

**KICKOFF MEETING MINUTES – FINAL
PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK – AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN (ATMP)**

Date: April 22, 2010, Time 8:30 AM – 2:15 PM PT

Location: Painted Desert Visitor Center, Petrified Forest National Park, AZ

Attendees:

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
 - Program Manager, Special Programs Staff: Keith Lusk
 - Flight Standards, 135 Flight Operations Branch: Joe Foresto

- National Park Service (NPS)
 - Project Manager, Natural Sounds Program (NSP): Lelaina Marin
 - Regional Soundscape Coordinator, Intermountain Region: Theresa Ely
 - Superintendent, Petrified Forest National Park: Cliff Spencer
 - Chief of Resource Management, Petrified Forest National Park: Patricia (Pat) Thompson
 - Chief Ranger, Petrified Forest National Park: Greg Caffey

- Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (Volpe)
 - ATMP Project Manager: Jennifer Papazian
 - Acoustics Engineer: Cynthia Lee

- Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)
 - Project Delivery Manager: Scott Polzin
 - Project Manager: Rhonda Boyer

A copy of the meeting attendance sign-in sheet, which includes contact information for the attendees, can be found in Attachment A.

Agenda:

8:30-8:40 Welcome and Introduction
(*Keith Lusk, Lelaina Marin, and Cliff Spencer*)

- Meeting goals and objectives

PROGRAMMATIC DISCUSSIONS

8:40-9:00 ATMP Team identification and roles and responsibilities
(*FAA and NPS*)

- FAA (Western-Pacific Region, Flight Standards, Air Traffic, Legal)
- NPS (NSP Regional Office, Petrified Forest National Park staff)
- Volpe
- PB

9:00-9:10 ATMP public video (9 minutes)

- 9:10-10:40 Briefing of ATMP/NEPA process
(*Keith Lusk and Lelaina Marin*)
- Review of the National Parks Air Tour Management Act of 2000
 - ATMP/NEPA development process
 - Scope of ATMP program
 - Current activities
 - New park starts
 - Planning and environmental analysis
 - Preliminary alternatives discussion
 - Scoping process (with input from NPS)
 - Alternatives development process
 - Section 106 and tribal matters (with input from NPS)
 - Rulemaking
 - Schedule
- 10:40-10:55 *Break*
- 10:55-12:00 General introduction to Petrified Forest National Park
(*Patricia Thompson*)
- 12:00-1:00 *Lunch*
- 1:00-1:25 Acoustics discussion – Baseline ambient data
(*Cynthia Lee*)
- Baseline Ambient Data
 - Acoustic Zones
 - Site Selection Considerations
 - Data Collected
 - Data Analysis
 - Results
 - Computer Modeling
 - Ambient Mapping
 - Types of Output
- 1:25-1:55 Air tour operations at Petrified Forest National Park
(*Joe Foresto*)
- Current operators
 - Number of existing air tour operations
 - Other air tour operational information
- 1:55-2:10 *Break*
- 2:10-3:25 Acoustics discussion – Computer modeling
(*Cynthia Lee*)
- 3:25-3:45 Preliminary alternatives discussion
(*NPS and FAA*)
- 3:45-4:00 Closing discussion/adjourn
(*Keith Lusk, Lelaina Marin, and Cliff Spencer*)

Minutes:

8:15-8:30 Petrified Forest National Park film

1. Attendees viewed the Petrified Forest National Park visitor's orientation film in the visitor center.

8:30-8:50 Welcome and introduction (Keith Lusk, Lelaina Marin, and Pat Thompson)

1. General remarks and welcome from Pat Thompson.
2. Attendees introduced themselves and gave a brief description of their roles and responsibilities.
3. The agenda was rearranged to accommodate Pat Thompson's presentation of the overview of the Park first since Cliff Spencer would not be available until 10:00 am, due to other matters.

