



# Dalton Highway State Scenic Byway Corridor Partnership Plan (CPP)

Meeting Transcript: Advisory Team Meeting #2

Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 12:30-3:30pm

BLM Offices, 1150 University Avenue, Fairbanks AK 99709

| Attendees:   | Via Teleconference:                                   |
|--|---|
| Burke Barrick— <i>Captain, Alaska State Troopers</i>               | Timothy Ahgook— <i>Naqragmiut Tribal Council</i>      |
| Brett Carlson— <i>Sukakpak, Inc.</i>                               | Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak— <i>Nuiqsut</i>                |
| Roger Delaney— <i>Bureau of Land Management</i>                    | Esther Hugo— <i>Naqragmiut Tribal Council</i>         |
| Charity Gadapee— <i>Fairbanks Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</i> | Justus Mekiana, Jr.— <i>Naqragmiut Tribal Council</i> |
| Alexa Greene— <i>AKDOT&amp;PF/Planning</i>                         | Bill Rodasky— <i>NMS/Arctic Caribou Inn</i>           |
| Ben Greene— <i>North Slope Borough, Planning Department</i>        | Thomas Rulland— <i>Naqragmiut Tribal Council</i>      |
| Mike Hertlein— <i>Private property owner</i>                       | Dave Sanches— <i>AK DOT&amp;PF/Planning</i>           |
| Lisa Jodwalis— <i>Bureau of Land Management</i>                    | Heidi Schoppenhorst— <i>Wiseman/Boreal Lodge</i>      |
| Roger Kaye— <i>USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge</i>          |   |
| Dorothy Shockley— <i>Legislative Aid for Senator Kookesh</i>       |   |
| <b>Facilitator:</b> Kathlene Rowell— <i>ADNR</i>                   |   |

## TRANSCRIPT

[**Dorothy Shockley** was unable to stay for the meeting due to emergency response for flooding in interior Alaska. Dorothy shared with the group that she believes the state does not have the resources to support increased travel on the Dalton Highway. She also mentioned that she appreciated the group's efforts.]

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Thank you. For those of you that are in the room I have the timeline up on the board and I believe I emailed this to everyone. We'll do our brief introductions. We'll talk for about an hour about the first draft. If it goes longer than that, that's ok.

Then I would like to speak about sections of the plan that have not been completed—the “Road and Transportation” section, the “Tourism Challenges and Opportunities” section, visitor experience, recreational qualities—the hunting issue that Ben Greene brought up in his comments. And if we have time, I would like to discuss how we would like to address making recommendations in the plan—there are a couple different ways we can go about that. And then just a brief comment about the Appendix. As we wrap up I would like to speak about the function of this group at the completion of the corridor partnership plan.

Thanks very much for coming. I know this is a busy season and thank you again for your input on the “Vision, Goals and Objectives” section. I think that round of comments went really well. I used the information I gained from the public process to put those “Vision, Goals and Objectives” sections together and of course the information that I got from you. With a few drafts having gone back and forth, I think we are at a pretty good spot with those right now, but we can keep working on it. It was my feeling, at maybe the third draft of that coming out, that we were going down the right track with those statements. So I think that's great.

There are a couple things that have come up with the first draft. I would like you to know that I have in no way disregarded the comments I received during the public process. I do want you to know that. I think that some folks were surprised by the content in the first draft. I did send out that outline in February. I think some reorganizing of what readers will come to first in the plan might help with some of that, so the first thing you are reading is not a description of the roadway. We'll put some of the other sections in the front and I have some ideas for that that I will share with you later.

I would like to talk briefly about the Federal Highways Interim Policy. If anyone here would like a copy, I have some here and will pass those around. Heidi brought this up in one of her emails this week and I just wanted to explain that briefly. Heidi is correct in saying that Corridor Partnership Plans must be complete for this National Scenic Byways status. And this policy, and my understanding of it, is written for committee members who are looking at applications for roadways that are applying for national designation. So it is kind of their guidelines for that. So yes, you will see that language in there that talks about the designation process.

There are a couple key things I would like to point out. Once you have completed the CPP in no way does that mean that your roadway has automatically been designated as a National Scenic Byway or an All-American Road. That is a completely separate application process. It is something that this group would have to go through, through the National Scenic Byways Program. I believe those applications are accepted every three to five years, and again it's a separate process. I don't want you to think that we're going around it; I know the language is in there and yes, the Corridor Partnership Plan is a necessary component for that designation process. However, you can complete the CPP and once it's complete, be eligible for the funding through the National Scenic Byways program without ever being a National Scenic Byway or All-American Road. And that's where this group can really benefit from those funding projects. I am not sure during this stage if we want to broach that NSB discussion now or not. I don't think that today is a good time, but I would like us to talk about that. This process in itself is not meant to be necessarily moving toward that.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Can I interject? I have a few questions I don't feel have been answered.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Sure

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Referring to us a State Scenic Byway, I was able to pull up the designation information online. It explains the process for applying for a State Scenic Byway and I am curious, I really haven't learned yet, who actually applied to have this designated as a State Scenic Byway and also part of that application requires community participation. Stated in there it says it is crucial to have support from important community organizations that are involved in or affected by the designation. List those organizations and when and how they are contacted. I was wondering if you could make that information available. I was never notified this was, I was never able to put any public comments in before the designation and was wondering what community members supported this designation to begin with.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I do not know the answer to that question, Heidi. I do know the road was designated as a State Scenic Byway in 1998. I do not know what the process was for that. Marcheta Moulton, who is the acting State Scenic Byways Coordinator—I believe I sent you her contact information.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

You did send me her contact information and I was really busy yesterday and was not able to contact her.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I was hoping she was calling in today. She wasn't able to come in person. But Heidi, I would ask you to direct that question to Marcheta. If that information is available, she should be able to get it for you. I don't know if the process was the same in 1998 for designating the State Scenic Byway as it is now and I am sorry that I don't have that information for you today.

Dave Sanches, can you add anything to that?

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning**

No, that was long before my time starting here. I agree that question should be directed to Marcheta as far as getting that information.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

The reason I am asking this question is because all the comments I have seen and my own feelings is there really is no support for this scenic byway of the Dalton Highway corridor. We are not, it doesn't sound like anyone who has commented is supportive of increased information out there about resources, or any marketing for tourism. Basically what I have read in the Federal Register you referred me to and on the state website is the purpose of a scenic byway mainly to provide for recreational opportunities and knowledge to the public of an area.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Heidi, I would like to interject. The purpose of scenic byways programs—and the national program may have a slightly different purpose than the state program—the state program is a little less involved. It is to acknowledge roads that have outstanding scenic qualities. Really the only marketing that is done for State Scenic byways—unless the local byway organization is doing it themselves—is through the State Scenic Byways website. There are those words to “promote and enhance” the qualities, but it is not to be at the risk of ruining those qualities that make it unique and distinctive. These roadways are designated as scenic byways because there is something special about them.

I wanted to say this in my introduction: the intended audience for the CPP is not the general public. It is not to be sold in gift shops and gift stores. The intended audience is really those people on state and federal committees who are evaluating your byway to receive grant funding. Or if you are going to the legislature asking them to consider a particular project that is supposed to be on the Dalton Highway to share this group's vision, goals and objectives for that. It is not meant to be a marketing and tourism document and I do understand that some of the language that is in the intrinsic qualities section and even in the route overview is somewhat promotional and there are some phrases in there that would be very easy to take out. I would be more than happy to do that. I understand that some of that language can be taken out.

However, since the folks that would be reading this document may never have visited Alaska, they may be completely unfamiliar with the roadway, this group would need to express to them what makes it important, what makes it unique. What is the traveler going to experience—whether I am a truck driver or on a tour group—as I go up there. You have to give them a feeling of what it is like. If they don't feel your passion in preserving those qualities, they probably won't feel inclined to help you with your projects.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I think Heidi brings up some very important points. For those of you on the phone, this is Ben Greene, I am with the North Slope Borough, and I think the points that Heidi is trying to articulate—and please Heidi interject if I mis-translate what I sense you are trying to say. Just by virtue of making it a scenic byways, regardless of what is stated in the scenic byways literature, or mission statement or anything else, just by virtue of having it as a scenic byways, you have dramatically changed some features of the corridor.

This is similar to the designation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers. If you look over the USGS topo maps of Alaska that some rivers are noted as National Wild and Scenic Rivers, which just that designation changes those areas and indeed those river receive much more visitor use pressure and concomitantly have the inevitable, even if it is very minor, but the wear and tear on habitat and the resources, increased fishing pressure, increased use, and similarly the Dalton highway, just by virtue of going through this process—I understand it has been named a State Scenic Byway for over 10 years and that was a process and I am very interested in the history of that for reasons similar to what Heidi has indicated.

Certainly the North Slope Borough at every opportunity have commented in opposition to anything that is going to increase use of the Dalton Highway, attract additional recreational hunters or just general use of those lands and at the beginning of this process, which was nine months ago or something like that, it was emphasized, I thought, to the group that this is sort of an exploratory venture, “we are looking at some options, we want to get interested stakeholders involved, but we haven’t made any decisions what will or won’t happen in terms of designating the highway. We are gathering public comments.” And you did the road show so to speak of community visits and several teleconference call-ins and meetings etc. And similar to what Heidi expressed I have not seen any comments in favor of moving ahead with the designation of it as a scenic byways.

The North Slope Borough has some very serious concerns about the Dalton Highway as it is right now, without changing it one iota and our concerns would just be ramped up to a much higher level of concern if we felt the state or any other entity was moving in a direction of promoting the Dalton Highway as an attractive destination for additional vehicles, additional traffic, because of the lack of emergency services, restrooms, lack of enforcement along the highway—whether wildlife or vehicular. I do think it’s appropriate to talk about where this process is likely headed and what we want.

As a stakeholder, the North Slope Borough feels as though we are asked to carry increased burdens of risk from the increased activities without receiving rewards for it. I would like to speak up by saying “wait a minute, do we really want to be doing this.” I think it is an absolute folly to continue in the direction of designating the Dalton highway, unless it was to involve—and there are some “unless-es”—unless it was an avenue to get greater Trooper coverage of the Dalton Highway, additional emergency services on the highway, search and rescue capabilities, fish and wildlife enforcement. Unless we were able to receive benefits to the highway that would address some of our current concerns—and these are concerns that have existed for twenty to thirty years—and reiteratively, every time we have had the opportunity to comment we have commented along the very same lines. We haven’t changed our tune at all. We have never seen a move by the state, state legislature, or any of the political powers that be to lend increased support to the Dalton, but they are very eager to want to advertise the Dalton as a great visitor destination and we are just saying “whoa, wait, stop.”

