

DRAFT
GUIDELINES
for
DEVELOPING
JOINT
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
and
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLANS
Process and Contents
August 1999

PREPARED BY THE
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON OFFICE, OPERATIONS AND EDUCATION

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Proposed Air Tour Management Plan Process	2
Air Tour Operator Initiates Process	2
Air Tour Management Plan Started (1-2 Months*)	3
Public Scoping and Planning Orientation and Analysis Completed (2-4 Months)	4
Alternatives Developed (2-4 Months)	6
Draft Air Tour Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement or Environmental Assessment Prepared and Distributed (6-12 Months)	7
The EA or EIS Process Completed	7
Final Outcome: Federal Aviation Administration Issues Operation Specifications (with or without Limitations) for Park Flightseeing Based on Air Tour Management Plan or Denies Air Tours at the Park Unit	8
Proposed Air Tour Management Plan Contents	9
Purpose of and Need for the Plan	9
Alternatives	12
Affected Environment	13
Environmental Consequences	14
Consultation and Coordination	14
Appendixes, Bibliography, Planning Team Members, and Index	14

INTRODUCTION

In 1996 President Clinton directed his administration to take actions that would lead to the establishment of a regulatory framework for managing sightseeing aircraft flights over units of the national park system and to maintain and restore natural quiet in the national parks. To accomplish this, the National Parks Overflights Working Group (NPOWG), composed of individuals from the private sector, was established jointly by the Departments of the Interior (National Park Service) and Transportation (Federal Aviation Administration). This working group developed consensus on a series of recommendations that were forwarded to the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service. The Federal Aviation Administration, assisted by the National Park Service and by two NPOWG members designated by the full working group, is developing a "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" based on these recommendations, which were endorsed by the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee and by the National Park System Advisory Board.

Although congressional action, actions by several local governments, and actions by other federal agencies have tried to address these issues at a few specific parks, no one had been able to propose an approach that would aid the protection and restoration of natural quiet in the parks and also gain significant support from both environmental and aviation communities. The National Parks Overflights Working Group has achieved a consensus beyond what most observers believed possible. The proposed procedure recognizes the Federal Aviation Administration's responsibility and authority to manage the nation's airspace to ensure the safety and efficiency of aviation, and also recognizes the National Park Service's responsibility and authority to protect park resources, values, and visitor experiences.

Legislation to establish the NPOWG recommendations as federal law has been passed in both the House and the Senate. As of the writing of this document, the legislative differences between the two branches of Congress should be resolved in conference in September 1999.

A key element of the NPOWG proposal is the development of air tour management plans (ATMPs). Because of the National Park Service Denver Service Center Resource Planning group's familiarity with the planning process, this group was contracted to develop proposed joint National Park Service and Federal Aviation Administration guidelines for producing air tour management plans as envisioned by the National Parks Overflights Working Group. These guidelines are presented in this document, which is divided into two components. The first section is a detailed outline of the process for joint development of air tour management plans. The second component presents the likely contents of the air tour management plans (based upon the NPOWG-recommended requirements in the proposed rule, National Park Service planning guidelines and policies, the National Environmental Policy Act, and National Historic Preservation Act).

PROPOSED AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS

The detailed outline for the proposed ATMP process incorporates the necessary steps to meet National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance requirements, fosters close cooperation and coordination between the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service and with interested publics, and incorporates relevant park planning and the NPOWG recommended rule stipulations for air tour management plans. Various examples are used in this outline to illustrate the desired content, but the examples are not intended to include all possible options.

AIR TOUR OPERATOR Initiates Process

Air Tour Operator Requests to Continue Existing Service via Interim Operating Authority

- An air tour operator already operating commercial air tours within 0.5 mile outside the boundary of a park and below 5,000 feet above ground level over the park or less than 1 mile laterally from any geographic feature within the park may continue to do so provided that, within 90 days after the effective date of the final rule, (1) An air tour operator conducting air tours under Part 91 applies for an operating certificate under Part 119; or (2) An air tour operator conducting operations under Part 121 or 135 applies for appropriate operations specifications. The air tour operator would meet with the park superintendent and the appropriate Federal Aviation Administration official to develop an interim operating authority (IOA) that embodies the existing service, as documented to Federal Aviation Administration and National Park Service satisfaction. The parties may agree on any modifications to the interim operating authority that improves protection of park resources and values.
- The draft interim operating authority would be presented to the public for information and comment. Pertinent public comments would be considered in developing the final interim operating authority.
- An interim operating authority (a letter to the air tour operator signed by the park superintendent and the designated Federal Aviation Administration representative) that incorporates the agreed-upon operations and requirements (including any reporting requirements) would be issued to the air tour operator. The interim operating authority would remain in place until the park's air tour management plan is developed and approved.
- An air tour operator's application to the Federal Aviation Administration for an operating certificate or operations specifications, as appropriate, also triggers the initiation of an air tour management plan (ATMP), to be developed jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service.

