

***Analysis of Public Input on the
Comprehensive Studies for the
Decommissioning of the Airstrips in
Banff & Jasper National Parks of
Canada, Alberta***

Submitted By:
STRATEGY PLUS, Edmonton, AB

Submitted To:
PARKS CANADA, Calgary, AB

March 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
I. Background and Process.....	1
I.1. Purpose of Public Consultation	1
I.2. Background.....	1
I.3. Process.....	1
I.4. Input Received	2
I.5. Analysis of Input	3
II. General Information Regarding Respondents.....	4
II.1. Airstrip in Question.....	4
II.2. Support/Non Support for Decommissioning	4
II.3. Responses from Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots	5
II.4. Place of Residence of Respondents	5
II.5. Place of Residence by Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots	6
II.6. Respondent Group Size.....	7
II.7. Number of Comments by Individual Respondents.....	8
III. Comparisons Between Respondent Groups Regarding Awareness	12
III.1. Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips by Airstrip Identified	12
III.2. Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips	13
III.3. Place of Residence by Awareness of Closed Status	14
IV. Analysis of Specific Comments and Concerns.....	17
IV.1. Frequency of Comments.....	17
IV.2. Comparison of Comments by Self-Identified Pilots and Non-Pilots	23
IV.3. Comments by Respondents Aware/Not Aware of Closed Status of Airstrips	33
IV.4. Number of Comments Per Submission	42
IV.5. Comments by Place of Residence	46
IV.6. Comments Suggesting Mitigations.....	54

APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Appendix 1</u>	57
Appendix 1.1: Comment Codes (Full List).....	58
Appendix 1.2: Collapsed Comment Codes	60
 <u>Appendix 2</u>	 62
Appendix 2.1: Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked Based on “Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips”	63
Appendix 2.2: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta	67
Appendix 2.3: Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta	70
Appendix 2.4: Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked By Total Alberta	72
Appendix 2.5: Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta	75
Appendix 2.6: Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta	77
Appendix 2.7: Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked By Total Alberta	79

TABLES

Table 1	Airstrip Mentioned in Submission	4
Table 2	Support/Non Support for Decommissioning	4
Table 3	Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Total Submissions and by Airstrip.....	5
Table 4	Place of Residence of Respondents by Number of Submissions	6
Table 5	Place of Residence by Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots.....	7
Table 6	Group Size by Total Submissions and by Airstrip	8
Table 7	Awareness Closure by Number of Comments	8
Table 8	Place of Residence by Number of Comments Per Submission	9
Table 9	Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Number of Comments.....	10
Table 10	Group Size by Number of Comments	11
Table 11	Closure Awareness by Total Submissions and Airstrip	12
Table 12	Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots Awareness of Closure of Airstrip	13
Table 13	Place of Residence by Awareness of Closure.....	15
Table 14	Frequency of Collapsed Comments Based on Responses Identifying “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”	21
Table 15	Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”	28
Table 16	Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Non-Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”	31
Table 17	Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Awareness.....	38
Table 18	Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Non-Awareness Responses	41
Table 19	Frequency of Comments by Submissions With One and Two or More Comments...43	43
Table 20	Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence by Total Alberta	48
Table 21	Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Alberta Place of Residence by Total Alberta	51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Purpose of Consultation

This report presents and analyzes public input regarding the Comprehensive Studies completed by Highwood Environmental Management in March 2002 and the Air Safety Risk Assessment prepared by Kootenay International Associates in July 2003 relative to the proposed decommissioning of the Banff and Jasper Airstrips.

These studies resulted from a court challenge by airstrip users in 1997 following closure of the two airstrips to all but emergency or diversionary access. Access by the general aviation public for recreation or other purposes is currently not allowed at either airstrip.

The consultation process for review of the three reports was formulated by Parks Canada with input from major stakeholders, including the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA), the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS), and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). *Strategy Plus* of Edmonton was contracted as a third party to receive, compile and analyze the public input and comments relative to the three reports.

The three reports were posted on the Parks Canada websites for Banff and Jasper National Parks. Printed copies of the reports were also made available for public review in Banff, Jasper, Calgary, Edmonton, and Ottawa. The public was invited to provide comments relative to these reports during the consultation period that ran from September 27 to November 29, 2004. Advertisements regarding the review were provided on the Parks Canada websites and in regional newspapers. Major stakeholder groups were also notified, and they in turn advised their membership of the consultation process.

Neither formalized comment forms nor specific questions to address were provided to the public for use in their review. This open-ended approach was adopted to ensure that there was no perception of bias.

Who Responded

A total of 1,512 valid submissions with 4,363 specific comments were received during the two month consultation period. Submissions were received by e-mail, fax or regular mail by *Strategy Plus*. Any mailed submissions post marked no later than November 29, 2004 and received by December 6, 2004 are included in the analysis.

An additional 9 e-mail, 1 fax and 3 letters postmarked after November 29, 2004 were received. These were not included in the analysis, but have been provided to Parks Canada for information.

Of the total 1,512 submissions, the majority referred to both Banff and Jasper airstrips (1,402 or 92.7%), while 69 (4.6%) referred only to the Banff airstrip in their comments, and 41 (2.7%) referred only to the Jasper airstrip.

Respondents were not asked to identify themselves as pilots or non-pilots, although many did identify themselves. The majority of submissions received were from self-identified pilots (1,167 or 77.2%).

A further 96 or 6.3% of submissions were from self-identified non-pilots, and it was not clear from the remaining 249 submissions (16.5%) if they were from pilots or non-pilots.

Respondents were not asked to identify their place of residence, although many respondents did provide the information, either in return addresses or in information provided within the content of the submission. As a result of the analysis of the place of residence information that was provided, it is evident that decommissioning of the airstrips is of interest to residents from across Canada and the United States.

The highest number of submissions was from Alberta (387 or 25.6%), followed by Ontario and eastern Canada (378 or 25.0%), and British Columbia (311 or 20.6%). If submissions from Alberta and British Columbia are combined, the response from the two western provinces accounts for 698 responses, or almost half of all 1,512 submissions (46.2%).

Further review of the place of residence of respondents from Alberta revealed a slightly higher level of response from Southern Alberta, including Red Deer and south (193) and Banff/Canmore (29) for a total of 222 responses (14.7%), than from Northern Alberta, which includes north of Red Deer (136) and Jasper (29), for a total of 165 (10.9%) of all submissions.

In addition, just over two-thirds of the respondents from Alberta were self-identified as pilots (262 or 67.7% of Alberta responses). Alberta also accounted for the highest number of submissions from self-identified non-pilots (49 or 12.7% of the total responses from Alberta). This may be indicative of greater awareness of issues in Banff and Jasper National Parks due to their location in Alberta.

Most of the respondents from British Columbia (266 of 311 or 85.5%), Saskatchewan/Manitoba/Territories (72 of 86 or 83.7%), Ontario and East (305 of 378 or 80.7%), and the United States (58 of 68 or 85.3%) were self-identified pilots. Collectively, self-identified pilots accounted for 701 or 83.2% of the 843 submissions from these jurisdictions.

Most submissions received were from individuals. A total of 1,430 (94.6%) of submissions were from an individual and 42 (2.8%) specifically represented input from 2 people.

A total of 28 (1.9%) submissions represented large groups or associations of 20 or more people. The remaining 12 submissions were from small groups ranging in size from 3 to 19 persons.

Of the 1,512 total submissions, 428 or 28.3% provided only one comment, while the remaining 1,084 or 71.7% of the total submissions provided two or more comments. In general, there were no significant differences in the nature of responses based on the number of comments per submission.

Support or Non-Support for Decommissioning

The majority of respondents do not support the proposed decommissioning of either airstrip. Of the 1,512 submissions, only 21 or 1.3% support decommissioning, one was neutral, and the remaining 1,490 or 98.5% did not support the proposed decommissioning of the airstrips.

Of the 21 respondents who support decommissioning of the airstrips, 12 or just over half (57.1%) specifically noted support for decommissioning of the Banff airstrip and 7 or one third supported decommissioning of both Banff and Jasper airstrips.

None of the 21 respondents supporting decommissioning of the airstrips were self-identified as pilots, and all provided more than one specific comment regarding the issue. The majority of specific comments supporting decommissioning were made by residents of Alberta (e.g., 18 of the 21 submissions indicating support for decommissioning are from Alberta). Of these, 14 were Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore, and only 4 were from Red Deer North and Jasper.

Most specific comments made did not support decommissioning of the airstrips, and the straight forward appeal to “keep the airstrips open” was made by 193 respondents (12.8% of all respondents and 4.4% of all comments).