8:50-9:45 Slide presentation of Park resources (Pat Thompson)

1. Historical background
 - 1.1 The Petrified Forest was first visited by tourists heading west on the railroad.
 - 1.2 A hotel for passengers was located in Adamana where the railroad crosses through the Park.
 - 1.3 Many tourists explored the area and collected the petrified wood as souvenirs.
 - 1.4 Petrified wood was also collected to make sandpaper.
 - 1.5 In 1906, the American Antiquities Act was enacted and 60,776 acres were set aside for Petrified Forest National Monument for protection of petrified wood.
2. Paleontology was the primary reason Petrified Forest National Park was created.
 - 2.1 Approximately 220 million years ago the area was a large tropical forest. It was also the age of dinosaurs/reptiles.
 - 2.2 The Petrified Forest captured this ecosystem in time in various layers and strata.
 - 2.3 The Petrified Forest has preserved big trees, reptiles, also clams, fish, sharks, etc. It is the best place in world to study this ancient ecosystem.
3. Today the Petrified Forest is a lush grassland.
 - 3.1 It was fenced 65 years ago, and the grasslands are now recovering from overgrazing.
4. There are approximately 340 species within the Park, which is some of the most diverse in the Colorado Plateau.
 - 4.1 There are 10 species of snakes.
 - 4.2 Birds include ravens, hawks, eagles, etc.
 - 4.3 The keystone species are the Pronghorn Sheep and the prairie dog.
 - 4.4 The Pronghorn is listed as an Arizona State species of concern and the prairie dog is a state-listed species.
 - 4.5 The 4-corner states have completed a prairie dog management plan to ensure their survival.
 - 4.6 Pronghorn sheep are a game species in Arizona; however, there is no hunting permitted in the Park.
5. The region has some of the best air quality in the U.S. and the Park is a Class 1 airshed. Air quality is monitored throughout the Park.
6. Night skies are unique. The Navajo reservation is also dark. While camping in the Wilderness Area visitors can see no light from other places.
7. Impact from humans has been going on for at least 10,000 years.
 - 7.1 There are 750 known archeological sites.
 - 7.2 Only half park has been surveyed.
 - 7.3 There are structures, buildings, pottery, etc.
 - 7.4 The Puerco Pueblo site is 7,000-8,000 years old.

8. The Park was an important crossroads for plants, animals and people.
 - 8.1 It was a natural transportation corridor.
 - 8.2 Pottery from all over has been found, indicating a trading route.
 - 8.3 The people that occupied the area were highly evolved and skilled and made use of resources.
 - 8.4 Numerous solar markers can be found in the Park. One such marker is known as the “Dagger of Light” that marks shortest and longest day of year.
9. One of the biggest challenges facing the Park is the boundary expansion.
 - 9.1 The expansion will more than double the size of the Park.
 - 9.2 The eastern side of the expansion area contains more Chinle fossils.
 - 9.3 The western side of the expansion area contains more cultural resources.
 - 9.4 The Park received 14,000 acres from the Bureau of Land management (BLM).
 - 9.5 The 14,000 acres are still being inventoried; there are many unknowns.
 - 9.6 Congress did not authorize funding. It will most likely take 10-20 years to acquire the rest of the authorized land.
 - 9.7 The Park recently received Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) to purchase lands from willing sellers; there will be no condemnation.
 - 9.8 Some of the land to be acquired is private and some is state-owned.
 - 9.9 There are limitations on getting state land. Arizona state legislation requires the highest value for the land. Also, state trust land sale funds go to public schools.
10. Review of the Park organizational chart
 - 10.1 Superintendent – Cliff Spencer – responsible for everything
 - 10.2 Admin Assistant – R. Fischer
 - 10.3 Management Assistant – vacant
 - 10.4 IT – Y. Lincoln
 - 10.5 Budget Officer – M. Richards
 - 10.6 Admin Technician – vacant
 - 10.7 Admin Support Asst. – vacant
 - 10.8 Chief Ranger – Greg Forest – Enforcement Ranger too
 - 10.9 Chief of Interpretation – vacant – give tours, programs, brochures – kind of communications
 - 10.10 Chief of Resources – Pat Thompson – archeologist, biologist
 - 10.11 Chief of Maintenance – vacant – custodial responsibilities, trails, etc.
11. **Q:** Could you please clarify how many acres of new land has been acquired? (*Rhonda Boyer*) **A:** 14,000 acres of BLM land (*Pat Thompson*); **A:** A total of about 17,000 acres has been acquired (*Greg Caffey*).
12. **Q:** Do you have all the BLM land? (*Scott Polzin*) **Q:** Can we get clarification of where the BLM land is located? (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** Yes, all the BLM land has been acquired. Pat pointed to a dark green area representing BLM land that has been transferred to the Park. (*Pat Thompson*)
13. **Q:** When do you expect a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Boundary Expansion General Management Plan (GMP)? (*Scott Polzin*) **A:** The public comment period just closed and the Park anticipates finishing the final document by September or at least the fall 2010. This will give the Park three GMPs – 1993, 2004, and this one. The Park will then prepare a compilation of all GMPs that will take a year. The combined document will be number four. The GMP process has not had much interest from the public because the Park is not the most controversial park in the region. The last public meeting had about 25 people attend. Most public meetings only have 3-4 people. Citizens of Holbrook not actively involved. Some people came from Show Low, which is 75 miles away. (*Pat Thompson*)
14. **Q:** Where did you hold the public meetings? (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** The Holiday Inn in Holbrook. One was held at a City building in Holbrook and at the Community Meeting facility. They have also been held at the Park. The Park placed ads in Flagstaff, Lakeside, Show Low, and Holbrook papers. (*Pat Thompson*)