- An air tour operator conducting air tour operations under Part 91 but not applying for an operating certificate under Part 119 must meet the very limited exception described in the rule (no more than a combined total of five flights per 30-day period for all such operators), and must secure a letter of agreement signed by the Federal Aviation Administration and the park superintendent describing the conditions under which such flights will be conducted.

New Air Tour Operator Applies for Part 135 Operations Specifications

- A new air tour operator who desires to begin flying commercial air tours within 0.5 mile outside the boundary of a park and below 5,000 feet above ground level over the park or less than 1 mile laterally from any geographic feature within the park must apply to the Federal Aviation Administration for operations specifications.
- Federal Aviation Administration staff would notify the National Park Service that a formal proposal has been submitted by the air tour operator to conduct air tours over the park.
- A joint Federal Aviation Administration-National Park Service ATMP process would be initiated upon receipt of the aforementioned operator's completed application.

AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS Started (1-2 MONTHS¹)

Conduct Internal Scoping Meeting

Appropriate Federal Aviation Administration staff and park superintendent would initiate the ATMP process by convening an internal scoping meeting that includes the joint Federal Aviation Administration-National Park Service planning team. The purpose of the meeting would be to agree on the following:

- the sufficiency of data (e.g., aircraft operations data, noise or other impact data, visitor surveys, information on critical wildlife habitat and cultural resources, etc.) and the need for new or updated data
- the relationship to other park plans, including the park's general management plan, resource management plan, and visitor services plan
- compliance: the NEPA process must be followed, including making a decision on whether to develop (1) an environmental assessment (EA) leading to either issuance of a finding of no significant impact or (2) the preparation of a notice of intent, draft environmental impact statement (EIS), final environmental impact statement, and record of decision
- interdisciplinary planning team composition: identify core members and consultants

¹ Time estimates are based upon close coordination and communication between cooperating agencies and any necessary research being conducted quickly.

- schedule
- public involvement approach: determine political and public situation and develop an appropriate public involvement strategy. How many public meetings should be held and where? Would news releases and/or newsletters be appropriate?
- products: scoping letter, newsletter(s), alternatives workbook, environmental documents, draft and final air tour management plans
- scope of work: What are the parameters of the project? Will it entail one park or will two or more parks be included in the air tour management plan?
- roles and responsibilities for Federal Aviation Administration staff, National Park Service staff (park and planning team), air tour operator(s), Native American tribe(s), if appropriate, and any other stakeholders (nearby or adjacent private landowners, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, etc.)
- costs for data acquisition, travel, salaries, and plan production

Prepare Joint Federal Aviation-National Park Service Project Agreement

The project agreement would be a contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and various National Park Service offices and would include the aforementioned internal scoping meeting agreements (scope of work). The planning team leader would write the project agreement, and it would be approved by the park superintendent and the designated Federal Aviation Administration representative.

PUBLIC SCOPING AND PLANNING ORIENTATION AND ANALYSIS conducted (2-4 MONTHS)

Identify, Acquire, and Analyze Data

During the public scoping period, appropriate Federal Aviation Administration and National Park Service personnel (superintendent, park staff, and planning team members) would identify data needs, and analyze data and/or initiate necessary research or procurement of required data (e.g., visitor use, acoustical sampling and monitoring, critical wildlife habitat, significant park resources, and wilderness). If extensive data were required, this planning phase would take longer than 2-4 months because noise and vibration data and visitor surveys may have to be collected and conducted at the peak tourist season when the greatest aircraft impacts on park visitors are expected.

Team Orientation Trip

Conduct joint Federal Aviation Administration-National Park Service planning team orientation trip to:

- confirm park purpose and significance statements, management zoning, sensitive areas for wildlife, visitor experiences, Native American lands, etc., and how the proposed overflight(s) relate to them
- enhance team members' familiarity with the park resources and related issues and the overflight proposal(s), status, and air tour issues, including Federal Aviation Administration safety and operation concerns and Native American issues. If appropriate, the planning team would meet with Native American tribe(s) and any other stakeholders to discuss their concerns.