Numerous respondents suggested that the airstrips should be maintained and expanded for tourism and recreation access (178 or 4.1% of all comments). Potential benefits for the local economy, recreation, tourism, environmental awareness, and fire reporting, etc., resulting from use of the airstrips, were identified 61 times (1.4% of all comments).

Others (29 or 0.7% of all comments) suggested that, in recognition of the location of the airstrips in national parks and/or the conflicting protection and enjoyment mandate of Parks Canada, the airstrips should be maintained for emergency or diversionary landings, but not re-opened as destination strips.

Awareness Regarding Current Closed Status of Airstrips

Of the 1,512 valid submissions included in the analysis of public input, almost one third (455 or 30.1%) clearly demonstrated awareness that both the Banff and Jasper airstrips are closed to general aviation and are available for emergency and diversionary use only.

A total of 88 (5.8%) of the submissions clearly demonstrated that they were not aware that the airstrips are currently closed to general aviation. It was unclear in the remaining 969 (64.1%) submissions whether or not the respondent was aware of the closed status.

There was not a clear indication that self-identified pilots were more aware of the closed status of the airstrips than non-pilots, although there was a slightly higher percent of pilots who demonstrated they were not aware of the closed status

Demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips is highest in Alberta (169) and British Columbia (105), collectively accounting for 60.2% of the 455 total responses that demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips. However, this only represents 18.1% of the total 1,512 submissions received. This may reflect more familiarity with Banff and Jasper National Parks by residents in Alberta and British Columbia. Only a small number of respondents from Alberta (15) and British Columbia (18) demonstrated non-awareness.

Ontario and Eastern Canada (27 or 30.7% of the 88 submissions indicating non-awareness) demonstrated the highest percentage of non-awareness of the closed status of the strips, although this is a small number, accounting for only 7.1% of the total 378 Ontario responses.

Overall, a wider range of comments was presented by those respondents who demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips (e.g., 38 different comments) than by those who demonstrated non-awareness (22).

The most noticeable difference was that 18 of the 21 respondents noting support for the proposed decommissioning of the airstrips demonstrated that they were aware of the closed status of the airstrips. Similarly, all specific comments that suggested there would be positive results from decommissioning (e.g., restoration of grasslands and biodiversity, positive impacts on wildlife, minimal impact on safety, and that airstrips are an inappropriate activity in National Parks) were made only by those demonstrating an awareness of the closed status (or it was unable to tell from the submission).

While both groups demonstrating and not demonstrating awareness of the closed status of the airstrips provided specific comments regarding why they should be maintained, a wider variety of comments was made by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status. This included support for maintaining the airstrips as emergency or diversionary landing sites, but not opening them up to recreational use, and the view that the government of Canada has an obligation to maintain the VFR routes through the mountains.

Suggestions for mitigations and comments regarding the validity and amount of data provided in the reports were noted only by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status

Concerns for Safety, Diversionary and Emergency Landings

Safety and having airstrips available for emergency or diversionary purposes was of concern to almost three quarters of all respondents, and the most frequently noted comment.

Almost 40% of respondents (592 of 1,512 submissions) or 13.6% of all 4,363 specific comments received and the second most frequent comment, noted that they “support the recommendation of the Air Safety Risk Assessment to keep both airstrips open for emergency and diversionary use, including runway markings, windsock and listings in the Canada Flight Supplement”. This wording repeats the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA) position and interpretation of the results of the *Air Safety Risk Assessment* report that COPA provided to their members via correspondence and their website

Concerns about the safety of air and highway vehicular traffic if highways are used for emergency landings were noted, and the comment was made several times that having airstrips for emergency or diversionary landings was comparable to having run off lanes on highways (152 or 3.5% of all specific comments).

Inaccurate weather forecasts, rapidly changing weather conditions, and reduced services from Navigation Canada mean that the airstrips provide an option for pilots running into unfavourable weather conditions (148 or 34% of all comments). Also, there are limited options for VFR routes through the Rocky Mountains and the government has an obligation to maintain these identified and preferred VFR routes through the mountains (115 or 2.6% of all specific comments).

The role that the airstrips can play during emergency evacuations, forest fires, medivac, and so on was also noted by both self-identified pilots (43 times) and non-pilots (6 times), although more frequently by self-identified pilots.

On the other hand, comments from 3 self-identified non-pilots (1.1% of 279 total specific comments from non-pilots) noted that decommissioning the airstrips would have a low to minimal negative impact on the safety of pilots. It was suggested that even if the airstrips were decommissioned, the grasslands would still be available for emergency landings if required.

Environment and Wildlife

Over one quarter of respondents (394) or 9.0% of all 4,363 specific comments received, noted that the airstrips have less of an impact on the environment than the highways, railways and other activities in the Parks. This was the third most frequently made comment.

A total of 211 submissions (13.9% of all respondents or 4.8% of all specific comments received) noted that decommissioning the airstrips will have little if any impact on wildlife. Some comments suggested that the use of helicopters by Parks Canada for wildlife surveys and other management activities and operations is inconsistent with decommissioning the airstrips.

Specific comments related to the role restoring grasslands has in maintaining biodiversity and providing interpretive opportunities were noted 30 times in the 21 submissions indicating support for the proposed decommissioning of the airstrips. Most of these specific comments were from Alberta (29 specific comments or 2.1% of all comments from Alberta), and one each from British Columbia and unknown. Of these, 24 specific comments were from Red Deer and South and Banff/Canmore and only 5 were from Red Deer North and Jasper.

The comment that impacts on wildlife would be negative if the airstrips weren't decommissioned or positive if they were was noted 15 times, all by Albertans (1.1% of all comments from Albertans). Again, most of the comments were from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore (13), compared to only 2 from Northern Alberta and Jasper.

Liability / Costs

Legal liability issues for Parks Canada in the likely event of an accident/fatality due to the decommissioning of the airstrips were identified 141 times or 3.2% of total specific comments.

Concerns about closing air access over National Parks and the seeming unfair targeting of air access versus highway access were noted 149 times or 3.4% of all specific comments.

Concerns with bureaucrats, government expenditures and political control for no reason were noted 54 times by self-identified pilots (1.6% of all comments from pilots) and 8 times by non-pilots (2.9% of all comments from non-pilots).

Self-identified pilots noted that Parks Canada is too concerned with the costs of operating and maintaining the airstrips (52 or 1.6% of all comments from pilots). This was supported by 4 non-pilots (1.4% of total comments from non-pilots).

Heritage

Both self-identified pilots (59 or 1.8% of all comments from pilots) and non-pilots (4 or 1.4% of all comments from non-pilots) noted that the airstrips are part of the heritage of both Banff and Jasper National Parks.

Mitigations Suggested

Mitigations were suggested 22 times, with most by respondents from Alberta (20 or 1.4% of comments from Alberta), and 2 were suggested by respondents from other areas. Of the Alberta residents, 16 were from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore, and 4 were from Northern Alberta and Jasper.

**Report on PUBLIC INPUT
COMPREHENSIVE STUDIES FOR THE DECOMMISSIONING
OF BANFF AND JASPER AIRSTRIPS**

I. BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

I.1. Purpose of Public Consultation

This consultation was undertaken to obtain public input regarding the Comprehensive Studies and Air Safety Risk Assessment report completed relative to the proposed decommissioning of the airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks.

I.2. Background

General aircraft operations have been legally prohibited in Banff and Jasper National Parks since the enactment of the National Park Aircraft Access Regulation in 1997. An Environmental Screening was conducted in 1997 under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of closure of the airstrips, and they were subsequently closed to all but emergency or diversionary access. Access by the general aviation public for recreation or other purposes is not allowed.

A court challenge by airstrip users in 1997 resulted in direction that a Comprehensive Study be conducted under CEAA prior to a decision being made to proceed with decommissioning of the airstrips.

In March 2002, Highwood Environmental Management completed *Comprehensive Study reports for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks*. A third report, the *Air Safety Risk Assessment regarding Decommissioning of the Banff and Jasper Airstrips* was prepared by Kootenay International Associates in July 2003.

I.3. Process

The consultation process for review of the three reports was formulated by Parks Canada with input from major stakeholders, including the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA), the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS), and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). *Strategy Plus* of Edmonton was contracted as a third party to receive, compile and analyze the input and comments relative to the three reports.

The three reports were posted on the Parks Canada websites for Banff and Jasper National Parks. Printed copies of the reports were also made available for public review in Banff, Jasper, Calgary, Edmonton, and Ottawa. The public was invited to provide comments relative to these reports during the consultation period that ran from September 27 to November 29, 2004.

The major stakeholder groups were also notified about the dates of the consultation period, and they in turn advised their membership of the consultation process.