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I do hear what you are saying. The purpose of this process starting back in July was not to move toward a National Scenic Byway designation. It is to complete this planning document, which can include all of those concerns that you have just listed. I am not aware of many - I don’t know if the state, I would say, is going on a marketing campaign to try to get folks to go up the Dalton Highway. Maybe there is some things that are out there, but I can’t speak for that. I am state employee but I don’t necessary represent the Department of Natural Resources in this capacity. We were contracted by DOT to do the writing.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

I have a very different viewpoint on that. I have been managing the visitor center in Coldfoot for eight years. I have talked to thousands and thousands of visitors. I have never heard anybody, ever, say that they went up the Dalton because it was a State Scenic Byway. We have had several surveys done. Nobody has ever stated that that was their motivation. And I also do see this as a potential way for communities to get support for increased law enforcement, increased safety activities and operations in place. And I think that as Kathlene pointed out, the promotional aspect of the description can be taken out of there. The group over the winter has already come up with goals and objectives that say specifically that they want more support for law enforcement and safety. And I think that there is a process to go to the legislature and say “look, we would like to start a program to rent out CB radios for people traveling the highway” or whatever it is. I think this is a mechanism for getting funding for projects from little projects to big projects to promote law enforcement and safety on the highway, among other things.

I don't see it as a promotional tool for the public because the public is already getting bombarded with publicity about the Dalton from websites and blogs and newspaper articles. I started working with Dalton Highway information back when the road was first opened to the public. So I know that this is a concern that goes back for years and years. Especially when somebody did an article I think for *Sports and Field*, and I was working downtown at the public lands center back then—that one article generated a thousand requests for information. That wasn't the state promoting it. That was an individual who wrote a story in a magazine, in a national magazine. So I think that is where the publicity comes from. I don't think it's coming from a document like this.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I have a few more comments if Lisa is finished. I fully agree with what Ben was saying. As far as these meetings we have been having feel to me like what should have been the original public comment period prior to this being designated a State Scenic Byway. I think the local residents and stakeholders weren't aware of when this designation was going on and proper public comment wasn't solicited and as far as it generating more tourism, it will, it is another form of advertising and the funding that would be attained by this scenic byway designation would only be for infrastructure if, as you have stated before Kathlene, the funding that is generated is not for maintenance. What is needed more is for maintenance. Lisa sent out a supplemental, a few notes, facts on the Dalton, and was nice enough to put in costs of tons of trash and outhouse maintenance. These funds wouldn't even go for maintenance of increased visitor use.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

That's correct. The funds can't be used for maintenance or staffing a position. A lot of the benefits come from education projects, historic preservation, interpretation in the sense of Don Pendergrast and his comments mentioned that he thought audio tours and a driving booklet were some really good project ideas that would not have a physical footprint on the corridor. Heidi, you are correct, I do not believe the dollars can be used to maintain facilities, just to replace old ones or build new.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Exactly. So it seems to me that the designation of scenic byways is really unneeded. All it's really going to provide is more interpretation, bottom line.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Are you talking about the National Scenic Byways designation?

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I am talking about the State Scenic Byways designation. I would make a motion right now before we get too involved at ripping things apart to, I don't know if we can take a vote or something from concerned members on the team, to apply for de-designation of the Scenic Byway because it seems to me that nobody in the corridor, none of the stakeholders, really want it, don't really want to deal with it.

It's fine the way it is and the bottom line from everyone is we want to keep it the way it is as much as possible. This just adds more layers of bureaucracy, more or less. There is mention in there to keep it a certain way could mean zoning and all these things. We're not interested in that up here. None of the residents of Wiseman are for sure and the comments I have heard from other people are the same. I don't know what anyone else feels but I would make a motion to vote on putting in an application for de-designation of this state scenic byway.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

I would like to comment. I would like to second that motion. That wasn't my attitude when I started this process but looking at it carefully, I think it has, unlike a Wild and Scenic River designation, which gives protection to the resources it advertises, this does not. Over and over we see the term commercialized, marketing, and so on with both the scenic and the federal designation and I am afraid this first draft is a harbinger of things to come. The promotional language and I think it diminishes the value, the specialness, the uniqueness of the corridor. If you could get funding that was directed toward maintenance, hiring additional law enforcement that would be one thing, but as we went over earlier, that is not the funding opportunities are.

I see this largely to promote, secondly to seek state and federal funds. I work for the government and I think what you need is restraint not more government money going into this place for purposes that don't relate to protecting its intrinsic qualities or the interests of the people who live there.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Amen.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning**

What I am hearing is you guys want to de-designate the road even though with the designation there is some impetus to try and get the folks in Juneau to pony up more maintenance money by saying "hey look, there's people going up here and the increase in traffic means we need more money for maintenance on the roadways." Is that what I am hearing?

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

I don't think the designation relates to that. The road is going to be funded for reasons independent of whether it's a state or federal scenic byway.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

You have to remember this is a utility corridor. I mean this not some road that was [built] for people to view the arctic. This is a utility corridor. This road was put here to transport materials, supplies, and utilities from what I see and hear about aren't finished. It's real possible there could be a gas line going through and you know this is federally managed. The federal government—BLM, in cooperation with the National Park Service, USFWS—has been doing a pretty good job addressing the visitor needs as far as



interpretation to the road. As far as state maintenance of the road, that should be, in my opinion, first related to the utility that goes through here. It's a utility corridor.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

It is. It is a utility corridor and a state highway. Regardless of what happens in this group today there are other initiatives coming on. Dave may be able to speak more about the road improvement projects going on along the Dalton—probably a bit more paving in the years to come.

You can look at the scenic byways program in the way that you are speaking, as simply for promotion and marketing, or you can also look at it in a way that shows there is a group of citizens that really values the qualities that it has now—its naturalness, the undeveloped character—all the things this group has mentioned and many others have mentioned in the public comments—their desire to educate the public more about safety concerns and subsistence resources. You can look at it as a way that, along with this other development that is going to happen because it is a state road—the paving, replacing bridges, maybe straightening—Dave can talk more about projects—look at it as a way to say “ok, these things are going to happen. Here are some things that we would like to see: no new waysides at these points, etc. etc.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I would like to talk about the issue of money because it has come up at several points and it is often something we bounce back to, these federal funds that become available. I think when this process started nine months ago I did a little tinkering with numbers. There weren't any specific numbers allocated to what would be available if the Dalton became a National Scenic Byway. Nevertheless there were some total figures that were available in terms of what was the total amount of money that is allocated to the scenic byways program and I took that total number and there are X number of scenic byways in Alaska and I was rather underwhelmed in terms of how much money would become available and would likely be allocated to projects along the Dalton Highway. Perhaps my math can be faulted but the actual amount of funding, the number of highways for which that funding needs to be divvied up among, and considering the Dalton Highway would be just one more, it would be an additional scenic byway and granted it would probably receive more than its equal share of money for the first couple of years it was designated because it would be the new kid on the block, but I was rather unimpressed and I don't want the impression to be that there is a great amount of federal funds available. I am very much under the impression that it is a particularly nominal amount of money. And given the limitations on what the money can be spent on, it didn't seem like that large of a cherry to me.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I can speak maybe a little bit to that. The figure that I have been given is that annually the state would receive about \$600,000 towards grant funding through the National Scenic Byways program. I think there are 13 state scenic byways and any byway that has a CPP complete can apply for that funding. As an example, this last fiscal year there was only one scenic byway in the state that applied for a project. I think it was \$100,000. That leaves \$500,000 left to be applied for and what I have heard is that they are really interested in funding larger projects right now, or interested in accepting applications for those. So it's not divvied up evenly necessarily, it depends on—now if there were 15, there could be 100 applications in a single year, then it would be different. Not all projects are funded, it depends on whether or not the project is supported in the CPP, how well the application was put together, letters of support from the byway organizations for that project. So the numbers do vary, but the \$600,000 figure I believe is a good estimate for an annual amount that could be applied for.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Ok. Thank you.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Marcheta Moulton from DOT would be able to elaborate on that, maybe Dave as well.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

And the bottom line of that is that money put toward improvements to the road increases traffic. The paving that's gone on south of the Yukon and north of the Yukon has increased traffic to the Dalton Highway.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I believe through the National Scenic Byways program that money I don't believe can be used for paving, unless it was a major safety concern. But I don't know. I was just reading something about safety improvements and there is some lines in there like it couldn't have been a safety concern prior to it being designated—something like that. I don't know much about that. Typically they aren't used for paving.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Well if the overall vision for this group is more or less to keep it a wild place and keep it wilderness and not build more infrastructure and not increase interpretive signage and not promote the area, but just leave it as it is so it is sort of a special place for the visitors that do come up here like it because of what it is. It's unique in that aspect. If there is more money stuck into it regardless of how much for improving visitor facilities or improving the road it will increase visitation and I think I am happy with the number of visitors coming up the road, and I am seeing more every year. I don't think it needs any improvements or encouragement for visitors. I guess that's my point. It doesn't seem like anyone really wants to promote that. That's being done by the private sector. If anything we need to be going in the opposite direction.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

The first draft, I did mention that there were incomplete sections. And the sections that I completed first were some of the simpler and easier ones for me to do as far as my background research led me to be able to describe some of the scenic qualities, intrinsic qualities—the vision, goals and objectives of course we worked on together. The “Background on Byways” section we had. The “Road and Transportation” section will cover traffic volumes, safety concerns, and existing road conditions. The “Byway Visitation and Tourism” section would talk about what the existing traveler is like—not tourists—traveler, and then we can put in all the concerns we're hearing about today. It doesn't have to have a voice for increasing tourism.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Given the amount of concern that I felt among the stakeholder groups, and certainly the amount of concern the North Slope Borough has, I don't think that necessarily translates into let's throw this all away and abandon it, although it could, but I would like to actually, just to prove to the world that I am not categorically curmudgeon, I do think a CPP could be a valuable tool. I think it could be a tool the stakeholders would both embrace and benefit from. But I think the draft that's been circulated so far isn't it. What I am saying here is I think a CPP could be a vehicle to really, it could be a hard-hitting, no punches pulled document that outlines concerns with the Dalton Highway. It would present the arguments why as stakeholders we don't believe promoting additional recreational use of the highway is a good idea. It could articulate our desires for additional Trooper support, additional safety facilities, etc. I do think a CPP could be a valuable tool, but it certainly wouldn't be a glossy document that would read like a storybook or be that useful for visitors who want to know what is over the next hill scenically.