Initiate Public Scoping

The National Park Service planning team leader in conjunction with the Federal Aviation Administration counterpart would prepare and distribute a joint notice of intent in the *Federal Register* (if an environmental impact statement is to be prepared) and a public scoping newsletter (may also post the newsletter on the Internet). The purpose of the notice of intent/newsletter would be to (1) inform the public about the overflight proposal(s), issues, process, and schedule, and (2) request comments on the scope of the plan and provide information on any scoping meetings. If significant historic resources might be affected by the plan, the state historic preservation office (SHPO) would be contacted and apprised of the situation, issues, and scope of the project. If significant natural resources might be affected by the plan (e.g., threatened and endangered species), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the appropriate state wildlife agency would also be consulted. Ultimately, the primary purpose of public scoping is to assist in determining the range of issues and impacts to be addressed in the NEPA document.

Conduct Public Scoping Meetings

The joint planning team would then conduct public scoping meetings at a location(s) in or near the park and/or in the regional area. The purpose of the meeting(s) would be to inform the public about the overflight proposal(s), issues, major impacts, process, and schedule and to obtain public comments.

Analyze Public Comments

Subsequent to the initial public scoping period, the joint planning team would analyze public comments and confirm or modify the ATMP scope of work accordingly.

ALTERNATIVES Developed (2-4 MONTHS)

Prepare Preliminary Alternatives

After public comments were obtained from the scoping publications and scoping meetings, the joint Federal Aviation Administration-National Park Service planning team (includes the designated Federal Aviation Administration representative and the park superintendent) would develop a preliminary set of alternatives that would cover a reasonable range of overflight options, including a no-action alternative.

Conduct Public Involvement

The joint planning team would then prepare and distribute a public alternatives workbook and/or conduct workshops on the draft alternatives at the park and in the regional area. If necessary, the state historic preservation office, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, other appropriate federal agencies, and state and local governments, organizations, and individuals would also be involved in this stage of planning.

Analyze Public Involvement and Select a Proposed Action

Subsequently, the joint planning team would meet to analyze public comments on the workbook and/or alternatives meetings. Planning team members would modify the preliminary alternatives according to pertinent public input and then select a proposed action. Modifications to the alternatives and selection of a proposed action would require agreement between the designated Federal Aviation Administration representative and the park superintendent.

Brief Agency Leaders.

Senior planning team members from both agencies would brief their agency leadership on the selected proposed action. For the National Park Service, the job captain and park superintendent would brief the regional director.

DRAFT AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT OR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT Prepared and Distributed (6-12 MONTHS)

Prepare Draft Report

The joint planning team would prepare an air tour management plan / environmental assessment or a draft air tour management plan / environmental impact statement. The Federal Aviation Administration would be responsible for writing the air tour operations and safety sections of the plan, and the National Park Service would focus on the park-related components of the plan (including park visitor experiences and natural and

cultural resources). The draft plan would then be distributed for Federal Aviation Administration and National Park Service internal review and analysis prior to submittal and request for comments by the air tour operator(s), Native American tribe(s), and any other stakeholders.

Review and Print Draft Report

The joint planning team would meet and agree upon the internal review comments to be incorporated in the document (the senior planning team members from each agency would need to concur on the changes). The draft plan would be printed and distributed to the public for review and comment (may also post on the Internet if desired).

Conduct Public Meetings

Public meetings on the draft plan would be held by the joint planning team as appropriate depending on the issues, stakeholders, and level of public interest and controversy. Meetings could also be conducted with appropriate federal, state, and local government officials.

THE EA OR EIS PROCESS Completed

At this point in the process, the completion for an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement are different. The following steps describe these differences.

For an EA Process: Prepare and Distribute a Finding of No Significant Impact (1 Month)

If an environmental assessment has been prepared and the proposed action is determined to constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the human environment, a separate EIS process (see below) would be initiated. However, if it is determined that the proposed action in an environmental assessment would not constitute a major federal action that significantly affects the quality of the human environment, a separate "Finding of No Significant Impact" would be prepared after the public review period (usually 30 days), signed by joint Federal Aviation Administration and National Park Service signatories, and distributed to the public. This would end the NEPA process for an environmental assessment.