Advertisements regarding the review were also provided in regional newspapers.

The following is a listing of the newspapers that carried advertisements about the review period, listed by the dates on which they were placed:

- Tuesday, September 28, 2004:
 - Banff Crag & Canyon
- Wednesday, September 29, 2004:
 - Edmonton Journal
 - Calgary Herald
 - Golden Star
 - Valley Echo
 - Kamloops Daily
 - Prince George Citizen
 - Jasper Booster
- Thursday, September 30, 2004:
 - Canmore Rocky Mountain Outlook
 - Hinton Parklander
- Friday, October 1, 2004
 - Le Franco
 - L'Express du Pacific.

No formalized comment form or specific questions to address were provided to the public for use in their review. The pros and cons of providing a comment form with several specific questions and a general comments question for gathering input was discussed with Parks Canada. It was collectively determined that it would be better to provide the public with an opportunity to submit comments as they wished, rather than giving the appearance that any attempt was being made to focus the comments in any particular direction.

I.4. Input Received

A total of 1,512 valid individual submissions with 4,363 individual comments were received and included in the analysis. Duplicate copies of several submissions were received, but are only included once. A couple of e-mail submissions were deleted because they did not include any content.

Submissions were received by e-mail, fax or regular mail by *Strategy Plus*. Any mailed submissions post marked no later than November 29, 2004 and received by December 6, 2004 are included in the analysis.

An additional 9 e-mail, 1 fax and 3 letters postmarked after November 29, 2004 were received. These were not included in the analysis, but have been provided to Parks Canada for information.

All original documents and tabulations were provided to Parks Canada after the analysis and preparation of this report by Strategy Plus.

I.5. Analysis of Input

The 1,512 submissions received were reviewed and a list of 4,363 specific comments was developed. Codes were assigned to comments with similar content. The base list of the 54 codes identified is included in Appendix 1.1, and was used in the initial data run and frequency count.

The coding list and frequency count information was then reviewed to determine codes with similar intent that could be combined for further analysis. In particular, those codes that had a very low number of responses were combined with other codes of a similar nature for purposes of analysis. This resulted in a collapsed list of 39 codes, as identified in Appendix 1.2. The interpretation of the results in this report includes reference to the different components of the original codes.

Various cross-tabulations of the data have been completed, and the results are presented either in the following sections of this report or in Appendix 2 .

The results have been further analyzed based on whether the comments related to both Banff and Jasper Airstrips, to the Banff Airstrip Only, or to the Jasper Airstrip Only.

Since only 69 submissions related only to the Banff Airstrip and 41 only to the Jasper Airstrip, the results presented in this report are based primarily on the results of the analysis of comments received relative to both airstrips. Any anomalies will be noted, and tables will provide information relative to all 3 (e.g., Banff Airstrip, Jasper Airstrip, and Both Airstrips).

The information obtained from the analysis of the submissions is presented in the following sections under three broad categories:

- II. General Information Regarding Respondents
- III. Comparisons Between Respondent Groups Regarding Awareness
- IV. Analysis of Specific Comments and Concerns

II. GENERAL INFORMATION REGARDING RESPONDENTS

This section presents basic information about the respondents in a combination of text and tabular format.

II.1. Airstrip in Question

Many respondents identified to which airstrip(s) their comments referred, although this question was not specifically asked of them. This information is presented in Table 1.

- The majority of respondents (1,402 or 92.7% of the 1,512 valid responses) either referred to both Banff and Jasper Airstrips in their submissions, noting that their comments pertained to both, or did not refer specifically to either, so their comments are considered to be relative to both airstrips (See Table 1)

Table 1
Airstrip Mentioned in Submission

Submissions Related to:	Total Submissions	% of Total Submissions
Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips	1,402	92.7%
Banff Airstrip Only	69	4.6%
Jasper Airstrip Only	41	2.7%
Total Submissions	1,512	100.0%

- Of the total 1,512 submissions, 69 (4.6%) referred only to the Banff Airstrip in their comments, and 41 (2.7%) referred only to the Jasper Airstrip.

II.2. Support/Non Support for Decommissioning

Respondents generally indicated support or non-support for the proposed decommissioning in their submissions. This information is presented in Table 2 relative to Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips, "Banff Airstrip Only", and "Jasper Airstrip Only".

Table 2
Support/Non Support for Decommissioning

Submissions Related to:	Support Decommissioning	Not Support Decommissioning	Neutral
Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips	7	1,394	1
Banff Airstrip Only	12	57	-
Jasper Airstrip Only	2	39	-
Total Submissions	21	1,490	1

- The majority of respondents do not support the proposed decommissioning of either airstrip. Of the 1,512 submissions, only 21 or 1.3% support decommissioning, one was neutral, and the remaining 1,490 or 98.5% did not support the proposed decommissioning. .

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Of the 21 respondents who support decommissioning, 12 or just over half (57.1%) specifically noted support for decommissioning of the Banff Airstrip and 7 or one third supported decommissioning of both Banff and Jasper Airstrips.
- None of the 21 respondents supporting decommissioning of the airstrips were self-identified as pilots.

II.3. Responses from Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots

Respondents were not asked to identify themselves as pilots or non-pilots, although many did identify themselves. The number of self-identified pilots and non-pilots are presented in Table 3 in relation to the airstrip(s) for which they provided comments.

- The majority of submissions received were from self-identified pilots (1,167 or 77.2% of all submissions).
- A further 96 or 6.3% of the total submissions were from self-identified non-pilots.
- It was not clear from the remaining 249 submissions (16.5%) if they were from pilots or non-pilots. (See Table 3)

Table 3
Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Total Submissions and By Airstrip

Respondents (Self Identified)	Total Submissions By Self-Identified Pilot/Non-Pilot		Submissions Related To:					
			Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only	
	Total	% of Total Submissions	Total	% of Both	Total	% of Banff Only	Total	% of Jasper Only
Pilot	1,167	77.2%	1,102	78.6%	44	63.8%	21	51.2%
Non-Pilot	96	6.3%	89	6.3%	2	2.9%	5	12.2%
Unable to tell from the submission	249	16.5%	211	15.1%	23	33.3%	15	36.6%
Total By Airstrip				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
Total Submissions	1,512	100.0%	1,402	92.7%	69	4.6%	41	2.7%

II.4. Place of Residence of Respondents

Place of residence of respondents was determined from return addresses or from information provided within the content of the submission. The place of residence of respondents relative to the airstrips for which they provided comments is presented in Table 4.

- Decommissioning of the airstrips appears to be of interest to residents from across Canada and the United States. Comments were also received from Austria and Hong Kong.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- The highest number of submissions was from Alberta (387 or 25.6%), followed by Ontario and Eastern Canada (378 or 25.0%), and British Columbia (311 or 20.6%).
- Respondents from Alberta (387) and British Columbia (311) combined accounted for a total of 698 of the 1,512 total submissions (e.g., just under half or 46.2%).

Table 4
Place of Residence of Respondents by Number of Submissions

Place of Residence	Total Submissions By Place of Residence		Submissions Related To:					
			Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	% of Banff Only	Total	% of Jasper Only
British Columbia	311	20.6%	295	21.0%	12	17.4%	4	9.8%
Total Alberta	387	25.6%	329	23.5%	31	44.9%	27	65.8%
Red Deer South	193	12.8%	177	12.6%	13	18.8%	3	7.3%
Banff/Canmore	29	1.9%	12	0.9%	17	24.6%	-	-
Red Deer North	136	9.0%	128	9.1%	1	1.4%	7	17.1%
Jasper	29	1.9%	12	0.9%	-	-	17	41.5%
Sask./Man./Territories	86	5.7%	85	6.1%	1	1.5%	-	-
Ontario & East	378	25.0%	364	26.0%	13	18.8%	1	2.4%
United States	68	4.5%	67	4.8%	1	1.5%	-	-
Other	3	0.1%	3	0.2%	-	-	-	-
Not provided	279	18.5%	259	18.4%	11	15.9%	9	22.0%
Total by Airstrip				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
Total Submissions	1,512	100%	1,402	92.7%	69	4.6%	41	2.7%

- Further review of the origin of respondents from Alberta reveals that there was a higher level of response from Southern Alberta, including Red Deer and south (193) and Banff/ Canmore (29) for a total of 222 responses (14.7%), than from Northern Alberta, which includes north of Red Deer (136) and Jasper (29), for a total of 165 (10.9%).
- Residents of Banff/Canmore and Jasper each accounted for 29 submissions, with just over half of each identifying both airstrips in their comments.

II.5. Place of Residence by Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots

The place of residence was reviewed by whether respondents self-identified themselves as pilots or non-pilots. This information is presented in Table 5.