15. **Q:** Did you hold multiple scoping meetings? (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** Yes, multiple meetings were held. Letters were also sent out. The Park has a large and current mailing list. The Park really tried to encourage people to come, but typically there is only a small group of people who attend. The Park has found that people really want newsletters. The Tribes (Hopi, Zuni, and Navajo) were informed by letters, phone calls, and discussions. (*Pat Thompson*)
16. ATMP project will talk to tribes regardless because their lands abut park or are required as part of tribal consultation requirements. (*Keith Lusk*)
17. Hopi and Zuni are really interested in being included in discussions. (*Pat Thompson*)
18. **Q:** What are your visitation numbers? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** Approximately a half million visitors a year. Prime tourist season is June, July, and August. (*Greg Caffey*) **A:** There is a bump in visitors around Thanksgiving and college football bowl games. (*Pat Thompson*)
19. **Q:** Will all parks need an ATMP? (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** Only those that have air tours or operators that have applied, which is currently 85 parks. (*Theresa Ely*)

9:45-10:00 Break

10:00-10:15 ATMP public video

1. FAA prepared the video with Volpe assistance. (*Keith Lusk*)
2. The FAA website link provided in the video is outdated. (*Keith Lusk*)
3. The NPS Natural Sound Program site will direct visitors to the FAA site. (*Lelaina Marin*)
4. Watched video

10:15-10:20 Cliff Spencer arrived and attendees re-introduced themselves for his benefit

10:20-10:35 Briefing of ATMP/NEPA process (Keith Lusk and Lelaina Marin)

1. Review of National Park Air Tour Management Act (NPATMA) of 2000
 - 1.1 The main objective of NPATMA is to develop a plan to mitigate impacts from air tour operations. The plans are developed for parks that have air tours or for parks where operators have applied for air tours.
 - 1.2 FAA is lead agency and NPS is cooperating agency. Both agencies will sign the environmental decision document.
 - 1.3 NPATMA applies to commercial air tour operations below 5,000 feet above ground level (AGL); for flights inside a park and ½-mile outside of parks; and over tribal lands within or abutting a park.
 - 1.4 The Navajo Nation will be invited to be a cooperating agency.
 - 1.5 The FAA typically prepares a FONSI/ROD document, if appropriate.
 - 1.6 Interim operating authority (IOA) was granted to “grandfathered” operators (those that conducted tours prior to enactment of NPATMA).
 - 1.7 **Q:** Do any other parks have similar levels of air tour operations as the Petrified Forest? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** Yes – Death Valley and Mount Rainier are similar to Petrified Forest. About ½ of the other parks with air tour operations have below 50 operations. (*Keith Lusk*)
2. Brief overview of other parks currently working on ATMPs (*Lelaina Marin*)
3. Brief discussion of the federal action for an ATMP (*Keith Lusk*)
 - 3.1 Establishment of ATMP at the Park will be in accordance with 14 CFR 136
 - 3.2 Approval of FAA operating specifications authorizing air tour operations in the ATMP
4. **Q:** Will we need to accommodate growth? (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** Growth can be considered during alternatives development. (*Keith Lusk*)