OR

For an EIS Process — Prepare and Distribute Final Air Tour Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (5-7 Months) and Prepare a Record of Decision (1 Month)

Analyze Public Comments. At the end of the public 60-day review period for the draft

document, the joint planning team would meet and analyze the public comments. The senior members from each agency would agree on modifications to the document.

Prepare Final Plan. The joint Federal Aviation Administration-National Park Service planning team would then prepare a final air tour management plan / environmental impact statement and distribute it for internal review as per the draft plan. The final plan / environmental impact statement would include responses to substantive comments on the draft plan received from agencies, organizations, Native American tribe(s), and the general public.

Review, Print, and Distribute Final Plan. The joint planning team would meet and agree upon the internal review comments to be incorporated in the document (senior agency planning team members would need to concur on the changes). The final plan would be printed and distributed to the public and appropriate government agencies for their information and comment (may also post on the Internet if desired).

Prepare a Record of Decision (ROD). At the end of a 30-day public “no action” period following distribution of the final air tour management plan / environmental impact statement, the joint planning team would prepare a “Record of Decision” and distribute it for review (Federal Aviation Administration, National Park Service, air tour operator, Native American tribe(s), and any other stakeholders). The “Record of Decision” would include the rationale for selection of an alternative, as well as appropriate mitigation measures to minimize environmental harm.

Print and Distribute Record of Decision. Review comments would be incorporated in the “Record of Decision” (as agreed upon by the senior agency planning team members), signed by joint Federal Aviation Administration and National Park Service signatories, printed, and distributed to the public. This would end the NEPA requirements for the EIS process.

Final Outcome: FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION ISSUES OPERATIONS SPECIFICATIONS (WITH OR WITHOUT LIMITATIONS) FOR PARK FLIGHTSEEING BASED ON AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN OR DENIES AIR TOURS AT THE PARK UNIT

PROPOSED AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN Contents

The proposed contents of an air tour management plan incorporate the components necessary to meet National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance requirements and are designed to dovetail with the park's general management plan and other pertinent park documents and the NPOWG recommended rule stipulations. All air tour management plans will require either an environmental assessment (EA) or an environmental impact statement (EIS). In most cases, an environmental impact statement will be necessary due to the complexity and controversial nature of the issues.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PLAN

This introductory section would explain why an air tour management plan is being prepared, what are the associated problems, what is the purpose and significance of the park, what are the air tour and park planning backgrounds, and what are the relevant park studies. This section would not be a major component of the plan, but it should be sufficient in description so that the reader has a good understanding of why the plan is being prepared and what are the parameters. Graphics orienting the reader to the area and any illustrations necessary to enhance understanding of the problems should be used.

Introduction

The introduction should provide the appropriate background material about air tour management plans; the relationship of the air tour management plans to other park plans; an overview of the park and the regional area; the history and status of the park overflights; the roles and responsibilities of the Federal Aviation Administration (lead agency), National Park Service (cooperating agency), and other cooperating agencies and entities; and any other pertinent background information. Listed below are the major components of this section, the contents, and some examples to enhance understanding.

Air Tour Management Plan Background. This section should describe the background and intent of these plans. Below are some of the major points that should be discussed.

- President Clinton's April 22, 1996 Executive Order: This order directed the Administration to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to establish a regulatory framework for the management of sightseeing aircraft over units of the national park system and to maintain and restore natural quiet in the national parks.
- Briefly describe the formulation of the National Park Overflights Working Group: Describe its composition (private sector), its objectives (if air tour flights are not prohibited, they must be conducted in a manner that will protect park resources, values, and visitor experiences), its philosophy (where appropriate allow commercial air tours of parks but protect park resources and the visitor experiences, including natural quiet), and its products (national rulemaking).
- The development of the national rule: Present major points (e.g., legislation reflects the

NPOWG recommendations, definitions and the applicability of the rule to the ATMP process, Part 135 of the national rule, fees, interim operating authority, ATMP requirements, the process for air tour operators to follow when they apply for their park operations specifications, enforcement, and compliance monitoring) and provide examples to illustrate the major points.

- The establishment of National Park Service policy for air tour management plans: Describe when they are required, what the criteria are for developing them, and what is the process.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Lead and Cooperating Agencies. The Federal Aviation Administration is the lead agency and the National Park Service is the cooperating agency in developing the air tour management plan. The roles and responsibilities of each agency need to be clearly described so that there are no misunderstandings on the process and how decisions are made. If other agencies (e.g., the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or state parks), Native American tribe(s), or private stakeholders are affected by the proposed air tour(s), their roles and responsibilities also need to be clearly articulated.