- About two-thirds of the respondents from Alberta were self-identified as pilots (262 or 67.7% of Alberta responses). This accounted for 17.3% of the total 1,512 submissions.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Alberta had the highest number of responses from self-identified non-pilots, accounting for 49 or 12.7% of the total responses from Alberta. This may be indicative of greater awareness of issues in Banff and Jasper National Parks due to their location in Alberta.
- Most of the respondents from British Columbia (266 of 311 or 85.5%), Saskatchewan/Manitoba/Territories (72 of 86 or 83.7%), Ontario and East (305 of 378 or 80.7%), and the United States (58 of 68 or 85.3%) were self-identified pilots. Collectively, self-identified pilots accounted for 701 or 83.1% of the 843 responses from these jurisdictions.

Table 5
Place of Residence by Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots

Place of Residence	Total Submissions By Place of Residence		Self-Identified Pilot/Non-Pilot					
			Pilots		Non-Pilots		Not Specified	
	Total	% of Total Submissions	Total	% of Total Province/ Area	Total	% of Total Province/ Area	Total	% of Total Province/ Area
British Columbia	311	20.6%	266	85.5%	14	4.5%	31	10.0
Total Alberta	387	25.6%	262	67.7%	49	12.7%	76	19.6%
Red Deer South	193	12.8%	142	36.7%	25	6.5%	26	6.7%
Banff/Canmore	29	1.9%	9	2.3%	6	1.6%	14	3.6%
Red Deer North	136	9.0%	99	25.6%	14	3.6%	23	5.9%
Jasper	29	1.9%	12	3.1%	4	1.0%	13	3.4%
Sask/Man/Territories	86	5.7%	72	83.7%	2	2.3%	12	14.0%
Ontario & East	378	25.0%	305	80.7%	15	4.0%	57	15.1%
United States	68	4.5%	58	85.3%	1	1.5%	9	13.2%
Other	3	0.1%	1	33.3%	-	-	2	66.7%
Not provided	279	18.5%	203	72.8%	15	5.4%	62	22.2%
Total Submissions	1,512	100%	1,167	77.2%	96	6.3%	249	16.5%

II.6. Respondent Group Size

Information regarding group size was determined from the content of the submissions and is presented in Table 6. Some submissions noted specifically that they represented a group of a certain size, while others were signed by one or more people.

- Most submissions were from individuals. A total of 1,430 (94.6%) of all submissions were from an individual and 42 (2.8%) specifically represented input from 2 people.
- Submissions related to “Banff Airstrip Only” or “Jasper Airstrip Only” were also primarily from individuals or couples, with 65 or 94.2% and 35 or 85.3% of total submissions specific to each airstrip respectively.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- A total of 28 (1.9%) submissions represented large groups or associations of 20 or more people. Of these, 5 submissions related to “Jasper Airstrip Only” and 3 related only to “Banff Airstrip Only”.
- The remaining 12 submissions were from small groups ranging in size from 3 to 19 persons.

Table 6
Group Size by Total Submissions and By Airstrip

Group Size	Total Submissions By Group Size		Submissions Related To:					
			Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only	
			Total	% of Total Submissions	Total	% of Both	Total	% of Banff Only
1	1,430	94.6%	1,338	95.4%	60	87.0%	32	78.0%
2	42	2.8%	34	2.4%	5	7.2%	3	7.3%
Small Group (3-19)	12	0.8%	10	0.7%	1	1.4%	1	2.4%
Large Group (20+)	28	1.9%	20	1.4%	3	4.3%	5	12.2%
Total by Airstrip				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
Total Submissions	1,512	100.0%	1,402	92.7%	69	4.6%	41	2.7%

II.7. Number of Comments by Individual Respondents

The number of separate comments within each submission was reviewed in relation to other variables, such as awareness of the closed status of the airstrips, place of residence, self-identified pilot or non-pilot, and group size.

Table 7 provides information about the separate number of comments per response based on awareness of the closed status of the airstrips.

Table 7
Awareness of Closed Status by Number of Comments

Aware / Not Aware of Closed Status	Submissions With One and Two or More Separate Comments					
	Total Submissions By Awareness		One Comment		Two or More Comments	
	#	% of Total Comments	#	% of Aware/ Unaware	#	% of Aware/ Unaware
Aware of Closure	455	30.1%	72	15.8%	383	85.2%
Unaware of Closure	88	5.8%	45	51.1%	43	48.9%
Unable to Tell From Submission	969	64.1%	311	32.1%	658	67.9%
Total Submissions by Aware / Unaware	1,512		428	100.0%	1,084	100.0%
Total Submissions		100.0%		28.3%		71.7%

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Overall, 428 or 28.3% of the 1,512 submissions only provided one comment. The remaining 1,084 or 71.7% of the total submissions provided two or more comments.
- A total of 72 or 15.8% of the 455 respondents who demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips provided only one comment, compared to 383 or 85.2% who provided two or more separate comments.
- There was an even distribution between respondents who provided one comment (45) or two or more comments (43) among those respondents who demonstrated non-awareness. This number is small, so should be treated with caution.

Table 8 provides information about the number of comments per submission based on place of residence of respondent.

Table 8
Place of Residence by Number of Comments Per Submission

Place of Residence	Total Submissions by Place of Residence		Submissions with One or Two or More Separate Comments By Place of Residence and by Number of Comments					
			One Comment			Two or More Comments		
	#	% of Total Submissions	#	% of Total Province/ Area	% By Total One Comment	#	% of Total Province/ Area	% By Total 2 or More Comments
British Columbia	311	20.6%	67	21.5%	15.6%	244	78.4%	22.5%
Total Alberta	387	25.6%	80	20.7%	18.7%	307	79.3%	28.3%
Red Deer South & Banff/Canmore	222	14.7%	39	10.1%	9.1%	183	47.3%	16.9%
Red Deer North & Jasper	165	10.9%	41	10.6%	9.6%	124	32.0%	11.4%
Sask/Man/Territories	86	5.7%	24	27.9%	5.6%	62	72.1%	5.7%
Ontario & East	378	25.0%	124	32.8%	29.0%	254	67.2%	23.4%
United States	68	4.5%	31	45.6%	7.2%	37	54.4%	3.4%
Other	3	0.1%	1	33.3%	0.2%	2	66.7%	0.2%
Unable to Tell	279	18.5%	101	36.2%	23.6%	178	63.8%	16.4%
Total Submissions by Number of Comments	1,512		428	n/a	100.0%	1,084	n/a	100.0%
Total Submissions		100%			28.3%			71.7%

- Alberta (307) and British Columbia (244) recorded the highest number of submissions with two or more comments, accounting for half (50.8%) of all submissions with two or more comments.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Within Alberta, respondents from South of Red Deer and Banff/Canmore provided 183 submissions with 2 or more comments (16.9% of all submissions with 2 or more comments), slightly higher than the 124 or 11.4% of responses from North of Red Deer and Jasper. There was an equal distribution of submissions from across Alberta that only had one comment (e.g., 39 in the South and 41 in the North).
- Ontario and East accounted for the highest number of submissions with only one comment (124 or 29.0% of all responses with only one comment). However, they also accounted for the second highest number of submissions with 2 or more comments (254 or 23.4% of all submissions with two or more comments), reflecting the fact that the second highest number of submissions was from Ontario.
- Interestingly, there were slightly more submissions from the United States that included two or more comments (37), compared to 31 submissions with one only comment.
- Overall, just under ¾ of all respondents (1,084 or 71.7%) provided more than one separate comment in their submission.

Table 9 presents information about the number of comments per response based on whether the respondent was self-identified as a pilot or non-pilot.

Table 9
Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Number of Comments

Self-Identified Pilot / Non-Pilot	Total Submissions by Pilot/Non-Pilot		Submissions With One and Two or More Separate Comments by Pilots and Non-Pilots and by Number of Comments					
			One Comment			Two or More Comments		
	#	% of Total Submissions	#	% of Submissions by Pilots / Non-Pilots	% by Total One Comment	#	% of Submissions by Pilots / Non-Pilots	% by Total 2 or More Comments
Pilot	1,167	77.2%	315	27.0%	73.6%	852	73.0%	78.6%
Non-Pilot	96	6.3%	27	28.1%	6.3%	69	71.9%	6.4%
Not Able to Tell From Submission	249	16.5%	86	34.5%	20.1%	163	65.5%	15.0%
Total Submissions by Pilots / Non-Pilots	1,512		428	n/a	100.0%	1,084	n/a	100.0%
Total Submissions		100.0%			28.3%			71.7%

- There was not a noticeable difference in the percentage of separate comments submitted by self-identified pilots or non-pilots.
- Self-identified pilots accounted for 852 or 78.6% of all submissions with 2 or more comments and 315 or 27.0% of all submissions by self-identified pilots with only one comment.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Two or more comments were received from 69 or 71.9% of the 96 self-identified non-pilot submissions, or from 6.4% of the total submissions with two or more comments.