**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

I think the goals and objectives the group came up with pretty much hit those very points. I thought that was pretty well mapped out.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

The one thing I would like to throw out on that—there is a bunch of things I have written down here—but one of them I will tap in to what Lisa was saying. One thing we have to be careful from and understand, and I am kind of coming with the direction you are going [motioning to Ben Greene] is that this group coming up with a plan, a focus, a direction, for how they would like to see things go along the Dalton Highway will go a long way whenever BLM—remember there are BLM lands on both sides of the road for the most part, all the way up there, so really and truly we can come up with whatever we want to here. BLM will actually come up and say what is going to happen along those lands along the road. So my point is that this group can certainly help direct what BLM does when we do our plan, which was actually to be started this year but because of funding is not going to happen. But it's imminent. It's going to happen within the next two to five years. And you got to remember when we do the plan it's an EIS [Environmental Impact Statement] and it's national. Now we're going to hear from the national organizations, it's public lands, ok, it's not just the locals and it will be everybody and those big groups come in and we listen to that. So this group I think can have a lot of say in help crafting what happens along the road.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

Roger, can you just back up a second and explain. You are talking about the Utility Corridor Management Plan.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

The Utility Corridor Management Plan—it's the main plan for all BLM lands north of the Yukon River and along the road, within the utility corridor and not to get into a big history lesson on that. Basically that's what it is. As a part of the original plan, which was done in 1991, arose this—the Recreation Management Plan for the Dalton Highway. And so we've got all kinds of things in this that we haven't put on the lands yet. So we're talking about not putting any more, this is a document if right now, if the money was there, there would be more going on there right now.

The money that is being used up there currently is all coming through the same program that Kathlene is talking about, which is the Federal Highways program. BLM gets very little money to none for construction and most all of the facilities that are up there now has come through the Federal Highway, generally the T21 I think was the plan that most of the money came from. But it's something to keep in mind.

And again, Kathlene and Lisa can help me with the figures, I don't even remember when the road became a state scenic byway [1998 from Kathlene]. We have seen a gradual increase on the number of people traveling the road and it has been there basically since the road opened in 1994 and it's about 10%. Seven to 10% is about what we're seeing. And there was no jump when this thing went to a State Scenic Byway—I didn't even know it happened until the signs started showing up. So I am a little concerned about the concerns we have in here about that happening and again the other concern I have is when we talk about scenic byway and all of a sudden more people are going to come, what people are coming? A lot of times we're talking about, it sounds like, we're talking about concerns with people getting off the road and going into the hinterland, when most things I look at when I see a scenic byway is the traveling public—it's the ecotourism-type folks. And if that's the case then the real concern I think we have up there would be State DOT because of the road conditions and what have you, or safety and that sort of thing. More so than how this is going to impact the lands other than people seeing them. I understand where Heidi's coming from, don't want hordes of people up there.

But there are two things I think we have to look at: one of them, they are public lands and we have to keep that in mind. I know it's not in our backyard but our backyard happens to be everybody's backyard when it comes to funding the management of those lands. And so we have to keep that in mind. We can't discount that.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I would like to hear from some...sorry Heidi I have Burke and...

**Burke Barrick – Captain, Alaska State Troopers:**

First of all, I am not speaking for my agency, this is just my opinion. I am sympathetic to everybody's concerns here. I understand that if I lived in Wiseman I wouldn't want hordes of people coming through my backyard. But I also agree with this last gentleman. This is a state road, this road is open and people are coming and they are going to continue to come. Burying our heads in the sand or hoping that it will go away is not a strategy.

I agree that there are not sufficient public safety resources, or highway resources, or maintenance or things like that. I am hoping that this document can shine some light on those facts and maybe get that information to the decision makers and allow them to—without opening the thing up like Disneyland—to make sure there are some basic services to accommodate the people that are coming now and the 10% per year that are going to continue to trickle into the area. I guess that's my concern. If we get caught up on the idea that there are signs out here we should stop the whole process—there's a document there [pointing to table] from 1995 that I found that basically did this whole exercise 14 years ago and they pointed out concerns about the numbers of people coming in and they pointed out concerns about infrastructure and public safety and highways and all these things and nothing happened. I guess that's what I am concerned about most is that we address the concerns that the people have that live there, to certainly not turn this into just a floodgate of people storming through the area, but at the same time provide the basic level of services for the people who are going to be going up that road anyway. Or close it down.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

I think everybody agrees with that. The question is whether the scenic byways, state and or federal, is the means to do that. I don't think that it is. I think the corridor plan we've been involved, BLM has been a good steward, we should continue to have input, when they revise it we certainly have input at that level. But this, the scenic byway is not the purpose of it. We've looked at it—you can't get funding for maintenance, safety, and a number of things. It's promote, you read what it's intending. Go to the internet—that's the national and state programs, to promote and market these places. It is not to protect them and that's reflected in this document and I don't think this reflects the concerns we have. I think that the group last time clearly expressed concerns about commercialization and marketing, it's not in here. We have all agreed, the agencies need restraint and it's not in here. I just don't see this as being the vehicle to go where we want to go.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I have to step in. This is Kathlene again for those of you that are on the phone. I believe I did a disservice to you sending out the first draft incomplete, but I wanted to stick with the promise I had made to you to send you a first draft by April 27<sup>th</sup>. And I was not complete with the other sections. My feeling is that your impressions of the document are that maybe you are not necessarily looking at the other sections to be complete and the things that we can do from here to make the plan better. I am here for you. This is my job and I would like to see this project succeed in whatever way the group would like—to see the CPP be complete. And I understand that the sections aren't complete and that's a little bit hard to see, but to look

at the outline and see what is yet to come and what we can do to make the outline better and go from there. I think there is a lot of good to be done within the document.

**Burke Barrick – Captain, Alaska State Troopers:**

Maybe it's the language that's got everyone excited. Maybe we need to step back and look at some of the phrases we have in there that make it sound like a travel log.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Can I say something? I agree with, I am feeling the same way Roger [Kaye] is and agree with Ben and the other comments I have heard, that if this could be used, we do need some kind of, I mean it's great there is this group of people that sort of have consensus, we all have the same feelings, it would be a great tool, but as Roger said this may not be the vehicle for this tool because what we want for the area is in opposition to the purpose of a scenic byway. The purpose of a scenic byway is mostly designed toward travelers and recreation and we're kind of saying that we want to keep it real wilderness. Another thing you have to consider is one of the main reasons why visitors come up here and why there is this increase in visitation every year is there is a lot of private advertising of the wilderness stuff that's why the visitation is increasing. But people are coming here because it is a wilderness and if there is more visitor facilities, if there are more signs on the road, if it's paved, it's not going to be the same place, it's not going to be the experience that it is. I would say that it's probably definitely the last place in the U.S. that is a true wilderness experience for travelers. I am not down on travelers. I am just down on development and improvements. We're concerned that there's not the safety for people. It just seems like the wrong venue to accomplish what the people that are at this meeting and care about this meeting, this is the wrong venue to accomplish those goals. I don't know where the right vehicle is, I don't know what places, but I don't believe a scenic byway is the right vehicle to address our concerns.

**Alexa Greene – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

This is Alexa from DOT planning. I work with Dave [Sanches]. You don't have to do the scenic byways. This tool is just a plan to show people who don't come here, that live in Washington DC who have the money to get the safety, to help the Troopers get more staff to drive the road, to help fish and wildlife with their funding. People in Washington DC, most of those people will never come here and if you have this plan that says "we need help here, we need help here, we need help here, but we don't really want visitors, but we know there is a road and people are coming," this will give them a document to say "ok this is what they want, let's find some money." It would be a good document to give to them. You don't have to do the byways stuff. You don't have to have more signs. You don't want them, don't ask for the money. If you don't want more rest areas, you don't have to have them. But you'll have this plan and then you may be able to get more money in other areas.

BLM is coming in a couple years and they are going to tell everybody what to do with BLM lands. Most of the time, everybody forgets these plans are out there and then when you go out there you have to do what they say. This plan will help them direct what we want, what everyone wants out there in the corridor.

**Dave Sanches AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

This is Dave from the other planning office. I just spoke with the previous scenic byways coordinator. And she said the Dalton was originally designated a state scenic byway in 1995 and there was a series of meetings that accompanied that designation. I forgot who was asking for that background information.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I was and I just wondered who put in the application and what were the public comments. If you have record of those public comments if you could email them out to everyone.

**Dave Sanches AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

We would have to do some more digging, but it was nominated by the state along with several other byways in 1995. There was public meetings and public testimony taken.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I just wonder what local public comment was. They all refer to local support and I just wondered what local support there was for the designation.

**Dave Sanches AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

As far as what Alexa said, she's right. At least, you don't have to take the National Scenic Byway designation. I agree the CPP is important just to have your concerns made known in the plan and hey, if that's what you want, that's what you want. But at least we need to plan so those concerns are reflected.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I would like to make a suggestion about how to proceed mechanically—how to proceed with finishing the CPP. I do believe the CPP can be a valuable tool. I will suggest that in terms of drafting this document the wrong place to begin is by writing the introduction, even though in the end it will appear first. We really don't have the material in front of us to write the introduction yet. What we need to write are the meaty sections. Those sections that clearly articulate the concerns of the stakeholders that clearly articulate historically problems that have cropped up along the corridor and what needs to be addressed. So I think those meaty sections, the muscle of the document, that's where we need to start. We need to make sure we have covered comprehensively the list of issues, concerns, problems, and looking forward we can certainly suggest potential solutions or perceived solutions that the stakeholders have brought up as missing pieces—the fact that we need more enforcement, the fact that we will need to step up our litter pick up, trash pick up, etc. etc. Once we are happy with this as a document, that really sort of a hard-hitting document that embodies the concerns, then we can go back and proofread this and wordsmith it, get it down to where we think it's good, then we can go back and write the introduction based on what the meat is.