5. **Q:** What is the lifespan of ATMP? Maybe 10 years? *(Pat Thompson)* **A:** We would see if anything changes; however, there are no specific requirements regarding an ATMP shelf life of say 5 or 10 years. *(Keith Lusk)*
6. **Q:** Will FAA continue with the process or is FAA done once an ATMP is complete? *(Pat Thompson)* **A:** Local FAA will continue to coordinate with NPS if issues come up. There most likely will be reporting requirements as part of the ATMP. *(Keith Lusk)* **A:** There will also be acoustical monitoring of air tours to determine if any noise impacts from air tour flights are occurring after the ATMP is approved. *(Lelaina Marin)*
7. **Q:** Will the onus fall upon the Park to report any impacts? *(Pat Thompson)* **A:** Yes, but you will be able to communicate your concerns to the local FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO). *(Lelaina Marin)*.
A: The process for reporting impacts is still being developed. *(Theresa Ely)*
8. **Q:** The approach to alternative development will vary depending on how long the ATMP is expected to last. For instance, there is a difference in planning for 5 versus 10 years. *(Pat Thompson)* **A:** As an example, a 10 or 15 year planning horizon is being used on the Grand Canyon Overflights EIS (which is being prepared under separate legislation and is not an ATMP park). *(Keith Lusk)*
9. ATMP/NEPA process
 - 9.1 This document is anticipated to be an EA. *(Lelaina Marin)*. This is a lengthy process. Kick off meeting will get juices flowing to structure and develop alternatives. Later an alternative development meeting will occur. Scoping will occur before alternatives development. *(Keith Lusk)*
 - 9.2 Scoping process. *(Lelaina Marin)*
 - 9.2.1 Discussed the option of not holding a public scoping meeting. At least one public meeting is required by NPATMA – usually after draft NEPA document is released to the public.
 - 9.2.2 Agency and Tribal scoping
 - 9.2.2.1 Letters will go out to all agencies. The Park will decide whether or not to hold separate agency meetings. Tribes will be invited to be cooperating agencies, if they have lands in or abutting the park. A separate tribal meeting as well is an option.
 - 9.2.2.2 Yes, it is a good idea to hold separate tribal meetings. Hold two meetings, one for the Hopi and Zuni and one for the Navajo. *(Pat Thompson)*
 - 9.2.2.3 **Q:** You mentioned other tribal affiliations. *(Keith Lusk)* **A:** Yes, maybe another 10-12 tribal affiliations. Good chance to inform and invite them but the Pueblos probably will not come. *(Pat Thompson)* Pueblos feel that Hopi/Zuni can represent their interest. *(Theresa Ely)*
 - 9.2.2.4 When communicating with the Tribes it is best to take a “multiple” approach and send any correspondence to three or four different members so everyone is covered.
 - 9.3 Will need a list of stakeholders from the Park. *(Lelaina Marin)*
 - 9.4 The Park has a freshly updated contact list from the GMP process. *(Cliff Spencer)*

10:35-11:00 Preliminary alternatives development (Keith Lusk and Lelaina Marin)

1. Brief overview of potential alternatives and other ATMP elements *(Keith Lusk)*
 - 1.1 An ATMP may prohibit air tour operations in whole or in part
 - 1.2 It may establish different conditions for the air tour operations
 - 1.3 The ATMP applies to all commercial air tour operations within ½-mile outside the boundary of a national park
 - 1.4 It should consider quiet aircraft technology incentives
 - 1.5 It will provide for the allocation of opportunities when the ATMP limits the number of operations
 - 1.6 The ATMP shall justify and document the need for measures in the record of decision
 - 1.6.1 Alternatives Development Process