Table 10 provides information regarding the number of comments per submission based on group size.

- The number of comments by group size was fairly consistent, with approximately three quarters of all group sizes providing two or more comments.

Table 10
Group Size by Number of Comments

Group Size	Total		Submissions with One and Two or More Comments			
			One Comment		Two or More Comments	
	#	% of Total Submissions	#	% of Group Size	#	% of Group Size
1	1,430	94.6%	411	28.7%	1,019	71.3%
2	42	2.8%	9	21.4%	33	78.6%
Small Group (3-19)	12	0.8%	3	25.0%	9	75.0%
Large Group (20+)	28	1.9%	5	17.9%	23	82.1%
Total Comments by Group Size	1,512		428	n/a	1,084	n/a
Total Comments		100.0%		28.3%		71.1%

III. COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENT GROUPS REGARDING AWARENESS

This section presents cross-tabulations of several variables to help identify any similarities or differences between respondent groups in terms of their awareness of the closed status of the airstrips.

III.1. Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips by Airstrip Identified

Were respondents aware of the closed status of the Banff and Jasper airstrips?

Table 11 presents information about all respondents regarding awareness / non-awareness of the current closed status of the airstrips.

- Of the 1,512 valid submissions included in the analysis of public input, 455 (30.1%) were clearly aware that both the Banff and Jasper airstrips are closed to general aviation and are available for emergency and diversionary use only.
- A total of 88 (5.8%) of the submissions clearly demonstrated that they were not aware that the airstrips are currently closed to general aviation.
- It was unclear in the remaining 969 (64.1%) submissions whether or not the respondent was aware that the airstrips are currently closed to general aviation.

Table 11
Closure Awareness by Total Submissions and Airstrip

Awareness of Closed Status	Total Submissions		Submissions Related To:					
			Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only	
	Total	% of Total Submissions	Total	% of Both	Total	% of Banff Only	Total	% of Jasper Only
Aware of Closed Status	455	30.1%	397	28.3%	38	55.1%	20	48.8%
Unaware of Closed Status	88	5.8%	84	6.0%	4	5.8%	-	-
Unable to tell from Submission	969	64.1%	921	65.7%	27	39.1%	21	51.2%
Total By Airstrip				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
Total Submissions	1,512	100.0%	1,402	92.7%	69	4.6%	41	2.7%

Summary

In summary, only about one third of respondents clearly indicated awareness of the current closed status of the airstrips and expressed comments in the context of “decommissioning” of the airstrips. Terms such as “closure” and “close” were used by many, but it is difficult to tell from their submissions whether or not they were aware of the current status of the airstrips.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

The small number of submissions that clearly demonstrated non-awareness means this information should be used with caution.

III.2. Self-Identified Pilots/Non-Pilots by Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips

Were both self-identified pilots and non-pilots aware of the closed status of the airstrips?

Information regarding the demonstrated level of awareness regarding the closed status of the airstrips by self-identified pilots and non-pilots is presented in Table 12. If awareness was not clearly stated, the response was categorized as being “unable to tell from the submission”.

- It is not clear from the majority of the submissions from self-identified pilots (e.g., 730 or 62.6%) whether or not they were aware of the closed status of the airstrips.
- This was also the case in the percentage of responses from self-identified non-pilots and from those who did not specify (e.g., 66.7% and 70.3% respectively).
- Almost one third (359 or 30.8%) of the submissions received from self-identified pilots indicated awareness that the airstrips are closed. Again, this is very comparable to percentages of responses from self-identified non-pilots and from those who did not specify (e.g., 30.2% and 26.9%).
- The percentage of self-identified pilots who are clearly not aware of the closed status of the airstrips is slightly higher (e.g., 6.7% compared to 3.1% of non-pilots). This may be a reflection of the number of responses received from pilots from outside of Western Canada who do not normally fly in the area.

Table 12
Self-Identified Pilot/Non-Pilot Awareness of the Closed Status of Airstrips

Pilot/Non-Pilot	Total Submissions By Pilot/ Non-Pilot		Closed Status Awareness					
			Aware of Closed Status		Not aware of Closed Status		Unable to Tell Awareness from Submission	
	Total	% of Total	Total	% of Total Pilots/ Non-Pilots	Total	% of Total Pilots/ Non-Pilots	Total	% of Total Pilots/ Non-Pilots
Pilot	1,167	77.2%	359	30.8%	78	6.7%	730	62.6%
Non-Pilot	96	6.3%	29	30.2%	3	3.1%	64	66.7%
Unable to tell from submission	249	16.5%	67	26.9%	7	2.8%	175	70.3%
Total Submissions by Awareness	1,512	100.0%	455	30.1%	88	5.8%	969	64.1%

Summary

In summary, there is not a clear indication that self-identified pilots are more aware of the closed status of the airstrips than non-pilots, although there is a slightly higher percent of pilots (6.7%) who demonstrated they were not aware of the closed status than non-pilots (3.1%).

The small number of submissions that clearly demonstrated non-awareness means this information should be used with caution.

III.3. Place of Residence by Awareness of Closed Status

Were respondents more aware of the closed status of the airstrips if they are resident in Western Canada (e.g., Alberta or British Columbia)?

Table 13 provides information regarding the demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips by place of residence of the respondent.

- Demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips is highest in Alberta, with 169 respondents. This accounts for 37.1% of all those aware of the closed status and 43.7% of all responses from Alberta, but only 11.2% of total submissions.
- This is followed closely by British Columbia, with 105 respondents being aware of the closed status. This accounts for 23.1% of all those aware of the closed status and 33.8% of all responses from British Columbia, but only 6.9% of total submissions.
- Alberta (169 or 37.1%) and British Columbia (105 or 23.1%) together accounted for a total of 374 or 60.2% of the 455 total responses that demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips.
- Awareness of the closed status of the airstrips is slightly higher in Southern Alberta and in the Banff/Canmore area (97 or 21.4%) than in Northern Alberta and the Jasper area (72 or 15.9%), calculated as a percentage of the total 455 submissions demonstrating awareness of the closed status.
- About one quarter of all responses came from Ontario and East (378 or 25.0%); however, only 69 or 15.2% of the 455 respondents that demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips were from Ontario and East.
- Ontario and Eastern Canada accounted for 27 of the 88 respondents indicating non-awareness or (30.7%); however, this only accounted for 7.1% of the total 378 responses from Ontario and East.
- More than three quarters (282 or 74.6%) of all Ontario respondents did not clearly demonstrate awareness of the closed status of the airstrips. This accounted for 29.1% of all submissions for which it was unable to determine whether or not the respondent was aware of the closed status.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Only 18 respondents from British Columbia were not aware of the closed status (20.5% of the total 88 respondents who were not aware and 5.8% of the total 311 responses from BC residents).
- Similarly, only 15 respondents from Alberta demonstrated non-awareness of the closed status (17% of the total 88 respondents who were not aware and 3.9% of the total 387 respondents from Alberta).

Table 13
Place of Residence by Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips

Place of Residence	Total Submissions		Awareness of Closed Status					
			Aware of Closed Status		Not Aware of Closed Status		Unable to Tell from Submission	
	Total	% of Total	Total	% of Total Aware	Total	% of Total Not Aware	Total	% of Total Unable to Tell
British Columbia	311	20.6%	105	23.1%	18	20.5%	188	19.4%
Total Alberta	387	25.6%	169	37.1%	15	17.0%	203	20.9%
Red Deer South	193	12.8%	74	16.3%	9	10.2%	110	11.4%
Banff/Canmore	29	1.9%	23	5.1%	1	1.1%	5	0.5%
Red Deer North	136	9.0%	54	11.9%	5	5.7%	77	8.0%
Jasper	29	1.9%	18	4.0%	-	-	11	1.1%
Sask/Man/Territories	86	5.7%	25	5.5%	5	5.7%	56	5.8%
Ontario & East	378	25.0%	69	15.2%	27	30.7%	282	29.1%
United States	68	4.5%	13	2.9%	10	11.4%	45	4.6%
Other	3	0.1%	1	0.2%	-	-	2	0.2%
Not provided	279	18.5%	73	16.0%	13	14.8%	193	19.9%
Total by Awareness				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
Total Submissions	1,512	100.0%	455	30.1%	88	5.8%	969	64.1%

Summary

In summary, demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips is highest in Alberta (169) and British Columbia (105), collectively accounting for 60.2% of the 455 total responses that demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips. However, this only represents 18.1% of the total 1,512 submissions received. This may reflect more familiarity with Banff and Jasper National Parks by residents in Alberta and British Columbia

The highest percentage of demonstrated non-awareness of the closed status of the airstrips is in respondents from Ontario and East (27 or 30.7% of the total responses indicating non-awareness). This is still a relatively small number, and only accounts for 7.1% of the total 378 responses from Ontario.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

The number of respondents from Alberta (15) and British Columbia (18) demonstrating non-awareness is very small, accounting for 37.5% of all respondents demonstrating non-awareness, but only 2.1% of total respondents.