And I think Kathlene, you've gotten beat up a lot and I feel badly that you are sort of a punching bag and we're all taking swings at you and I think you started in a very good-faith way to write your introduction to what this document would be based on criteria from the National Scenic Byways program, which has been articulated here, is really one of promotional, it is promoting the scenic values of the given byway.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

But I do have to say that the state DOT does have to approve of the document before it goes to print so those 14 components need to be addressed in some way. So I agree with what you're saying with focusing on some of the other issues, that's why we started with the vision, goals and objectives—I think that's a very good start. And yeah, I went to the other sections first, but that doesn't mean that they had any more importance. And I have an idea for reorganizing that.

[other mixed voices] But with those 14 sections, they do need to be included in order for it to be approved.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I do think it's important in that case that we critically look at those 14 and decide that with the requirements for those 14, do we want to do this. Because as has been articulated, if it is decided that this isn't the right tool, that this is a Phillips screwdriver and we've got a standard screw that we want to, it's just not going to work. Given that this document is constrained by necessary ingredients, and I am not sure whether we have actually gone through the appropriate decision making steps, and I am suggesting that we may need to put the brakes on and do that. Unless this is a tool to accomplish a much-needed task, we are all much much too busy to really invest more energy into it.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

A lot of that energy is my job. I am happy to take that on, with the input you are going to give me, put it into a workable document. I will say that within the constraints of those 14 points, there is things that say, I am just trying to pick up one I think you might comment on, number 8 “a plan to accommodate commerce while maintaining safe and efficient...” and then there are other ones that say “signage plan” and a “narrative describing how the National Scenic Byways,” it says national but we could say state, “will be positioned for marketing.”

[other mixed voices]

We can say whatever we want. This one says a “narrative describing how it will be positioned for marketing,” it [the plan] can say “It won't,” it just has to be addressed. Use these loosely.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Ok

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Yeah. So I don't want you to get necessarily scared off by the 14 components, we can still work within them to make it a usable document.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

Heidi, talking to you there a minute too. Going back to the fundamental question of whether or not this is the way to do this, go with the scenic byways or what have you, even though through the Federal Highway funding that if this ends up being a National Scenic Byway of whatever we're working towards, and there is no funding there for maintenance, I can tell you in the internal budgets of the federal government when we have like a scenic byway, a designated scenic byway, or national scenic byway, when we send in our budget request and we have that as what we are trying to get money for, are facilities along that for maintenance purposes, it certainly raises it up to a higher level. So internally it is important to BLM. It does give us a higher leg for getting more money through our own budget process.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

That would be for the recreational department.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

For maintenance of outhouses and things like that because we're hurting there.

[mixed voices from phone line and conference room]

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Ester Hugo, are you trying to chime in? [Kathlene talking to teleconference participants]

**Rosemary Ahtuanguak – Nuiqsut:**

This is Rosemary calling in from Nuiqsut. I also had a lot of questions as far as our involvement in this process and how we are supposed to work with others that could really provide input into this process. I am glad that some of the discussion that has gone on in looking at other documents because when I saw this document, it comes across my table in two different ways. I am one who travels this road up and down and count on it as a point of access to other activities that are not available in our village, but I also have my traditional and cultural activities which are different. When you look at the activities promoting in this document and what we're supposed to provide input into this is very different.

I don't have any page of additional wording or changes that we could put into this process as we've had teleconferencing the communications that went through were very different than the document that came out. To have no means to try to consider articulating where in the document we can put our concerns into this process it doesn't give me much depth to comment further into this.

I am very concerned because I have a lot of people in this area who really rely on keeping the value of this area intact and there are already changes promoted that are really going to change this area tremendously. And adding on additional changes promoting with this document, you can put things out there but without having a lot of information to put variables in it is very hard to participate.

Also this process is not conducive to allow effective participation. This process, if you are willing to constantly interrupt, maybe you can get a few words in, but there is never a process of trying to say, "do we have comments further in this area?" "do we have other people who would like to add comments to this point or objective?" so it is very frustrating sitting here listening to that. If I had means to get there face to face maybe you could see that I have been trying to get on for almost 45 minutes to provide some comments. But I am not there face to face and it not an effective means for those of us in the rural cities to participate in this process and get some comments in there.

I would like to see some additional variables. I think our area is too unique. It is not a template that can be taken from elsewhere to create a document or a plan that is going to be something that will work up here. This is very different than what can work elsewhere without putting in some tools to allow us to even consider alternatives this venue is not a good venue to try to think of being a tool to facilitate, that is maybe something that helps us or hurts us or not.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Well thanks Rosemary. I am sorry that you were having trouble chiming in. I didn't know that you were on the phone line and I apologize. I guess I don't know exactly how to answer your question. I don't have many of your comments up to this point. I do have some of your comments from the teleconference you participated in last fall. I guess I would ask you to think about, to look into the documents that I have been sending via email, look at the outline, or the table of contents, to see where some of your concerns might fit into the document.

I am not asking you to do that right now on the spot, but after the meeting.



I was kind of looking around the table here, and I am not sure who we still have on the phone, but if there is anyone who hasn't had an opportunity to chime in, thank you Rosemary for bringing that up. I don't know if Charity or Brett [pause], no.

Bill Rodasky, are you still on the phone?

**Bill Rodasky - NMS/Arctic Caribou Inn:**

Yes I am.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Would you like to say anything?

**Bill Rodasky - NMS/Arctic Caribou Inn:**

No, I am quite in agreement with the folks in Wiseman and Nuiqsut. I agree with them and no, I don't have any added comments.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Michael? [motioning to Mike Hertlein]

**Mike Hertlein - Private property owner:**

No, this is a very interesting discussion and a lot of good points being made.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

Can you [Kathlene] think of any examples of projects that other scenic byway teams have requested?

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Yeah, and I should have brought that with me. When Aneta Synan was the State Scenic Byways Coordinator that most of you met during the public process last year—she is no longer in that position—part of her presentation was an example of projects. I am trying to think of some off the top of my head. Someone did some work at a museum, there was some restoration in Hope, I believe, off the Seward Highway, which is quite a ways off—I am not exactly sure how that works. Educational brochures, there is a group applying for an interpretive plan, groups have applied for marketing plans—which wouldn't be applicable to this group probably. Numerous interpretive projects. The byways in Alaska that are the most active right now would probably be the Glenn Highway and as far as particular dollars I think they did do a marketing plan. They are heavy on visitation and tourism so they have a different vision than this group does. The Parks Highway is pretty active, but they just finished their CPP so they haven't received funding yet. The Alaska Marine Highway, I believe they have done an interpretive plan, I am not sure what else. Some of the other groups are just now finishing their corridor partnership plans, like the Richardson, so they haven't necessarily done those projects yet. The Seward Highway is an All-American Road but they don't have a very active group so I don't think they apply for many grants. So I really just have those and the federal register and online, if you go to the America's Byways Resource Center, you can look at the different types of projects that can be funded.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

I am just trying to think of an example. I know a couple years ago, I think it was Terry was asking about, possibly putting in a trail from the café in Coldfoot over towards the visitor center that would keep people off the main access road. So that's kind of a safety thing—it's a pretty big safety thing actually and I just wonder if that kind of project, if an application could be made for that kind of project.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

It could be—I am not exactly sure. That would be a Marcheta question, from DOT. I did, that it is somewhere in the draft document. Well I was thinking of that particular project when I was doing the vision, goals and objectives. So, I don't know what number it is offhand. Improving pedestrian access at development nodes. That was the project I was thinking of when I wrote that goal.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

Oh, ok.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

No offense to Roger or Lisa there, but it just seems that BLM is very supportive of this plan because it will help provide more funding for further developments along the Dalton Highway that the BLM wishes to pursue and it seems that the concerns from other residents and stakeholders are not so supportive of this and it seems like all the projects that have been funded by the scenic byways has been for marketing or interpretation.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Heidi, you seemed pleased with the vision, goals, and objectives. Is that still the case?

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I had not done a lot of background on this, and I recently since you came out with your draft and I saw the content I was very disturbed by the resource inventory and stating all the fish that are in the creeks and all the promotion and I started researching what is a scenic byway. I didn't really understand what it was. And now I think I have a pretty clear picture in reading the law and the law more or less says what it is for is to recognize an area and essentially promote it for visitors and the whole scenic byway concept is based on visitor recreation and visitor experience and it's you know not really a management venue or necessarily protecting an area just to protect an area. It's all focused toward recreation and tourism and improvements on that, in that direction. I don't know, as I keep saying, leave it alone, we don't need any more layers of bureaucracy up here. I don't know, to see any zoning. I don't want the viewshed to be disrupted across the highway if somebody might not like my windmill power in Wiseman or who knows where it will lead. What will that actually lead to? If you do put out resource inventories and things like that you can't tell me that won't end up in someone's hands eventually or they'll tell someone else, a friend of theirs might get a hold of it if it is not made available to the public, someone else will go "oh I can fish for this and this and this in this creek," that stuff gets out, it just does. This is the arctic, it is very fragile. It has to be approached very cautiously. It is very susceptible to degradation, quite easily, and it really needs."

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

That information can go into the plan, Heidi. I can take that, I mean I can take a lot of that information out of the resource inventory. I think I know what you're talking about—the mile-by-mile where it says fishing upstream and downstream. I mean, through conversations like these, that's stuff I can remove.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

And not just fishing, but mining, it might seem like this huge wilderness that just has endless resources but really it's not that way, it's pretty fragile up here. When you use something up, it's gone, it's destroyed. I am into preserving the place as it is because that is a benefit to people from around the world for future generations. If everything is explained and everything is interpreted that totally takes away from the whole experience of a visitor to travel the road. If they discover something on their own that's one thing, cool, that's exciting to them, and it's good for the land. Where if everything is explained, interpreted, and marketed it's detrimental and totally, look down the road and you'll see where this could lead to because it's not based on preservation type thing it's based on marketing and promotion. It's basically what the purpose of the scenic byways are to set aside some place so visitors can go there and have visitor facilities and learn about the area when they get there, it's not a park, but similar.

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

We have a couple other folks here

**Charity Gadapee** – *Fairbanks Convention and Visitors Bureau:*

The corridor partnership plan isn't a binding agreement to anything or anyone, it's just written and quite possibly is never read again by anybody. This group can fizzle, never do a thing, and it just goes away, I mean it sits.