- 1.6.2 We will need to identify information needs – existing documents, etc. We will also need resource mapping – sensitive areas, avoidance areas. Providing GIS data is good too. *(Lelaina Marin)*
- 1.6.3 NPS Region has all the current GIS layers, including those used in the GMP. *(Pat Thompson)*
- 1.6.4 Scoping will help identify initial alternatives. A scoping comments summary will be prepared. *(Lelaina Marin)*
- 1.6.5 Alternatives development will be an interdisciplinary, inter-agency process. *(Lelaina Marin)*
- 1.6.6 Tribal coordination is a programmatic approach; a government to government coordination. FAA will work with the Park on the tribal coordination effort. *(Keith Lusk)*
- 1.6.7 Jay (Jason Theuer, NPS Archeologist) handles most tribal coordination, but FAA should send requests to Pat. Pat will furnish tribal contact information. Coordination letters will be sent to the Chairman and Tribal Historic Preservation Office. There should be multiple notifications. *(Pat Thompson)*

11:00-11:10 Review of milestones schedules (Jennifer Papazian)

- 1. There has been a previous kick-off meeting in 2004. *(Theresa Ely)*
- 2. Milestones *(Jennifer Papazian)*
 - 2.1 Reviewed milestones handout
 - 2.2 Scoping in May-July 2010
 - 2.3 Alternatives Development Meeting August-September 2010
 - 2.4 Preliminary Draft EA out for comments May-June 2011
 - 2.5 Draft EA out for public review July-September 2011
- 3. Do not see a need to do a public scoping meeting at the start of the process. Instead, seek public input after the alternatives have been developed but prior to finalizing them. *(Pat Thompson)*
- 4. Public scoping period sometime between May and July. A better time is May or June 2010. Scoping could be accomplished by correspondence. *(Cliff Spencer)*
- 5. After alternatives are developed then have a public meeting. This will provide the most “bang for the buck”. *(Pat Thompson)*
- 6. This is how it was done for the GMP process; no meeting at draft NEPA document stage. *(Cliff Spencer)*
- 7. We could do a newsletter or something. *(Lelaina Marin)*
- 8. Provided an explanation of what scoping would entail, including letters, etc. *(Lelaina Marin)*
- 9. Lelaina Marin will handle the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) site and posting documents. Cliff agreed this would be helpful.
- 10. Alternatives development meeting would be needed in August or September. *(Keith Lusk)*
- 11. Holding the alternatives development meeting in September would be better than in August but could accommodate both months. *(Cliff Spencer)*

11:10-11:25 Break

11:25-11:30 Conference call discussion

- 1. Theresa Ely proposed that the team hold a monthly phone conference call to update all parties on project status.
- 2. Discussion ensued and it was decided the conference call will occur the fourth Tuesday of each month – 9:30–10:00 am Arizona time.
- 3. First call to be May 25, 2010.

11:30-11:45 Acoustics discussions (Cynthia Lee)

1. Acoustic Support (Baseline Ambient Data)
 - 1.1 Preliminary Acoustic Zones – land cover, topography, elevation, and climate. At the Park there is shrubland, grassland, and bare rock/sand/clay.
 - 1.2 Site selection considerations include: acoustic zones, park management zones, air tour routes, noise sensitive areas, access, and security. The Park management zones include mostly front country and backcountry.
 - 1.3 Noise monitoring was conducted in summer 2004 and winter 2010.
 - 1.4 Data collected
 - 1.4.1 24 hours, 25-30 days per season
 - 1.4.2 Short-term observer logging at each site to document sound heard
 - 1.4.3 Majority of Park noise is natural but there was some jet noise
 - 1.4.4 At Agate Bridge there was more human and road/train noise recorded
 - 1.5 Analysis
 - 1.5.1 Metrics and descriptors computed
 - 1.5.2 The natural ambient is typically used by NPS as baseline ambient condition; the FAA typically uses the existing ambient without the sound source of interest (i.e., air tours)
 - 1.5.3 Examples of ambient data results at several locations throughout the Park were presented
 - 1.5.4 **Q:** There appears to be trends in frontcountry and backcountry that are unique to the Petrified Forest. *(Theresa Ely)* **A:** Yes. *(Cynthia Lee)*
 - 1.6 Train modeling was also conducted for existing ambient.
 - 1.7 NPS should consider natural ambient according to its management policies. *(Lelaina Marin)*

11:45-12:10 Air tour operations at Petrified Forest National Park (Joe Foresto)

