

Workshop 4.2, Fairbanks, Non-NPS Stakeholders, 10/14/04, 8:00-12:00 pm
Transcriber: Diane Breeding

- 4.2.1. Rate of sociological and ecological change in AK parks is rapid. Are we going to repeat problems of the past? How do we bring that change together in the uniqueness of AK parks (e.g., scenario analysis for planning)? (8 votes)
- 4.2.2. Conservation, subsistence values, effects of subsistence on parks and effects of parks on subsistence. (7 votes)
- 4.2.3. NPS role in gateway community planning—what are the economic, social, ecological linkages between parks and adjacent communities? (4 votes)
- 4.2.4. Need to understand stakeholder attitudes and concerns, particularly those who are not at the table. (6 votes)
- 4.2.5. Need to do research that is stratified—e.g., urban and rural strata at a minimum and where appropriate. (0 votes)
- 4.2.6. Region-wide baseline data on what needs and motives users seek and desire to achieve helps in marketing (of federal agencies); helps in marketing together so we can meet federal mandates and understanding positive psychological outcomes. (7 votes)
- 4.2.7. Identify social indicators of change that show an area may be changing or be altered from management goals and expectations. (0 votes)
- 4.2.8. How has the use of parks changed over the past 20 years and how can we expect it to change over the next 20 years? (1 vote)
- 4.2.9. How is recreation changing (extreme sports, etc.)? What is happening with traditional, non-motorized backcountry recreation? (3 votes)
- 4.2.10. What is the impact of park interpretive materials about indigenous cultures on stereotyping by visitors? (2 votes)
- 4.2.11. How does federal-level park policy on park personnel affect the relationship between local communities and parks, e.g., employee rotation system? (0 votes)
- 4.2.12. How to effectively develop local knowledge and sensitivity in new park employees. (1 vote)
- 4.2.13. How can parks preserve central subsistence values and resources into the future? (0 votes)

- 4.2.14. Importance of identifying land use trends and working on quantifying type of growth (e.g., road vs. non-road access). (1 vote)
- 4.2.15. What impacts do visitors' expectations have on park management practices (e.g., "frontier" expectations). (0 votes)
- 4.2.16. Test attitudinal frameworks from more urban areas to see if they apply in AK (from published literature), including values, attitudes, behavior. (0 votes)
- 4.2.17. Evaluate needs and motives of residents, visitors, and subsistence users (a reason why agencies should work together). (0 votes)
- 4.2.18. Are sportsmen's, hunters', fishers' expectations being met, and what are their expectations? (0 votes)
- 4.2.19. What use conflicts have affected the park experience and how? e.g ATVs. (2 votes)
- 4.2.20. How are parks/public lands being marketed by media and tour operators through technology, e.g., through individual personal websites? What is the effect on inquiries/visitation? (0 votes)
- 4.2.21. Can technology be implemented to give access to special populations (virtual tours) and to reduce impacts on park resources? (2 votes)
- 4.2.22. How can traditional knowledge/local knowledge affect park management (what is it, where does it fit, best methods)? (2 votes)
- 4.2.23. How to include conservation and subsistence in basic park planning? (0 votes)
- 4.2.24. How will parks work outside boundaries to maintain ecological processes, etc. (e.g., deal with outside threats)? (0 votes)
- 4.2.25. What can be done to enhance communication between NPS and communities outside park boundaries? (0 votes)
- 4.2.26. How do we best sample visitors in remote units with dispersed use? (2 votes)
- 4.2.27. How do improvements to park infrastructure and park infrastructure increases affect visitor and local perspectives, and how does NPS incorporate these perspectives into planning? (0 votes)
- 4.2.28. Identify users on regional scale and why they make the choices they do. Can we quantify qualitative experiences for management? (2 votes)

- 4.2.29. Where could managers do a better job meeting visitor needs and how, (but not including just facilities and information), but user conflicts, regulations, etc.? (0 votes)
- 4.2.30. What is the makeup of the gateway communities and how have they changed? Where have they been and where are they going (in terms subsistence uses, tourism, business opportunities, adopted lifestyles vs. traditional ways of life)? How do these affect management decisions? (2 votes)
- 4.2.31. What is the impact of rail into Denali NP? (0 votes)
- 4.2.32. What are different methods and evaluations of different technologies (e.g., GIS) to use in decision support for planning (what works)? (1 vote)
- 4.2.33. How can GIS contribute to more effective public participation? (0 votes)
- 4.2.34. How are some parks under-utilized because of access barriers (who are people under-utilizing public lands, i.e., the “King’s Lands”-*socio economic barriers*). (3 votes)
- 4.2.35. How do visitors get their information on where to go and what to do? What information is lacking? (2 votes)

Workshop 4.2, Fairbanks, Non-NPS Stakeholders, 10/14/04, 8:00-12:00 pm
Who should do the research?
Transcriber: Diane Breeding

4.2.1.

University of Alaska

Other stakeholders

Experts

Parks

Visitors, users, residents

4.2.2.

NPS and environmental groups, e.g., Northern AK Environmental Center, S.E. AK Conservation Council, ACE (Anchorage Center for the Environment), tribal entities, SACs, Federal Subsistence Board.

4.2.6.

FWS

U.S. Forest Service

BLM

State agencies (Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, state parks)

NPS

4.2.4.

Subsistence groups, sport hunting groups, environmental groups

Visitors, concerned citizens

NPS and other agencies

4.2.3.

Borough planning agencies

State parks

Local vol./community planning councils, chambers of commerce, AK Tourism Council

University of Alaska—Fairbanks

Concerned citizens