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

It could yes. If the group was to disband after this then, right.

**Charity Gadapee** – *Fairbanks Convention and Visitors Bureau:*

You would have completed the task at hand, which was to complete the Corridor Partnership Plan, which possibly maybe gets funding for projects down the line if we use it as a backup document. But it's not guaranteed by any way, shape, or form, correct?

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

Right

**Charity Gadapee** – *Fairbanks Convention and Visitors Bureau:*

My viewpoint is, I work at the visitor center, and like what was already brought up, people travel the Dalton not even because it's a scenic byway—it's because you go up the Dalton to get to the Arctic Circle. You go up the Dalton to get to Prudhoe Bay or as close as they can possibly get to Prudhoe Bay.

Saying that this is going to bring a huge amount of visitors to the road, I do not believe that is a correct statement. I don't believe that every stakeholder in this room and on the phone believes the same thing as what is being brought up, so the comment of "we the stakeholders believe this," I believe that is a very broad comment and you should only talk about what you are personally thinking and feeling and your vision for what you want to see happen, because grouping me in with you saying that I don't want visitors up there, well that's my job, is to promote the area, to educate them about the area, and give them the best resources possible. I just want to make that point—please don't group everyone by saying the stakeholders don't want anything to happen up the corridor or along the Dalton Highway because that's not always the case.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Well, sorry about that, I was just referring to the comments, I mean it's hard to know who's out there when they don't comment.

**Charity Gadapee** – *Fairbanks Convention and Visitors Bureau:*

In regards to that, when emails come and emails come about “this is bad, this is bad, this is bad,” I don't have any desire to make a good comment because the flow of comments is “this is bad, this is wrong, this is flowery talk.” I did the scenic byway application to get the Parks Highway from Healy here extended. I know what went into that application. I put a lot of work into that application, so when you say “well this flowery talk and this and that,” I take offense to it because I put a lot of effort into getting it into a scenic byway designation. And whoever got the Dalton designated a scenic byway, they put a lot of effort into it and they had to go through a lot of hoops to get it designated. So to de-designate it, that feels like a slap in the face.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Well if that person you know wanted it they should have solicited for public comment. Maybe there was and the locals, at least in Wiseman weren't aware of it.

[mixed voices]

**Charity Gadapee** – *Fairbanks Convention and Visitors Bureau:*

And there is a very specific timeline for public comments so they are not going to knock on your door and say “please comment on this document.”

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Things like designations of scenic byways and public comments it's very annoying when it doesn't take into consideration that some places that might be affected like Wiseman don't have newspapers or at that time didn't have any internet access. How are you supposed to know to comment on something if you don't hear about it? I think that communities that are affected by anything should be notified so that they can comment.

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

This is Dave Sanches. On that vein from what I understand there was a public meeting held in 1995 and I don't know if they were in Wiseman or not. But normally there is a timeline on public comment, if a plan has to move forward, there is a specific time that comments have to be taken or considered or whatever. So, you're isolated, and back in 1995 you're right—internet access wasn't what it was, phone service may not have been what it was—I am sure there was an outreach program, it just may not have been as extensive as it is nowadays because of technology.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Where are we headed? What do others feel? When I am speaking I am speaking for myself and other residents of Wiseman, and if I say “stakeholders” I am referring to those that have commented not to others that haven't commented. What is the general consensus with everybody involved, where are we headed with this? We have been debating here, like I figured we probably would be, but what's happening? What do people want to do? It seems like some people don't want it at all, other people may want it.

**Alexa Greene – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

Like Kathlene was saying, it's the first draft. Let's find out what comes out in the second draft. Let's help Kathlene put the information that everyone wants in the second draft. As for the appendix, the Dalton Highway resource inventory, that doesn't need to be in there. You can put very short, brief information in there. It's the first draft. Why don't we get through the first draft, find out how Kathlene would like to reorganize it, and then move on.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I think we are skipping one thing that Heidi has asked for and I think it is fair and I think we owe it to address her question. I think at the root of what she is asking is, what are the forces promoting or pushing this forward? We have gotten a fair bit of push back in this particular meeting and in previous meetings with this group, so I think those of us who have pushed back, and I am one of them, those individuals have been identified, is the State Department of Parks and Rec or DNR, where are the impetus to move forward on this?

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

This is a DOT project. I don't know what to say. My job was to facilitate this process and write the plan. So obviously I would like to see the plan completed. I have been working hard on it and listening to everyone and trying to incorporate ideas and I would like to be given a chance to go to the second draft and continue to work with the group.

[mixed voices] Marcheta [Moulton] would make the ultimate decision I guess if the

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Because from the get go, nine months ago, it was very clearly articulated to us that this is an exploratory thing, they wanted to put together an exploratory group, they wanted to take public comments, they did a whole series of visits to different communities, they came up to Barrow and talked with our Mayor's office, etc.. But in no way at the time was the forgone conclusion that the process would move ahead and I want to make sure that it doesn't move ahead simply because it has gained some momentum somewhere, gained a life of its own.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

It was always supposed to move ahead to the completion of the Corridor Partnership Plan, not the National Scenic Byways designation. It's part of the same process, but it's separate. It was always meant to be the completion of the Corridor Partnership Plan. I have the minutes from the meetings, I have a digital voice recording so I know that we said, if the group chooses, you can use this to apply for a National Scenic Byway designation, but the purpose of this process starting last spring was to complete this document.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

Now Kathlene, isn't it also true we have to get through the plan in order to be in line for applying for grant money?

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Correct

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

That's the reason for the plan we're doing now and it has to be a State Scenic Byway before you can do the plan. It's a process, it's a protocol kind of. So that's what she's doing. We could leave it a State Scenic Byway for years but you get nothing for it. At least by going through the Corridor Plan then you can apply for the money she was talking about, the \$600,000 or whatever it is in the Federal Highways.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

This is Dave Sanches, that's exactly true. De-designating the State Scenic Byway would be counter-productive because maybe in 5 years the mood may change and we want to designate it as a National Scenic Byway--we already have all the mechanisms in place to do it. So completing the plan is very important and you can reflect what the consensus of the public is right now, but at least getting the plan completed is essential for the future.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I understand that this plan is essential if it does want to be designated a National Scenic Byway in the future and that's why I am putting my brakes on because I don't want to see it designated as a National Scenic Byway, that incorporates to me a lot more restrictions and exposure. I for one am certainly not in favor this staying a National Scenic Byway. Someone made a comment a little bit ago that this plan may not even be read, well then why are we even working on it? Why are we evening doing this?

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

We are working on this largely for funding purposes, but I think it is a good idea to stand back. We have learned a lot more and ask ourselves if this state designation is going to serve the ends that it purports to. I don't think so. I think it is a valid thing what you are asking, whether it be rescinded, or retracted, or whatever is a valid question and why not look into it. I think Ester Hugo said it best [Rosemary Ahtuanguak], the scenic byway program is a template developed for the lower 48, for different types of byways, not for this extremely unique roadway that we're looking at.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

It's meant to highlight roads that are unique and distinctive. What else is the Dalton Highway but unique and distinctive?

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

It is clearly reflective in this first draft, which reflects the wording of the others we look at, the intent of it: to promote, market, to make it as Don Pendergrast said "Any Highway USA." I am sure it's unique and remote and it's got some scenery and animals, it acknowledges that, but it puts it in the same template. You could take most of what is written here and substitute another highway name and you would never know the difference. I do not see the chief recommendations, the most important things in the vision statement or the draft and waiting for a second draft I don't think, unless there is a significant shift, is going to change that.

**Alexa Greene – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

We haven't gotten to the section yet.



**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Kathlene, could you, Kathlene I don't know if you are the right one, could there be something written up and emailed, pros and cons—if we de-designate that means you are not going to have this and this and this, and if it is designated and we continue with this plan it's going to be a benefit to this and this and this. Because I am really not clear as to what the benefits are besides possible funding for BLM, you know it sounds like that would be for a national scenic byway. What are the benefits of having it? I am just really not clear.

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

I have tried to give the group so many resources: internet sites, through meetings, I have given you handouts and flyers explaining the benefits of the program. But as far as listing the pros and cons of moving forward, that is not me. That would be Marcheta Moulton. Dave you might be able to chime in here, but no, I am not the right person to facilitate that discussion.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

I just don't see the benefit because every benefit comes with a catch.

**Burke Barrick** – *Captain, Alaska State Troopers:*

I am just one person, but I would like to see the second draft and see what we come up with as opposed to worrying about what might be in the document. I mean the document is incomplete. We haven't addressed several sections of it. So if we don't like the second draft I think we can panic and yell and jump up and down, but until we have something in hand, I think it is premature to criticize the thing before we have actually seen it. I understand there are things that we need to be concerned about. There are some things that I am concerned about and would like to see changed, but I will reserve that until the second draft.

Put me down for wanting the second draft.

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

I guess we can go around and do that. We do have some Advisory Team members who are not here today. I don't know.

Dave Sanches, can you chime in here?

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

Yep, the plan needs to be finished. Regardless of what the recommendation is going to be, the Corridor Partnership Plan needs to be finished and it can address everybody's concerns about safety concerns, and whatever the case may be, but the plan itself needs to be finished.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Why does it need to be finished? Why does it need to be finished if it is to be de-designated? If it's finished then basic de-designation would be a much harder process.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

We receive Federal Highway funding for these projects. We get X amount of dollars a year for scenic byways programs. In order to even consider a road for future designation for whatever reason, these Corridor Partnership Plans need to be finished. Now that said if we just stop what we are doing, we do a disservice to you guys because your concerns won't be made public. If we just say "well we're done with the plan because nobody wants it," and we stop what we're doing, we have to pay that money back to Federal Highways for one, and we're doing a disservice to a lot of the hard work that has been done already. And then you the public, your comments will not be reflected officially, formally.

So finishing the document is important just to have your comments alone and everybody else in the room, addressed and recognized. If we just stop what we're doing and throw our hands up and say we're done, we have certain requirements we have to fulfill in accepting Federal Highway dollars for this stuff.