Relationship of this Plan to Other Pertinent Park Plans. The air tour management plan needs to be closely correlated with the major park planning documents (e.g., general management plan, resource management plan, and visitor services plan), National Park Service management policies, and other relevant policies, laws, and regulations. The park's general management plan provides the long-range (15-20 years) management approach for the park. The resource management plan presents key natural and cultural resource research results and the appropriate management actions to maintain the park ecosystems and cultural resources. The visitor services plan focuses on the visitor experience as it relates to the concessionaire and services from the National Park Service.

Park management zoning presented in the general management plan establishes the management prescriptions to ensure resource protection and quality visitor experiences. Any park management zoning should be reproduced in the air tour management plan, and the zoning criteria and desired resource protection and visitor experiences for each zone should also be discussed. The park goals, desired future conditions, and management objectives that are provided in the park's general management plan should also be included in this section. Pertinent components of the resource management plan and visitor services plan that relate to critical wildlife habitats and appropriate visitor experiences should also be presented. If there is a conflict between the park air tour routes and the desired management zoning, goals, desired future conditions, and management objectives, it is presented in the "Issues and Concerns" section.

Park Purpose and Significance. The reason(s) why the park was established and the significant resources of the park should be presented in this section. The park's enabling legislation contains the purpose(s) for establishing the park (e.g., to preserve and protect the park's unique natural and cultural resources and to provide for an enjoyable visitor

experience). The significance of the park resources can also be gleaned from the enabling legislation, but additional information may be obtained from the park's general management plan, previous planning documents, technical literature, scientific studies, and popular accounts. An example of a significant park resource is Crater Lake (i.e., it is the seventh deepest freshwater lake in the world and is renowned for its clarity, blue color, size, mountain setting, and ever-changing character).

Overview of the Park and the Status of Park Overflights. To orient the reader to the park and park overflight situation, the following information should be provided: a general description of the park and region; the park's location, access corridors, major developed areas, visitor facilities, and visitor experiences; and the status of the park's air tour operations.

If there are no park overflights, this section should discuss what an air tour management plan is, what actions triggered the development of the plan, what NEPA compliance documentation would be required, and how and who would develop the plan. If there are existing park overflights, this section should discuss what the process is for continuing these flightseeing operations (interim operating authority until a park air tour management plan is developed) and how the process is conducted.

Issues and Concerns. This section focuses on presenting the issues and concerns associated with air tours adjacent to or over the park. The issues and concerns are usually initially identified by the park staff, but interested citizens, park visitors, organizations, and other government agencies may also voice concerns. The initial list of air tour issues and concerns is subsequently refined during the scoping process.

In the plan, the issues should be presented succinctly but with enough information that they are understood. Proposed actions to resolve the issues or desired results (needs) are not incorporated in the issues discussion; they are incorporated in the alternatives.

The park air tour problems can be categorized in two areas -- those affecting the park resources and visitor experiences and those associated with the air tour operator. Below are some examples of issues and concerns from the air tour operator's and park staff's perspectives:

- Air Tour Operator
 - * safety problem with current overflight pattern(s)
 - * economic viability of operation due to limited number of overflights -- current limited flightseeing does not concur with marketing analysis or operator's business plan
 - * numerous requests by aircraft overflight clients to see additional park resources
- Park Resources and Visitor Experiences
 - * disturbance to critical park wildlife (e.g., elk during calving season and bighorn sheep in critical summer habitat)
 - * affects on various user groups (e.g., retain natural quiet in remote wilderness and/or park areas and nearby Native American lands)

Alternatives

The alternatives that are formulated should address to varying degrees the identified issues and concerns; be in accordance with the park purpose, significance, goals, and management objectives; and be logical, feasible solutions to protecting park resources, the quality of park visitor experiences (in the air as well as on the ground), and any significant values on adjacent lands (e.g., Native American lands, other federal lands, state lands, and/or private lands). Wherever possible, at least one of the alternatives should also provide viable air tour operations that are enjoyable and educational flightseeing experiences. For both an environmental assessment and an environmental impact statement, there must be at a minimum a no-action alternative and a proposed action in the park's air tour management plan. In addition, there should be a range of other pertinent feasible alternatives. Following is a scenario of the plan alternatives.