1. Current Operations
 - 1.1 As of this date, no new air tour operators have been granted approval to fly at Petrified Forest. *(Keith Lusk)*
 - 1.2 The local park staff would prefer not to make the decision to allow new entrants before the ATMP is complete; would rather that decision go to a higher level (i.e. Director). *(Theresa Ely)*
 - 1.3 NPS is trying to get some guidance. Usually, air tour operators contact the park first. The Park should contact Lelaina Marin if calls from operators are received. *(Lelaina Marin)*
2. Joe Foresto showed Cliff and Pat an example FAA authorization.
3. Number of existing air tour operations
 - 3.1 Two operators fly over the Park: Southwest (SW) Safaris and Air Grand Canyon Inc.
 - 3.2 Bruce Adams owns SW Safaris
 - 3.3 Air Grand Canyon Inc. has a certificate for six aircraft but is currently flying only one; however, it is not interested in flying over the Park at this time.
4. Other air tour operational information
 - 4.1 Flying fixed wing aircraft; no helicopters.
 - 4.2 Heading in from the N/NE and existing to the W/SW is the primary route on the way to the Grand Canyon or other sites.
 - 4.3 **Q:** Do operators have altitude discretion? *(Greg Caffey)* **A:** They can fly wherever they want. *(Joe Foresto)*.
 - 4.4 **Q:** Do these certificates specify aircraft. *(Greg Caffey)* **A:** Yes, the certificate states the type of aircraft. *(Joe Foresto)*
 - 4.5 Three flight routes filed by SW Safaris were presented. There is no reverse traffic.

- 4.6 The FAA risk assessment tool was explained briefly. It was noted that one pilot landed on a road nearby a number of years ago.
- 4.7 Discussion continued regarding military aircraft. Greg Caffey stated that there are many military flights over the Park and that they fly pretty low.
- 4.8 Theresa Ely replied that NPS meets with military to discuss flights. Theresa Ely will send both Pat Thompson and Greg Caffey a form to report military activity.

12:10-1:00 Lunch

1:00-1:15 Acoustics discussion – computer modeling (Cynthia Lee)

- 1 Two primary types of output: sound levels or time base activities. Can compare different flight tracks.
- 2 Audibility – minutes of time audible. Show how modifying a flight route can change noise contours. Also, the model can show how altitudes affect impacts. Modeling can show noise impacts of various aircraft.
- 3 Tabular output – can model sensitive areas or areas you need to know exact noise levels.
- 4 Interactive screening – aircraft can be modeled on each route and results can be produced at various locations.
- 5 You can change the metrics used. Need to determine what metrics the Park would like to use. (*Lelaina Marin*)
- 6 **Q:** Are you including this [iterative spreadsheet table] in the FEA/FEISs? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** It would be a part of the appendix. This is a quick screening tool. (*Keith Lusk*)
- 7 **Q:** Do you have any threatened and endangered (T&E) species? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** No, we have species of concern. (*Pat Thompson*)
- 8 T&E areas could be one of the locations you may want to model. (*Theresa Ely*) We don't know about expanded boundary area. (*Pat Thompson*)
- 9 **Q:** In the tables you can change the number of flights and determine what hours the flights are happening correct? (*Lelaina Marin*) **A:** Yes, you can estimate operations. The table shows what the noise data results would be at certain points of interest. (*Cynthia Lee*)
- 10 Will need to get with the Park staff to determine what areas should be modeled. (*Keith Lusk*)
- 11 **Q:** How many points do parks typically have? (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** About 20. (*Cynthia Lee*)
- 12 **Q:** Would we need verification from Bruce Adams on his routes? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** Joe has gotten most recent data. (*Keith Lusk*)
- 13 To follow the current footprint (route) would be the way to go. (*Joe Foresto*)
- 14 Existing routes 1 and 2 are not easily accessible to rescue crews on the ground. (*Pat Thompson*)
- 15 Prescribed routes could be taken into consideration. FAA would establish an acceptable level of risk. (*Joe Foresto*)
- 16 **Q:** Does this eliminate routes? (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** No, everything else is outside of the terms of their certificates. (*Joe Foresto*)
- 17 **Q:** For the sake of being inclusive, we have done our baseline sound monitoring, do we need to consider a few more sites? Do we model according to the expansion area? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** We would perform modeling in the expansion area. The NEPA document would include modeling of proposed expansion area. (*Cynthia Lee*) The ATMP would only have jurisdiction over park boundaries in place at the time the ATMP is prepared. (*Keith Lusk*)
- 18 Land cover is similar in the expansion area and the data will be expanded to these areas. (*Cynthia Lee*)
- 19 **Q:** Modeling considers land cover? **A:** Yes, we did consider land cover. (*Cynthia Lee*)
- 20 Is there wilderness in the northern area? (*Lelaina Marin*) **A:** Yes. (*Greg Caffey*).
- 21 Pat showed a map of existing designated wilderness and where all the camping takes place. Not a lot of backcountry camping. Impacts to wilderness areas very light.
- 22 **Q:** Can you send PDF of this map? (*Joe Foresto*) **A:** Yes. (*Pat Thompson*)