So bottom line is the plan has to be finished.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

But the assumption there is that the document will reflect the comments received. So that's really what we need to see. We need I think a significant re-write and I would suggest not spending time on things like the introduction. I think that we really need a detailed dissection of concerns, issues, problems, and potential problems so that the document has some vision for the future, that it can be a powerful instrument of change. And the North Slope Borough has been frustrated I won't say for years, I will say for decades, we have been very frustrated, we have taken every opportunity we have had to try to rattle the cages of our legislators in Juneau and other political powers that are in a position to designate additional Trooper support, services, etc. to the Dalton Highway. We have never seen any favorable response in terms of doing that. But we do see these things come across the horizon like, "well never mind your comments about wanting additional State Trooper support but we're interested in designating it as a scenic byways" and we're left shaking our heads saying "I guess you didn't hear or understand our earlier comments."

I have nothing against finishing the CPP, and as I said several times, I do think the CPP can become a tool that very clearly and strongly articulates our concerns. But if we are moving ahead to complete the CPP I would like to have some commitment that that's the document we're working toward. Before I can vote for completion of a document, I really need some commitment on what the finished product is intended to accomplish and maybe a little about what it would look like.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

This is Dave again. It's not a matter of if we're going to finish the plan—the plan has to be finished. That's the bottom line. It has to be completed. We accepted Federal Highway dollars for the scenic byways program, these plans have to be finished and it can reflect concerns. In my opinion and from what I have been through on the Parks Highway and the Richardson Highway Corridor Partnership Plans, it's not a matter of if the plan needs to be done—we need to finish it, we started it, we accepted money for it, we need to go forward and finish it.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

How much money did you accept and what is that money allocated for?

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

I don't know those numbers. That would be a Marcheta [Moulton] question.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

Ok, what will those funds be, they must have been appropriated already if you accepted them.

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

Through the Federal Highway Administration for the Scenic Byways Program

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

What is exactly the money appropriated for? Improvements or what are you going to use those funds for?

**Kathlene Rowell** – *Facilitator:*

It's just for the plan, Heidi.

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

It supports the scenic byways program to do these plans

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

So the contract for Kathlene to facilitate this or what is this money for?

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

To conduct Corridor Partnership Plans. To gather public comments. To put these programs together. That's what the appropriation is for through the Scenic Byways Program.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

And if you didn't have a scenic byway anymore, you would have to give back the remaining funds?

**Dave Sanches** – *AK DOT&PF/Planning:*

The Federal Highway Program supports scenic byways. Are you saying if we de-designated it as a scenic byway?

**Heidi Schoppenhorst** - *Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:*

You said the plan has to be finished because you accepted money for it, so I asked what the money was for and you said it was for creating the plan. So if it was de-designated you wouldn't need to create a plan anymore so therefore, it wouldn't really matter if you had to give back the money, you wouldn't be working on that job anymore.

I will go to the extent, I will agree with Ben, if there is a second draft out there of something that reflects our concerns or sounds you know what I am hearing people want to see, great but I am worried about having the plan completed at all because that puts us in a position for National Scenic Byway designation, and I really don't, like I said, support that.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

But the completion of the plan itself does not automatically give you a National Scenic Byway designation. It reflects your comments

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

It puts you in a position where it could become a National Scenic Byway, but without this plan there is absolutely no way it can become a National Scenic Byway. Without this plan it is not possible, is what I am saying. So once the plan's there that's a possibility, and that's something else you have to think about and maybe what comes with that. Maybe with the State Scenic Byway maybe our comments are heard a little more or something, but maybe at the national level maybe not because there might be stricter requirements and I am just saying that if it was de-designated now, if it has to be finished because you've accepted money for it and the money, apparently, was designated to pay peoples salaries to create this plan and facilitate travel and things like that, I assume. So if you stopped at this point, if it was de-designated you wouldn't need to facilitate the plan any longer and remaining funds for that could be returned.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

Heidi, can I ask you a question?

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Sure

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

Let's say that we de-designate it, ok. We're still getting the 10% or so increase in traffic going up the road.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

Exactly

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

This past year we had roughly 13,000 I believe, you can share with that, Lisa, I don't remember the exact numbers. My point is this: not to use a proverbial ostrich head in the sand, but if we don't, by doing the designation it does put us in line, and we can dictate, this body can dictate what facilities that we have up there at least to take care of this additional traffic that is going to come whether we do anything. And the problem with that is that if we don't, BLM is the one that is going to be catching the flack on this because we're the ones that's going to have to be doing the trash pick up and whatever else happens. And so BLM certainly has a concern in what happens up there because it's gonna fall directly on us.

My concern is that if we don't do something, and this body here doesn't help craft what that is, something will be done. I mean without a doubt something will have to happen because that increase in traffic is still gonna come, whether we go this route or what. And my point, is if it is a designated byway we at least would get some funds or have an avenue for funds through the Federal Highways program if we decide to put a new outhouse up there or something, we could get that provided through these funds, I do believe, right Kathlene? And we won't through our own budget. That's the problem.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

The maintenance wouldn't come.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

The maintenance will not and we'll still have to deal with that.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

The greater needs aren't going to come, I guess that's the issue. I think we need to clarify—I don't think anyone believes that just designation in itself is going to or has resulted in a massive increase. It's the funding, it's the grants, it's the federal money that you get that are intended for marketing and promotion as stated in the Federal Program. That's the danger.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

But it depends on what the project is that you're applying for.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

But we can dictate that, that's the point.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

If someone applies for a project that isn't supported in the Corridor Partnership Plan, if it's not supported then it won't get funded. So if your goals and objectives are very specific, if your recommendations are very specific, it gives you a lot of, it gives you a lot of weight there. As far as how those particular dollars can be spent.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Well we'll see how visitation is. The economy is pretty bad, reservations are down, not as many people are traveling, and our country is facing a huge national debt. I don't feel it's real important to stick more money into outhouses on the Dalton Highway. I would rather see money go somewhere else where it's needed. Taxpayers can't continue to, I just hate to be supportive of something in my area that I am really not supportive of anyways, but I mean in general just help bring our country down. Our country is not doing so good, it's not going to continue like this, it won't.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

If we don't complete the plan your concerns will not be made official or public so the plan at least needs to be completed so the public concerns are formalized.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

And you waste more taxpayer funds, more tax payer funds will be spent finishing the plan and you know who's gonna look at it. I just don't think the real concerns or issues will be the end result of the plan. Maybe, I mean if that's possible, if this could be truly used as a tool to keep the Dalton Highway the way it is, and not create more development, not create more marketing, but help to restrict that, provide for more public safety, fund another Trooper so that they can go up and monitor all the hunters that are already coming, great. If that, but that's not going to happen, there will just be more visitor services is what I see. I

don't see it as creating more law enforcement. I don't see the management there. Everybody wants to promote the area but nobody wants to pick up the trash.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

The comments that you are making in the plan can be reflected for that so the State can go to the legislature and say “look, we just did the Corridor Partnership Plan, here are the comments in a formalized plan, supported by the Federal Highway Administration.” It gives us a little bit of leverage, and a little bit more ammunition to go to the legislature and say, “look here's the comments of the people up the Dalton. These are their concerns. This is the concern of the North Slope Borough.” If we don't have a formal document that supports any of this stuff then we're not going to get any more money for outhouse clean-out, trash pickup, any of that stuff, road maintenance. You've gotta have some sort of formal document to support these findings.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

If it's used for that, great, which is what I originally kinda what I assumed this was about, but then when I started reading you know the law behind the federal register, the law that makes a scenic byway, it didn't give me the feeling that it's supportive of maintenance of an area or maintenance of an area, but rather services.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I would ask the group to think about the byway traveler as not just a visitor. This includes anyone driving their semi truck up to Prudhoe Bay, anyone driving up to Coldfoot and Wiseman for work. It's any type of traveler. So when we look at the “Road and Transportation” section and we talk about a possible gas line, or other things in the future that might be happening to increase industrial traffic on the road, it's that many more people needing to pull off and use the restroom. I am not talking about a tourist, I am talking about workers—a pipeline or pump station worker, so a traveler is more broad in its definition than just a tourist.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Well it kind of sounds like everyone would like to see a second draft with taking into consideration all of Ben's comments, in other words, more related to the concerns of the highway instead of highlighting all the resources that are already in material out there. I don't think this document should reflect the specific resources of the area but more the concerns of the area and leave the resources a mystery.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

I think all of us went into this a lot more hopeful than many of us are right now and that's because I think the main thing most all of us agreed on, maybe all of us, is that for example the vision statement ought to focus on protecting the area and the unique qualities, the natural character, avoiding, and enabling the place to remain free of structures and unnecessary intrusions and secondly that management, both state and federal level, government agencies would exercise restraint. And I didn't see that in the vision statement and from that point on it pretty much told me that this is the template of all those other places. If a second draft could reflect those concerns we had very directly I'd feel differently about it. But I don't see it reflected here and if it can't be, I think we should keep open the possibility of looking at what comes out but keeping open the possibility of recommending changing the designation the state designation, keep it open.

Didn't everyone agree, doesn't everyone like to see in the vision protection of the qualities be prominent and that agencies use restraint? That they do get grants and money, but as agencies do, it's so easy to



get money to do things, that's what agencies do. I have worked for them all my life, they don't exercise restraint and we need to specify that. I don't see that in there and I think we need to begin with that vision and then move on to the specifics.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Again this is not a final document. This is a first draft. This vision, goals, and objectives went through at least two rounds through the whole Advisory Team. It has not been approved, we can still make changes. If anyone has their draft with them, page 31 is where the vision, goals, and objectives are listed, we can add a sentence on to the end that talks more about that management. The document can't really say "DOT, the State of Alaska, BLM will do this." It can't make those types of declarations. What the vision statement is supposed to be is what the traveling experience will be in the future.

**Roger Kaye – USFWS, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:**

Maybe this is a different highway and we can have a different vision than the stock template as Esther [Rosemary Ahtuanguak] described it and that would reflect the difference of this place. You know, why can't we have a different vision that focuses on what's unique and special here that emphasizes the greatest need in all these things. Any time a natural area is being planned its restraint by the agencies.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

We can. We can still keep working on this. I am using your comments, Roger, and I am using the comments I am receiving from the other eighteen Advisory, and I am trying to meld them into one complete vision. I have used a lot of your statements in the document so I am taking what you are saying to heart. We can keep working on it. Again, we're still in the very beginning stages.