- **No Action :** Describe a continuation of existing conditions and trends (the current frequency and flight patterns of air tours are continued or the absence of overflights is perpetuated).
- **Proposed Action:** Describe a preferred course of action, such as
 - * continue air tours but with modifications -- change in route, elevation, time of day, season, frequency, etc.
 - * expand or reduce number of air tour operations with or without restrictions
 - * eliminate air tours over the park
- **Other Action Alternatives :** Include appropriate air tour variations that are not included in the proposed action
- **Alternatives Considered but Rejected:** Other alternative air tour scenarios that were considered during the planning process but were rejected due to the reasons documented in this section, such as the potential negative impacts on park resources, park visitor experiences, and/or the air tour operator(s)
- **Summary Tables of Alternatives and Impacts :** At the end of "The Alternatives" section, summary tables of the alternatives and their impacts on the park and regional environment, the air tour operator, and the adjacent lands should be provided.

Affected Environment

The "Affected Environment" section should present the natural, cultural, and socioeconomic resource descriptions that is directly related to the park air tour issues, concerns, and impact topics that were identified during the scoping process. It is not an extensive section and should only present information that is pertinent to the park air tour situation. Use of graphics, charts, and tables to enhance understanding of the

environmental situation is appropriate. Below are some examples of affected environment discussions:

Natural Environment : affected physical and biological components of the park environment

- * scenic geologic formations (e.g., canyons, arches, waterfalls, and high plateaus)
- * wildlife (e.g., critical habitat for threatened and/or endangered species, elk calving grounds, and critical summer range for bighorn sheep)
- * vegetation (e.g., fall colors and types -- different types of vegetation can affect noise levels)

Cultural Environment -- affected prehistoric, historic, and ethnographic resources of the park

- * Native American lands
- * historic sites (e.g., battlefields, cemeteries, and cultural landscapes)
- * air tour attractions such as ruins, monuments (Mt. Rushmore), and historic homes

Socioeconomic Environment -- existing noise levels, existing visual quality, and affected regional, local, and park economic and social situations

- * remote wilderness and/or park areas where natural quiet would be appropriate
- * visitor responses to aircraft overflights over major park visitation areas
- * air tour operator(s) status (e.g., number of air tour operators, aircraft, and flights/operations; safety situation; operations specifications; local economic air tour operator's environment; overflight visitor experience; and numbers of park visitors flightseeing)
- * relationship of air tours to the other tourism and business opportunities associated with the park, etc.
- * management zoning, as presented in the park's general management plan

Environmental Consequences

The "Environmental Consequences" section should present an analysis of the natural, cultural, and socioeconomic impacts (includes noise and visual impacts associated with park air tour operations) of the proposed air tour alternatives on significant park resources, the park visitor experiences, any adjacent Native American lands, significant values of other adjacent landowners, and the air tour operator(s). The impacts should be directly related to the issues and concerns identified during the scoping process and dovetail with the "Affected Environment" section discussion. Noise and visual impacts (direct and indirect) associated with park air tour operations should be presented in this section. Unavoidable adverse impacts, irreversible and irretrievable commitments of

resources, the relationship between the local short-term use of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and cumulative impacts should also be presented in this section. Cumulative impacts are impacts on the environment resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.

Consultation and Coordination

This section should provide a list or discussion of the federal, state, and local agencies, Native American tribe(s), organizations, and other publics contacted during the course of the planning effort. It should also describe the public involvement process used during preparation of the plan, and in the final environmental impact statement it provides an accurate, comprehensive presentation of the agency and public comments received on the draft document and the National Park Service response to those comments.

Appendixes, Bibliography, PLANNING Team Members, and Index

Appendixes. Provide additional pertinent background information, which could include aircraft overflight rule, appropriate noise data, visitor survey results, etc.

Bibliography. Provides all referenced and source materials.

Planning Team Members. Lists Federal Aviation Administration, National Park Service, Native American tribe(s) members, consultants, and experts

Index. Provides key word references in the plan (for EIS documents only).

LIST OF PREPARERS

Howie Thompson: Senior Planner, National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Resource Planning

Dr. Wes Henry: National Park Service National Coordinator for Aircraft Overflights and Wilderness Issues

Rick Ernenwein: Intermountain Support Office/Aircraft Overflight and Noise Program Coordinator