- 23 Pat stated that there are no campgrounds and no trails in the wilderness except the short trail from the Painted Desert Inn. The Park is very pristine. If someone wants to go camping, the Park usually directs campers to the northern portion of the Park – it is a bigger area and away from archeological sites in the south.
- 24 **Q:** The Park is supposed to use natural sounds, are roadways and trains not considered? (*Greg Caffey*) **A:** They are factored in the existing ambient without air tours but NPS uses the natural ambient that does not consider existing human-made noise. (*Lelaina Marin*)
- 25 Human sounds are considered as well. (*Keith Lusk*)

1:15-2:00 Preliminary alternatives discussion continued

1. At the Mount Rushmore alternatives development meeting there was consideration given to where there was already noise in park. (*Jennifer Papazian*)
2. **Q:** Are there 42 flights per day that fly over the Park? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** There are 44 flights annually. They would not all be flown in one day. (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** He could operate with close to one and half to two hour turnaround times between flights; however, the decision will be up to the Park as to how many flyovers to allow. (*Joe Foresto*)
3. Cyndy will model peak month average day. (*Keith Lusk*) That is based on using park visitation as a proxy for peak air tour season. (*Cynthia Lee*)
4. Air tour flights are close circuit. FSDO and the Park should get to know one another to help determine flights. (*Joe Foresto*)
5. **Q:** Are there any areas where you would not like to see air tours. (*Lelaina Marin*) **A:** Newspaper Rock? Ambient noise includes trains. Cultural resources are scattered everywhere. (*Pat Thompson*)
6. The North Unit Wilderness Area is the area where visitors are seeking the greatest solitude. (*Pat Thompson*)
7. **Q:** Any concerns to Pronghorn? (*Lelaina Marin*) **A:** No, not concerning aircraft. Trains impact them more. (*Pat Thompson*)
8. **Q:** Any concerns about cultural ceremonies? (*Jennifer Papazian*) **A:** None specific. Most important ceremonies are not held here. (*Pat Thompson*)
9. **Q:** Have you gotten any complaints about aircraft? (*Lelaina Marin*) **A:** Not from tourists, but from the Park staff. (*Gregg Caffey*)
10. **Q:** In the GMP do you have developed and non-developed areas? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** Yes, but not for the expansion area. (*Pat Thompson*)
11. Cliff explained that the Park has completed three different GMPs. The Park will eventually prepare a compilation document.
12. **Q:** Does an ATMP prescribe minimum altitudes? (*Cliff Spencer*) **A:** Yes, it can be one of the components. (*Keith Lusk*)
13. **Q:** Do you see any problems with existing route 3 (furthest S/SW route)? (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** That may be the best place for a route. (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** All three routes seem alright. (*Cliff Spencer*)
14. If an air tour crashed while flying existing routes 1 and 2 it would take considerable time to get to the site. (*Pat Thompson*)
15. You could use different scenarios than the three existing routes shown today. (*Keith Lusk*)
16. Operators can have different flight routes. Existing route 3 allows operators to highlight everything visitors would want to see within the Park. (*Joe Foresto*)
17. **Q:** Are there any completed plans? (*Pat Thompson*) **A:** No; Mount Rushmore could be coming out soon. The Mount Rushmore AMTP/EA has proposed the existing routes that they have been flying but at various operation levels. Hawaii parks are still in alternatives development. There are a variety of ways to come up with alternatives. (*Keith Lusk*)
18. At Death Valley they consolidated the existing routes to follow roads to minimize impacts to surrounding Wilderness Area. (*Lelaina Marin*)