I am here to work hard to get this document accomplished for you.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I would be more supportive of this if I knew that this could be used as a tool to protect the resources, not just, everybody must have the impression that I don't like visitors, which is not true. We have a lodge and I am an interpretive ranger. That's not true. I don't mind visitors. I do have concerns for future utility development and the crews that are associated with them—if this could be used as a tool to help protect our resources from the same kind of impacts that occurred during the construction of the current pipeline, I would be very supportive of this. I guess I just haven't seen how that would happen. I am mostly concerned with keeping the Brooks Range and the North Slope and the Dalton Highway in general intact and the resources intact for future generations and not just for locals but for visitors to enjoy as well. There is not much to enjoy if it's impacted. If this can be used as a tool for that I would be supportive.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

It's almost as though we need to include in our vision statement some language to the effect of why we have completed the CPP and why we are participating in this process and state explicitly that our intention is that this CPP will be a forum for making public some very serious concerns that exist on the parts of several entities—I don't want to group all the stakeholders together that we are concerned about the same thing—but nevertheless I do think that part of the vision statement might not necessarily be a vision for the Dalton Highway but a vision for this CPP is intended to accomplish and it's intended uses. We would like to use it as a document to share with our legislators, to demonstrate degrees of concern and some series, what we see as some much needed facilities and much needed efforts, so.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

Well one example comes to mind right away and that was the Seekins Bill. If another legislator were to introduce a bill to open the Dalton Highway to off-road vehicles, it might be a situation where this Advisory Team could come out and say “that is against what the scenic byway corridor plan has recommended. That goes against the recommendations.” That is a potential way in which you can use the kind of plan and say this is something that came out of stakeholders along the highway, it’s been through a long process, it’s representative of people’s feelings, and it might be a bit stronger than if we as individuals were to object to something like that.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

If it could be used as a tool that way, written as Ben’s suggesting, I would totally be in support of that, you know 100% because I am in to protecting the area and the resources.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

I think the one thing we have to be a little careful, not careful, but cognizant of and that is, by all means I think all of us want to protect the resources as best we can. That to me should be ultimate, should be number one. Aside from that, somebody from the outside looking at the group and say you’re talking about protecting the resources within a utility corridor that’s been declared non-wilderness officially and may have two pipelines going down it within the next five years. And you know here we are in our little world trying to do this and this is a thing out there that we have nothing to say about. It’s going to happen if it’s going to happen.

So we have to keep that in mind and I realize we want to protect all that we can up there but I think the real key to us here is we gotta figure out how to manage it. That’s the big thing that this group can do is how are we going to manage that, not the fact that things are going to happen. It’s how are we going to, in our best way of looking at it, allow that management to take place. I think that’s what the key is for this group is, cause there are things that are going to happen up there—we have nothing to do about it. Pipelines as we all know, right now two of them are being looked at. Where they go, who knows, but they’ll go within the utility corridor.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

And they’ll bring a lot of workers and there is a complex web of enforcement up here right now that does a pretty good job of protecting the resources if it stays the same. If certain portions of that web are compromised, well.

**Roger Delaney - Bureau of Land Management:**

They definitely will be compromised certainly in the area where that goes. But I still think the group can come out with a direction and I can tell all of you right now, and you too Heidi, that you as an individual stating a purpose—and this is what I really would like to see—won’t have near the effect that this group would have making that same statement when it comes to time of submitting a proposal for something. I think all of us have been around the government world enough to know that that is the case. Multiple voices have more power than a single voice.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

And that’s really why I am suggesting—I hate to admit it—but I am actually suggesting that this CPP becomes a little bit more of a political document rather than a tourist handbook. You’re stating the need to manage, well one of the first steps in managing is make sure a careful analysis has been done for the

concerns that exist. Do a gap analysis between what kind of protections are in place and what kind of risks are we looking at when we look forward for 10-year, 20-year windows. And I, with apologies to Kathlene because it is not nearly as fun to write, but I do think the CPP needs to be a document which contains those rather dry and sometimes politically charged sentiments rather than being a visitors' guide to the Dalton Highway.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

And that's fine. It's intent is not to be a visitor's guide. In some section, in the intrinsic quality section, I would say would be included in the second draft. You have to explain in some way what those intrinsic qualities are and what they mean to the group. Otherwise it is going to look like you don't care about, you have to be able to describe to them why it is important. Some of that language does need to be included. But I am all for, please don't misunderstand that I don't like writing those other sections because it's not fun. I just didn't get to it yet.

**Dave Sanches – AK DOT&PF/Planning:**

This is Dave Sanches. To support Kathlene, she also has a scope of work which she has to stay within with regard to the document, so she can talk about the intrinsic qualities and then also reflect the public's concerns within, as long as it falls within the scope of work that she has been hired to do.

And then if the plan can then make recommendations then, to, if pipelines do go forward, then the needs of the communities do need to be addressed thoroughly, which they would have to be under at EIS and the environmental justice portion of an EIS.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Ok. I think we can say, if everyone is comfortable, if we can move forward. Ben I completely hear what you are saying and I completely hear what the group is saying. I think working on some of these other sections—I know the issues that have come up with safety and resource development, I have all of that data and I would, I think we'll need to collect some more and I will be asking your help for that. You don't want me pulling it out of thin air. I know it takes commitment from the group, and I know I have been sending out a lot of emails lately and I appreciate you taking the time to read those. But it's important for me to have your input and to act—this group needs to function as a reflective voice for the byway group. So we need to make sure we have folks commenting from all different interests so that we're getting a well balanced approach. I would like to see some other folks chime in from the other industries as well and some of the folks that aren't here today.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

That would be real nice to have Alyeska Pipeline Service Company.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

And they have been involved. I have a list of probably over 200 people that receive updates and all of those individuals weren't interested in being a part of this group, but are interested in receiving updates.

When we get to the point where the CPP is complete, and I believe that we will, this group will be very important past that point. You can add members, you can leave if you don't want to be a part of it anymore, but it's going to be this local byway organization that really takes this document and does something with it. That's where a lot of your goals are going to be met, so it is this useful tool, so that it doesn't, like Charity said, sit on a table. And that's not up to the state to do, that's up to this group. So yes, you do want to make sure that all of your views are reflected in it.

I am happy to give you as many progress reports on the document as you would like. I could inundate you with information if you want, but I don't know if that's the case.

**Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak – Nuiqsut:**

I had to step out for a few minutes, but one thing I would like to see are examples of various portions of scenic byways that have desires to protect different types of uses along the corridor so that we could see something similar in areas that we may feel important to change the wording of the document we received.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Ok, Rosemary, I can look into that for you.

**Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak – Nuiqsut:**

Thank you and I just needed to correct earlier for those that didn't hear that was Rosemary earlier not Esther.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I am not a scenic byways representative. My impression of the scenic byways program and from what I have read is that although some byways are more promotional in nature it's because they value something that is special about their area. So in most byways it is going to be because they want to protect something for people to enjoy and for the future. And sometimes those things are synonymous and sometimes they are not. So I think in most byway organizations, you would be able to find, Rosemary, examples of either a historic resource, natural resource, or scenic viewshed that people want to protect and allow people to enjoy. And for me that's what the heart of the scenic byways program is.

**Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak – Nuiqsut:**

We have another meeting getting ready to start here. I have to sign off. Thank you everyone for participating. I appreciate the comments from Ben and the others on the phone that are participating. I know this has been a very hard process. It's very different than a template of a document to start this process that's given to us as a guide. And I know this has potential to be a tool that can be used in good ways. I just hope to see a variety of information that allows us to develop the wording to make this document such. Thank you.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

A template is an ok place to start. We have to start somewhere, and now we can deviate and focus on the areas that are most important to us.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I actually think we've accomplished a remarkable amount in this meeting and it's been a little bit contentious and I do think we have accomplished a lot. And I would encourage you [Kathlene] to go back through all of the original public comments that were gathered nine months ago, whatever you can find and maybe re-read those and go through them a little bit now that it seems our vision for this document, as well as our vision for the highway may have changed a little bit. With the realization that this document actually could accomplish more than we thought it could. It could be a tool to actually, an instrument of change in a direction that we feel is needed for the highway. And I would go through some of those public comments, re-reading them now with an eye for what are the concerns, because I do think the CPP can

be something that really embodies the collective vision for this group and other important groups that aren't represented here. Don't be discouraged, Kathlene, we're on your side, we're all trying to keep our eyes of the prize and we will help you I think.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Thank you and I have been re-reading the public comments and I will continue to do so. Again will just keep looking to this group for input.

I know we didn't stay within our timeline, but that's ok. Let me just look at the list here and make sure that, I think in ways we have addressed a lot of these issues. Actually, Ben, one thing that you brought up in your comments [email comments from week of 5/4/09-5/9/09] was the issue of attaching public comments as an appendices. I don't think that's typical but we can do it if the group would like. I don't know, I am not sure if it would be a benefit or not.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I can see both sides. On one side we have said reiteratively that we want this document to, was it Dave on the phone?, said that "well if you want your voice to be heard you have to finish the CPP." So one way to literally have our voices as the CPP is if the appendices, one of the appendix had the actual transcripts from the public meetings, etc. There's some danger in that—the obvious danger of leaving some out and making sure all the comments are captured. The other thing is does anybody really want to read that. Another question is well if you're gonna have the comments do we need agency response to those comments. So there are all kinds of different options and I am not necessarily advocating that those need to be in there but I, since this is a public process.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

They are available for the public to review as soon as they come out. They are on the project website. My hope would be that the document would reflect, would accurately reflect the comments.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

It might be possible to categorize them. One of the things that I thought was that there was remarkable consistency in that everybody, a lot of comments, had to do with the need for more law enforcement, the concerns for safety, providing visitor services to the extent that things like trash pick up and outhouses, and the need to protect a very fragile environment. And I think those comments were fairly universal. I think that's reflected, and can be reflected, in the document.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

My vision for this document is exactly that—that those concerns would be the backbone or at least figuring prominently within the document.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I was kind of curious, is there anyone out in other villages, Anaktuvuk, I haven't really heard much for comments up there and I was just curious what they think about all this.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I don't know if they are still on the phone.

**Esther Hugo - Naqragmiut Tribal Council, Anaktuvuk Pass:**

Yes we're still on. Thank you so much Heidi, we're just right across from you. We wanted to ask Ben—nine months ago you did the comments and concerns. Were there any from our home, our village.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I have some.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I will let Kathlene tell it, Kathlene answer that. I compiled comments from NSB but Kathlene I believe does have comments that came from individual villages. She's looking right now. She's going through her folder.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Paul Hugo is on our Advisory Team, Esther, I am not sure if he asked you to participate in his stead, but on September 10<sup>th</sup> of last year we held a teleconference and Paul Hugo, Larry Burris, George Paneak, Eric Kenning from the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, Michael Morry—they all participated and gave their comments at that point.