The small number of submissions clearly demonstrating that they were unaware of the closed status of the airstrips (88 of 1,512 or 5.8% of all submissions) means that this information should be used with caution.

IV. ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Comments received from respondents were compiled, assigned codes, and frequency counts of the full list of comments were completed. However, because many of the comments were only noted a few times or were very similar to other comments, the list of comments was collapsed into a shorter list. Frequency counts of the comments based on the collapsed list were then completed. This collapsed list of comments has generally been used in the analysis of the comments.

This section presents information regarding all comments received and analysis of various combinations of comment codes in relation to each other, as well as to other variables, including:

- Self-identified pilot/non-pilot (Section IV.2.);
- Awareness of closed status of airstrips (Section IV.3.);
- Number of comments provided (Section IV.4); and
- Place of residence (Section IV.5.).

Mitigations suggested in the comments are also identified in Section IV.6.

IV.1. Frequency of Comments

The full list of comment codes and the number of times each comment was expressed is presented in Appendix 2.1. The comments have been sorted from highest to lowest frequency by the number of times each comment appears, based on the comments received for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

The collapsed list of comment codes and the number of times each comment was expressed is presented in Table 14. The comments have been sorted from highest to lowest by the number of times each comment appears, based on the comments received referring to “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”.

- A total of 4,363 individual comments were received from 1,512 submissions. Of these, 3,946 or 90.4% related to “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”.
- “Banff Airstrip Only” and “Jasper Airstrip Only” received a total of 271 comments (6.2% of the total comments received) and 146 comments (3.3% of the total comments received), respectively.

Differences in comments received for “Banff Airstrip Only” or “Jasper Airstrip Only” are noted, where applicable.

Highlights of the review of the frequency of comments are presented based on the categories of:

- Safety/Diversions/Emergency Access,
- Environment and Wildlife,
- Support for Not Decommissioning,
- Support for Decommissioning, and
- Mitigations Suggested.

Safety / Diversionary / Emergency Access

- Safety was of concern to almost three quarters of all respondents. The most frequent comments received for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”, “Banff Airstrip Only” and “Jasper Airstrip Only” related to the concern for safety and the need to maintain the airstrips to provide opportunities for emergency and diversionary landings in the mountain environment (1,107 or about 73.2% of all respondents or 25.4% of all comments received). It was noted by several respondents that when pilots plan their flight routes, they need to be aware of the options for emergency situations.
- Almost 40% of respondents (592) or 13.6% of all comments received, noted that they “support the recommendation of the Air Safety Risk Assessment to keep both airstrips open for emergency and diversionary use, including runway markings, windsock and listings in the Canada Flight Supplement”. This wording repeats the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA) position and interpretation of the results of the Air Safety Risk Assessment report that was provided to COPA members via correspondence and their website.

This comment was the second most frequent comment overall and in those submissions referring to “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrip”, and ranked fifth relative to “Jasper Only Airstrip” and 18th relative to “Banff Only Airstrip”.

Environment and Wildlife

- Over one quarter of respondents (394) or 9.0% of all comments received, noted that the airstrips have less of an impact on the environment than the highways, railways and other activities in the Parks. This comment ranked third in terms of overall comments and those relative to “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”, second relative to “Banff Only Airstrip”, and fourth relative to “Jasper Only Airstrip”.
- A total of 211 submissions (13.9% of all respondents or 4.8% of all comments received) noted that decommissioning the airstrips will have little if any impact on wildlife. Some comments suggested that Parks Canada use of helicopters for wildlife surveys and other management activities and operations is inconsistent with decommissioning the airstrips. This comment ranked fourth in terms of overall comments and those relative to “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrip”, third relative to “Banff Airstrip Only”, and second relative to “Jasper Airstrip Only”.

Support for Not Decommissioning

- The straight forward appeal to “keep the airstrips open” was made by 193 respondents (12.8% of all respondents and 4.4% of all comments).
- Numerous respondents suggested that the airstrips should be maintained and expanded for tourism and recreation access (178 or 4.1% of all comments). Potential benefits for the local economy, recreation, tourism, environmental awareness, and fire reporting, etc., resulting from use of the airstrips were identified 61 times (1.4% of all comments).

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Others (29 or 0.7% of all comments) suggested that, in recognition of the location of the airstrips in national parks and/or the conflicting protection and enjoyment mandate of Parks Canada, the airstrips should be maintained for emergency or diversionary landings, but not re-opened as destination strips.

Five other comments were recorded more than 100 times each. These comments all provided rationale for not decommissioning the airstrips and maintaining them for emergency and diversionary purposes, including:

- Concerns about closing air access over National Parks and the seeming unfair targeting of air access versus highway access (149 or 3.4% of all comments).
- Concerns about the safety of air and highway vehicular traffic if highways are used for emergency landings. It was noted that having airstrips for emergency or diversionary landings was comparable to having run off lanes on highways (152 or 3.5% of all comments).
- Inaccurate weather forecasts, rapidly changing weather conditions, and reduced services from Navigation Canada mean that the airstrips provide an option for pilots running into unfavourable weather conditions (148 or 34% of all comments).
- Legal liability issues for Parks Canada in the likely event of an accident/fatality due to the decommissioning of the airstrips (141 or 3.2% of total comments).
- There are limited options for VFR routes through the Rocky Mountains. The government has an obligation to maintain the identified and preferred VFR routes through the mountains (115 or 2.6% of all comments).

Support for Decommissioning

The following are the comments that were noted in support of decommissioning:

- Support for decommissioning the airstrips was noted 21 times (0.5% of all comments).
- The importance of grasslands in maintaining biodiversity and the potential for interpretation of restoration efforts was noted 32 times (0.7 % of comments).
- It was noted in 20 comments (0.5% of all comments) that there would be negative wildlife impacts if the airstrips are not decommissioned and positive impacts if they are decommissioned.
- The view that airstrips and other purely recreational activities such as ice climbing are inappropriate activities in National Parks was noted 15 times (0.3% of comments).
- The comment that decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety was made 11 times or 0.3% of all comments.

Mitigations Suggested

- A total of 22 mitigations (0.5% of all comments) were suggested. These are outlined in more detail in section IV.6.
- In addition, it was suggested 12 times (0.3% of all comments) that Parks Policy allows for the designation of landing sites within Parks.

The remaining 830 comments (19% of all of specific comments) related to support for not decommissioning the airstrips. These were noted in smaller numbers, each accounting for less than 2% of total specific comments.

Table 14
Frequency of Collapsed Comments Based on Responses Identifying “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrip		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversinary/Emergency Landings	1,046	26.5%	38	14.0%	23	15.8%	1,107	25.4%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	579	14.7%	5	1.8%	8	5.5%	592	13.6%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	367	9.3%	16	5.9%	11	7.5%	394	9.0%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	182	4.6%	17	6.3%	12	8.2%	211	4.8%
Keep Airstrips Open	170	4.3%	11	4.1%	12	8.2%	193	4.4%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	165	4.2%	6	2.2%	7	4.8%	178	4.1%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Highway Access?	140	3.5%	4	1.5%	5	3.4%	149	3.4%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Having Highway Run Off Lanes	139	3.5%	10	3.7%	3	2.1%	152	3.5%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information /Inaccurate Forecasts/ Weather Changes Rapidly	128	3.2%	14	5.2%	6	4.1%	148	3.4%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	128	3.2%	5	1.8%	8	5.5%	141	3.2%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	102	2.6%	11	4.1%	2	1.4%	115	2.6%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/ Political Control for No Reason	72	1.8%	4	1.5%	3	2.1%	79	1.8%