19. **Q:** Do you have to designate where you enter and exit the Park? (*Cliff Spencer*) **A:** Yes. There is a little leeway but it is up to Park. (*Keith Lusk*)
20. How the expansion area will be addressed in the ATMP is something that must be decided. Also, how will we address T&E diversity areas in the expansion areas? (*Lelaina Marin*)
21. **Q:** Are expansion areas better from tourist perspective? (*Keith Lusk*) **A:** Not really, they are escarpment and grasslands but no Painted Desert. It is more like the middle of the Park. It is expected that the Park will acquire the land to the east first. (*Pat Thompson*)
22. **Q:** Will flights come from Holbrook? (*Theresa Ely*) **A:** Cannot say but they could come from other locations. (*Joe Foresto*)
23. The ATMP/EA should at least mention the expansion area but it will be at least 10 years before the Park has enough data to make a good decision regarding the expansion area to the east; need to address it but not worry about it. (*Pat Thompson*)

2:00-2:15 Closing discussions/adjourn (Keith Lusk, Lelaina Marin, and Cliff Spencer)

Actions items

1. Cliff Spencer will have someone email to Lelaina Marin the stakeholders list.
2. Park staff will start thinking about alternatives.
3. Park staff will start considering attraction points to use in the analysis.
4. Theresa Ely will see that the NPS Regional GIS department gets in touch with Jennifer Papazian.
5. Pat Thompson will distribute copies of the GMPs (hard copy and electronic versions). [This action item was completed immediately after the meeting.]
6. Theresa Ely will send both Pat Thompson and Greg Caffey a form to report military activity.
7. Theresa Ely will set up Lotus Notes listserve for internal FAA and NPS staff.
8. Team to consider first two weeks in September optimum for meeting on alternatives development.
9. Team to consider Park staff coming to Phoenix for next meeting.

Attachment A – Meeting Attendance Sign-In Sheet

Air Tour Management Plan (ATMP) Program

**KICKOFF MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET
PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK – AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN (ATMP)**

Date: April 22, 2010, Time 8:30 AM – 4:00 PM PT

Location: Painted Desert Visitor Center, Petrified Forest National Park, AZ

Name and Title	Agency	Phone #	E mail
1. Pat Thompson Chief of Resource Mgt	NPS	928-524-6228	Patricia_Thompson@nps.gov
2. GREG CAFFEY Chief Ranger - PEFD	NPS	928-524-6228 x226	greg_caffey@nps.gov
3. THERESA ELY PHYSICAL SCIENTIST IMR	NPS	303 969 2653	Theresa-ely@nps.gov
4. Lelaina Marin Outdoor Recreation Planner	NPS	970-225-3552	Lelaina_Marin@nps.gov
5. Cindy Lee Acoustics Engineer	VolpeCtr	617-494-6340	Cynthia.Lee@dot.gov
6. Scott Polzin Proj. Delivery Mgr.	PB	505-274-1579	polzin@ptworld.com
7. Rhonda Boyer Project Manager	PB	281-589-5863	boyer@pbworld.com
8. Jen Paparizio Project Manager	Volpe Ctr	617-494-3913	jenni.fc.paparizio@dot.gov
9. Joseph M Forest AFS-250 Air Tour Risk Assessment	FAA	718-553-3235	Joseph.Forest@faa.gov
10. KEITH LUSK FAA ATMP PROGRAM MANAGER	FAA	310-705-3808	Keith.Lusk@faa.gov
11. CLIFF SPENKER SUPERVISOR - PETRIFIED FOREST	NPS	928-524-6228X105	CLIFF.SPENKER@NPS.GOV
12.			

Petrified Forest National Park – ATMP Kickoff Meeting Attendance

April 22, 2010
Page 1