I know that was probably the most specific time that they commented. We did not visit there as part of a public meeting. That's why we did the separate teleconference.

**Esther Hugo - Naqragmiut Tribal Council, Anaktuvuk Pass:**

And on your draft there Kathlene, page 26, on the first draft it says that “many residents will fly to Coldfoot and drive the Dalton Highway to Fairbanks for supplies.” I don't think any of our residents ever flew to Coldfoot to drive from Coldfoot to Fairbanks. We never ever go there to pick up a car or truck to drive to Fairbanks for supplies. All we do is most always fly in and out of the village.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I had asked Paul to review this section of the document and maybe correct it for me or supply other information. I did not hear back from him so I was expecting some of that to be changed. I think where that particular thought came from, is that I believe it was—I am not sure if it was Paul—but one of the folks who commented said that, yes it was Paul on September 10<sup>th</sup>, he said “we'd like to see a secured parking area at Coldfoot for Anaktuvuk Pass residents to leave their cars. Residents could then fly to Coldfoot and then to Fairbanks, therefore reducing travel costs.” That probably should have been more of a goal than a statement of current practices.

**Esther Hugo - Naqragmiut Tribal Council, Anaktuvuk Pass:**

Like Heidi we have lived here all our lives and I just disagree, or this is my first time getting all this information. [indiscernible] I read a couple hours before the teleconference but to me, today, we have such hard times with a lot of our supplies. Food costs so much at the store, the rate. I see that all these years Nuiqsut had a haul road, and it's just 60 air miles west of us here to the highway west of us. I don't know why board[?] doesn't support getting us this haul road because unemployment is 90% here and I don't know how we make ends meet but I am very in favor of the Dalton Highway being open but with some restrictions and conditions. It sure would take some load off us—I finally told my kids that maybe by the time I am gone you'll be able to drive from home to the highway and then to Fairbanks and you can



get all the groceries and all the cheap clothing, everything, and I sure hope to see it in my time. I just thought I would throw that in.

Include us on this because it is new to all of our members. I am sure Paul was aware of it. It's just something we need to do something about. Like I said our tickets, our freight is killing us and a lot of times we don't really, we wait until like our refrigerators, microwaves, anything we just wait until they burn out and stuff like this. I thought I would throw that in. Thank you so much for inviting us.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Esther, this is Ben Greene. I work with the North Slope Borough Planning Department. I will just speak up really quickly. This is not that interesting to this group, but I can't help because I think this will be useful for yourself. Note that we are in the process of developing individual village comprehensive plans for actually all the municipalities within the North Slope Borough. And Anaktuvuk is one of the first three villages that we'll be working on this with. So stay tuned, there will be, I think it's even being scheduled right now, unfortunately I can't tell you when it will be. The contact in the borough is Dan Forester. He is the Deputy Director of the Planning Department. Many of these concerns can be addressed in the Anaktuvuk Pass Village Comprehensive Plan.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

According to the Eric Kenning with Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, Anaktuvuk Pass has just recently signed a land-use policy as well.

One thing about Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuiqsut with the scenic byways program is that typically they only look at, the program looks at communities that are adjacent to the byway and I wasn't sure if those two communities should be included in the planning process, but because they are impacted by the roadway because this is such a different place, I decided to include them. But what I noticed was that I didn't include a description of Nuiqsut in the first draft. So I need to do that. And I think I need to speak with Marcheta from the Scenic Byways Program to see how those communities

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

Certainly Nuiqsut will vary, Nuiqsut is profoundly affected by whatever happens for the Dalton. They use the Dalton a lot because in the winter time there is an ice road that connects. There is no ice road connecting Anaktuvuk Pass.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Should we take a break? Let's see what time it is. It's 3:00 o'clock. I am not sure if everyone is kind of talked-out at this point.

[decided that we should set new meeting date and end the day's meeting]

I would like to thank you again for taking the time to participate today. I know it takes time out of your schedules. I know you are all very busy doing other things and I really appreciate all the comments we've received. A couple folks brought this up—this is a community supported document and I want your voices to be heard so keep me honest on that and please help me work within the parameters of the plan and look at ways that we can help to improve it.

I will say that please continue thinking about the ways this group can function after the CPP is complete and I think it will be a useful tool for you.

The timeline, I think I emailed this out, but I have copies of it here. The next step of course is to distribute the second draft. Now the second draft would be sent to you. We can do this two ways: we can, I can send the second draft to you prior to it being released to the public so we can hash out a version before it's released, or we can do it all at the same time. I almost feel like it would be beneficial for this group to review it first and then it will be released to the public to review. That would be sometime in July, to release the second draft.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I have a general question. I know you are trying to keep to a schedule and I commend you for doing that. At the same time, I would rather you not stick to a schedule per say unless it can be done well.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I have to spend the money by December. It's over in December. I do have to keep to a schedule. There are a couple things, if we need more time to put out this draft I think there is an allowance for that. The only things that are, like as soon as I release the draft to the public, they need 30 days notice before a public meeting. When we release that draft we'll actually go to those communities again and discuss it with folks. That 30 days has to be in allowance somewhere and then we'll have to review that document, make changes to that second draft and come up with a third draft that would have to be approved by this group. Then it has to be printed by, I am not sure if it is December 1<sup>st</sup> or 31<sup>st</sup>, so we're looking at kind of November 1<sup>st</sup>, somewhere in the beginning to middle of November to have a final approval for it.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I will just ask you to explore whatever possibilities there are for extensions or modifications of the timeline just so that you have that information, you know exactly what the limits are, because this, like a lot of documents, can either be finished and put on the shelf as has been mentioned, or hopefully and I think we accomplished a whole lot, it could be molded into a truly useful too, but that might take additional time. It might mean we want to have an additional draft to review, it might mean we have not just a first draft, second draft, but it might require a third draft and additional review by participants, etc. I encourage you to explore what possibilities exist just so that we're working on something that will really be

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I can do that. I can explore that end date and see if it can be extended if we would need to do that. There will not be more money given for it, so just extending it doesn't mean that I can spend that much more time on it. If that makes sense. I can only spend, if I only have 50 hours I only have 50 hours whether it's over a year or two years. But I can explore that end date.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

I was just curious if anyone was keeping notes to this meeting.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I am recording it.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Are you? Is it possible to, and that might be a big job, but transcribe. I mean to keep everyone current on what was discussed.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Yep. Just like with the other meetings I will transcribe it and send the meeting notes out to you and actually all of our stakeholders.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

And the other thing I guess is to clarify, I can't remember the lady's name that you emailed me yesterday, is that who I would need to contact to get a copy of the original public comments that were submitted when it was designated? I think it would be good for all of us to read the original comments that were out there when it was originally designated, maybe things are changing now, who knows, I am just curious.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Marcheta Moulton is her name.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Ok. I've got that in an email somewhere. But I need to go through her to get that information?

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Yes.

**Unidentified from Anaktuvuk Pass**

On the second draft, can you send that earlier, like in a week or so? That way we could review what we are looking at right now.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

No. I am not going to be able to put a second draft out in a week.

**Unidentified male participant from Anaktuvuk Pass**

I mean before the meeting. Before the 11-9

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

A week before the meeting.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Oh, yes, yes, yes. Yeah, just like we did with this one. I think I gave you two weeks, I can give you more time than that before we actually meet. Give you enough time to review the document. I would be sending that to Paul Hugo since he is our Advisory Team member, he is welcome to share that, and then it would be sent out to a larger group shortly after that.

**Unidentified male participant from Anaktuvuk Pass**

Thank you very much.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

You're welcome.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

It would be good if we had time to review, summers are always really busy so.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Yes, I understand. I can try to, as I get different pieces complete too, I can send you chunks as well. I think we'll need to do that anyways because I will need your input.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

That might be good.

**Burke Barrick – Captain, Alaska State Troopers:**

I don't know if you had a copy of that 95' document but I found it in my drawer and thought I would bring it if anyone cares to have one.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

I am not sure. There was a Dalton Highway Advisory Board and I think this is the same year and there is a document, I think I sent everyone a link to that. I don't know what happened to that group. But I have not seen this component. I have seen the plan.

**Burke Barrick – Captain, Alaska State Troopers:**

I don't know if that is particularly helpful or not, but I did find it and there is some stuff in there that I thought was interesting.

**Lisa Jodwalis - Bureau of Land Management:**

I can make copies right now.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

For those of you who are on the phone, Captain Barrick from the Troopers gave me a summary of notes that were taken from committee meetings in 1995 and when I get to the office I will scan those and then send it to you via email.

So as far as scheduling the next meeting, stay tuned. We won't meet in person until probably, well I am not sure we'll need to meet in person before we do that next round of public meetings. And what I would ask from this group when we do the public meetings, we'll go to—I am not sure if we'll go to Barrow again but we probably will—but we'll go to Barrow, Deadhorse, Coldfoot, Wiseman, and Fairbanks—I would ask you to be present at those meetings to act as a voice for the Advisory Group. But again just stay tuned, it will be later on in the summer.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I would suggest if any way possible, I do think Nuiqsut is an important stop.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Ok. I have contacted them in many different ways. So I don't know. I am trying to get folks involved. I look to the North Slope Borough and your position to act on their behalf.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

I will share with you the contact information for the village liaisons in Nuiqsut.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

And I have talked with them.

**Ben Greene - North Slope Borough, Planning Department:**

They are slowly become cognizant with their role as liaisons. I will try to help.

**Kathlene Rowell – Facilitator:**

Ok.

I guess that's it.

Heidi, thank you very much for taking time to talk, I know it was a long meeting. And Bill, if you are still there, and Dave, I appreciate it.

And if you continue to have these questions about the scenic byways program, about the document, ask myself, Marcheta—she's open to answering these questions—and I will do my best to answer them as well.

**Heidi Schoppenhorst - Community of Wiseman/Boreal Lodge:**

Ok well I appreciate being a participant and I appreciate everyone listening and considering my comments as well. Everyone take care, I guess the meeting is over.

[a round of “thank you” and “goodbyes”]