Table 14 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments Based on Responses Identifying “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Heritage Reasons	67	1.7%	6	2.2%	5	3.4%	78	1.8%
Other	61	1.5%	10	3.7%	7	4.8%	78	1.8%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	60	1.5%	4	1.5%	1	0.7%	65	1.5%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	57	1.4%	11	4.1%	10	6.8%	78	1.8%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	55	1.4%	4	1.5%	2	1.4%	61	1.4%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	46	1.2%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	49	1.1%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	43	1.1%	2	0.7%	-	-	45	1.0%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	43	1.1%	2	0.7%	-	-	45	1.0%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	40	1.0%	3	1.1%	2	1.4%	45	1.0%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	30	0.8%	4	1.5%	2	1.4%	36	0.8%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	30	0.8%	1	0.4%	1	0.7%	32	0.7%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	29	0.7%	4	1.5%	1	0.7%	34	0.8%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	25	0.6%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	28	0.6%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversions Landings but not as Destination Strips	25	0.6%	4	1.5%	-	-	29	0.7%

Table 14 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments Based on Responses Identifying “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	17	0.4%	-	-	1	0.7%	18	0.4%
Conflicting Parks Mandate (Protect & Enjoy)	16	0.4%	2	0.7%	2	1.4%	20	0.5%
Mitigations Suggested	14	0.4%	7	2.6%	1	0.7%	22	0.5%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	11	0.3%	1	0.4%	-	-	12	0.3%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	9	0.2%	1	0.4%	-	-	10	0.2%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	9	0.2%	21	7.7%	2	1.4%	32	0.7%
Inappropriate Activity/Park Should Not Cater to Recreational Interests (Airstrips, Ice Climbing)	9	0.2%	6	2.2%	-	-	15	0.3%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	8	0.2%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	11	0.3%
Support Decommissioning	7	0.2%	12	4.4%	2	1.4%	21	0.5%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	6	0.2%	14	5.2%	-	-	20	0.5%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	4	0.1%	7	2.6%	-	-	11	0.3%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	4	0.1%	-	-	1	0.7%	5	0.1%
Neutral	1	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1	0.0%
Total Comments by Airstrip	3,946	100.0%	271	100.0%	146	100.0%	4,363	
Total Comments		90.4%		6.2%		3.3%		100.0%

IV.2. Comparison of Comments by Self-Identified Pilots and Non-Pilots

Are responses from self-identified pilots the same as, or different from, those of non-pilots?

Tables 15 and 16 present collapsed comments by self-identified pilots and non-pilots, sorted based on the frequency of responses that related to both Banff and Jasper Airstrips.

Responses from self-identified pilots and non-pilots were compared to identify any distinct differences. Comments are presented relative to:

- Support for Decommissioning,
- Support for Not Decommissioning,
- Safety / Emergencies / Search and Rescue / Weather Reporting,
- Environment and Wildlife,
- Heritage Reasons,
- Liability / costs, and
- Mitigations Suggested.

Support for Decommissioning

- Of the total 21 respondents who noted support for decommissioning of the airstrips, none were self-identified as pilots and only 4 were self-identified as non-pilots.
- No comments were received from self-identified pilots in support of decommissioning of the airstrips, whereas there were 4 comments from self-identified non-pilots (3 relative to both airstrips and one relative to “Banff Airstrip Only”).
- There were 4 comments from self-identified non-pilots noting that airstrips were an inappropriate activity in the National Parks, and that Parks Canada should not cater to purely recreational interests, such as airstrips and ice climbing.

Support for Not Decommissioning / Benefits of Maintaining Airstrips

- Both self-identified pilots and non-pilots specifically stated that the airstrips should be kept open. This included 126 pilots (3.8% of total pilots) and 11 non-pilots (3.9% of total non-pilots).
- The fifth most frequent comment by self-identified pilots, accounting for 137 comments or 4.1% of total comments from pilots, was that consideration should be given to maintaining and/or expanding the airstrips for recreation and tourism access, instead of just for emergency and diversionary landing purposes. This sentiment was also shared by self-identified non-pilots, ranked 6th with 12 comments (4.3% of total comments from non-pilots).
- The potential positive tourism and economic benefits to the Parks and communities of Banff and Jasper were also noted by both pilots (51 or 1.5% of total comments from pilots) and non-pilots (2 or .7% of total comments by non-pilots). This comment also includes benefits for recreation, environmental awareness, and assistance by pilots in such things as reporting fires.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Concerns about closing air access over the Parks were noted by both self-identified pilots (107 or 3.2% of all comments from pilots) and non-pilots (8 or 2.9% of all comments from non-pilots).
- Concern about Parks Canada supporting extreme lobby groups was noted by 7 self-identified pilots (0.2% of all comments from pilots).

Safety / Emergencies / Search and Rescue / Weather Reporting

The top two most frequent comments from both self-identified pilots and non-pilots were the same, including:

- Safety concerns and the perceived need for the airstrips to provide an ongoing role for diversionary and emergency landings. This was stated by 913 or 27.3% of total comments by self-identified pilots, and by 56 or 20.1% of all comments by self-identified non-pilots.
- Support for the recommendation of the Air Safety Risk Assessment, as per the COPA interpretation, to keep the airstrips open. This was noted by 479 or 14.3% of all comments by self-identified pilots and by 59 or 21.1% of all comments by self-identified non-pilots.
- Alternatively, comments from 3 self-identified non-pilots (1.1% of total comments from non-pilots) noted that decommissioning the airstrips would have a low to minimal negative impact on the safety of pilots.
- Both self-identified pilots and non-pilots raised concerns about the rapid weather changes that occur in mountain environments, inaccurate weather forecasts, and reduced weather information services available from Navigation Canada. This concern was noted 126 times by self-identified pilots (3.8% of all comments by pilots) and 10 times by self-identified non-pilots (3.6% of all comments by non-pilots).
- Both self-identified pilots (129 or 3.9% of all comments by pilots) and non-pilots (7 or 2.5% of all comments by non-pilots) felt strongly that highway landings are dangerous and alternatives are required for emergency landings, somewhat like runaway lanes on highways.
- Both also noted that alternative airstrips are too far away to be of much assistance in an emergency (e.g., self-identified pilots noted this 24 times or 0.7% of all comments from pilots, and self-identified non-pilots noted this 4 times, or 1.4% of all comments from non-pilots).
- The role that the airstrips can play during emergency evacuations, forest fires, Medivac, and so on was also noted by both self-identified pilots and non-pilots, although at a higher ranking for pilots. Self-identified pilots noted this 43 times (1.3% of all comments by pilots) and non-pilots noted it 6 times (2.2% of all comments by non-pilots).
- The benefits of the airstrips in terms of their role in search and rescue operations was noted 37 times by self-identified pilots (1.1% of all comments from pilots) and 6 times by non-pilots (2.2% of all comments from non-pilots).

- The comment that decommissioning the airstrips contradicts efforts to promote aviation safety was noted 24 times by self-identified pilots (0.7%), but not identified by non-pilots.

Environment and Wildlife

The third and fourth most frequent comments from both self-identified pilots and non-pilots noted that the airstrips had little negative impact on wildlife and the environment:

- Environmental impacts of the airstrips are much less than those of the highways, railways and other activities in the Parks that occur adjacent to the airstrips. This was noted 334 times by self-identified pilots (10.0% of all comments by pilots) and 17 times by non-pilots (6.1% of all comments from non-pilots).
- Airstrips have limited impact on wildlife, and Parks management practices using helicopters are inconsistent with the efforts to decommission the airstrips. This was noted 159 times by self-identified pilots (4.8% of all comments by pilots) and 16 times by non-pilots (5.7% of all comments from non-pilots).

On the other hand, a few respondents noted potential positive benefits from decommissioning the airstrips:

- Three self-identified non-pilots (1.1% of all comments from non-pilots) noted that decommissioning the airstrips and not maintaining them would be positive for the grasslands in their role in maintaining biodiversity and would support Parks Canada's mandate and goals to maintain or restore biodiversity. It was further noted that this could result in positive opportunities for interpretive programming.
- Three comments from self-identified non-pilots (1.1% of all comments from non-pilots) indicated that there would be negative impacts on wildlife if the airstrips were not decommissioned and positive results if they were decommissioned.

A few respondents recognized the conflicting mandate of Parks Canada and the challenge that this provides for managers:

- The conflicting mandate of Parks Canada to protect and enjoy was noted by 15 self-identified pilots (0.4% of total comments from pilots) and by 1 non-pilot.

Heritage Reasons

- Both self-identified pilots (59 or 1.8% of all comments from pilots) and non-pilots (4 or 1.4% of all comments from non-pilots) noted that the airstrips are part of the heritage of both Banff and Jasper National Parks.
- Similarly, both felt that there are limited routes to traverse the mountains, and that the Government has an obligation to maintain identified VFR routes through the mountains. Self-identified pilots noted this 95 times (1.8% of all comments from pilots) and non-pilots noted it 3 times (1.1% of all comments from non-pilots).

