the National Park Service has in
17 working with the public in protecting and preserving
18 those resources that are held in trust for further
19 generations, and the organic inscriptions on the wall,
20 and those words conserve and preserve the national and
21 historic objects and the wildlife therein to provide to
22 enjoyment of the same in such ways that will leave them
23 unimpaired for the joy of the future generation.

24 Those are not just words on the wall, but I
25 think we can all recognize that they are words in our

1 hearts. And as you continue your process I hope that
2 you keep those words very close to the process you use
3 to help us in the rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun.

4 With that, I hope that all of you have a
5 safe journey back. Thank you for all of your hard
6 work, your labor and your attention. I expect great
7 things out of this group.

8 And with that, I would like to declare the
9 meeting of the Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee
10 adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
12 5:05 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