Liability / Costs

- The potential for lawsuits and legal responsibility on the part of Parks Canada was identified by 104 self-identified pilots (3.1% of total comments from pilots) and by 10 self-identified non-pilots (3.6% of all comments from non-pilots).
- Concerns with bureaucrats, government expenditures and political control for no reason were noted 54 times by self-identified pilots (1.6% of all comments from pilots) and 8 times by non-pilots (2.9% of all comments from non-pilots).
- Self-identified pilots noted that Parks Canada is too concerned with the costs of operating and maintaining the airstrips (52 or 1.6% of all comments from pilots). This was supported by 4 non-pilots (1.4% of total comments from non-pilots).
- In addition, 21 self-identified pilots (0.6% of all comments from pilots) and 2 non-pilots (0.7% of all comments from non-pilots) noted that the cost of trying to shut down the airstrips was too high.
- A total of 34 self-identified pilots (1.0% of total comments from pilots) noted that it is costly and short-sighted to close airstrips. This was also noted by one non-pilot.
- The right of Canadians and tax payers to access the National Parks were noted by 31 self-identified pilots (1.0% of total comments from pilots), as well as by one non-pilot.

Mitigations Suggested

- Mitigations were suggested 8 times by self-identified pilots (0.2% of all comments from pilots) and 6 times by self-identified non-pilots (2.2% of all comments from non-pilots).
- Suggested mitigations are presented in Section IV.6.

Summary

In summary, there is little difference between the types of comments provided by self-identified pilots and non-pilots, and most comments were repeated by both groups.

The most significant difference is that none of the self-identified pilots indicated support for decommissioning of the airstrips. Of the 21 individuals indicating support for decommissioning the airstrips, only 4 are self-identified as non-pilots.

Some comments were noted only by self-identified non-pilots, including:

- Four noted that airstrips are an inappropriate activity in National Parks, and that Parks Canada shouldn't cater to purely recreational interests (e.g., airstrips and ice climbing).
- Three commented that decommissioning the airstrips and not maintaining them would be positive for the grasslands in their role in maintaining biodiversity and would support Parks Canada's mandate and goals to maintain or restore biodiversity.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Three noted that wildlife impacts would be negative if the airstrips are not decommissioned and positive if they were decommissioned.
- Three noted that decommissioning the airstrips would have a low to minimal negative impact on the safety of pilots

Some comments were made only by self-identified pilots, including:

- Seven expressed concern about Parks Canada supporting extreme lobby groups.
- Decommissioning the airstrips contradicts efforts to promote aviation safety was noted 24 times.

Table 15
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Pilots Noting Both “Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversiory/Emergency Landings	870	27.8%	30	21.3%	13	18.1%	913	27.3%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	471	15.0%	4	2.8%	4	5.6%	479	14.3%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	314	10.0%	13	9.2%	7	9.7%	334	10.0%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks / Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	144	4.6%	9	6.4%	6	8.3%	159	4.8%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	131	4.2%	3	2.1%	3	4.2%	137	4.1%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Having Highway Run Off Lanes	117	3.7%	9	6.4%	3	4.2%	129	3.9%
Keep Airstrips Open	111	3.5%	9	6.4%	6	8.3%	126	3.8%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/ Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	108	3.4%	14	10.0%	4	5.6%	126	3.8%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Highway Access?	100	3.2%	2	1.4%	5	6.9%	107	3.2%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	98	3.1%	3	2.1%	3	4.2%	104	3.1%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	82	2.6%	11	7.8%	2	2.8%	95	2.8%
Heritage Reasons	54	1.7%	4	2.8%	1	1.4%	59	1.8%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	50	1.6%	1	0.7%	1	1.4%	52	1.6%

Table 15 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason	49	1.6%	-	-	2	2.8%	54	1.6%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	47	1.5%	2	1.4%	2	2.8%	51	1.5%
Other	42	1.3%	4	2.8%	1	1.4%	47	1.4%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/ Disaster Management Plan	38	1.2%	2	1.4%	3	4.2%	43	1.3%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	38	1.2%	1	0.7%	-	-	39	1.2%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	37	1.2%	-	-	-	-	37	1.1%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	33	1.1%	-	-	1	1.4%	34	1.0%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	31	1.0%	-	-	-	-	31	0.9%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	24	0.8%	4	2.8%	-	-	28	0.8%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	22	0.7%	1	0.7%	1	1.4%	24	0.7%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversionary Landings but not as Destination Strips	22	0.7%	4	2.8%	-	-	26	0.8%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	21	0.7%	2	1.4%	1	1.4%	24	0.7%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	20	0.6%	1	0.7%	-	-	21	0.6%
Conflicting Parks Mandate (Protect & Enjoy)	14	0.4%	-	-	1	1.4%	15	0.4%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	14	0.4%	-	-	-	-	14	0.4%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	9	0.3%	1	0.7%	-	-	10	0.3%

Table 15 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	8	0.3%	1	0.7%	-	-	9	0.3%
Mitigations Suggested	5	0.2%	3	2.1%	-	-	8	0.2%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	5	0.2%	-	-	2	2.8%	7	0.2%
Neutral	1	0.03%	-	-	-	-	1	0.02%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	1	0.03%	-	-	-	-	1	0.02%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	1	0.03%	-	-	-	-	1	0.02%
Total Comments by Pilots by Airstrip	3,132	100.0%	141	100.0%	72	100.0%	3,345	
Total Comments by Pilots		94.6%		4.2%		2.2%		100.0%

Table 16
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Non-Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Non-Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	57	22.4%	-	-	2	11.1%	59	21.1%
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	54	21.2%	-	-	2	11.1%	56	20.1%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	17	6.7%	-	-	-	-	17	6.1%
Limited Impact on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint	13	5.1%	-	-	3	16.7%	16	5.7%
Keep Airstrips Open	9	3.5%	-	-	2	11.1%	11	3.9%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	9	3.5%	1	16.7%	2	11.1%	12	4.3%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/Weather Changes Rapidly	9	3.5%	-	-	1	5.6%	10	3.6%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	9	3.5%	-	-	1	5.6%	10	3.6%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Highway Access?	8	3.1%	-	-	-	-	8	2.9%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason	8	3.1%	-	-	-	-	8	2.9%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Having Highway Run Off Lanes	7	2.7%	-	-	-	-	7	2.5%
Mitigations Suggested	6	2.4%	-	-	-	-	6	2.2%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	5	2.0%	-	-	1	5.6%	6	2.2%

Table 16 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Non-Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Non-Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	4	1.6%	-	-	-	-	4	1.4%
Other	4	1.6%	-	-	-	-	4	1.4%
Inappropriate Activity/Park Should Not Cater to Recreational Interests (Airstrips, Ice Climbing)	4	1.6%	-	-	-	-	4	1.4%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	3	1.2%	1	16.7%	-	-	4	1.4%
Support Decommissioning	3	1.2%	1	16.7%	-	-	4	1.4%
Heritage Reasons	3	1.2%	-	-	1	5.6%	4	1.4%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	3	1.2%	-	-	-	-	3	1.1%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	3	1.2%	-	-	-	-	3	1.1%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/Interpretation	3	1.2%	-	-	-	-	3	1.1%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	2	0.8%	-	-	-	-	2	0.7%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	2	0.8%	-	-	-	-	2	0.7%
Manage Each Park Based on Needs & Resources	2	0.8%	-	-	-	-	2	0.7%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	2	0.8%	2	33.3%	2	11.1%	6	2.2%

Table 16 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Self-Identified Non-Pilots Noting “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”

Comment	Frequency of Response by Self-Identified Non-Pilots							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	2	0.8%	2	33.3%	2	11.1%	6	2.2%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	2	0.8%	1	16.7%	-	-	3	1.1%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	1	0.4%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Conflicting Parks Mandate (Protect & Enjoy)	1	0.4%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers to Access Parks	1	0.4%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Access	1	0.4%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	-	-	-	-	1	5.6%	1	0.4%
Total Comments by Non-Pilots by Airstrip	255	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	279	
Total Comments by Non-Pilots		91.4%		2.2%		6.5%		100.0%

IV.3. Comments by Respondents Aware/Not Aware of Closed Status of Airstrips

Did awareness of the closed status of the airstrips result in different types of responses?

Comments were sorted by whether or not the respondent demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips. Tables 17 and 18 present the collapsed codes sorted by awareness and non-awareness of the closed status, ranked based on the frequency of responses that indicated Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips.

Comments from respondents demonstrating awareness of the closed status of the airstrips were compared with comments from those who did not demonstrate awareness, to identify any distinct differences. Overall, fewer different comments were raised by individuals who demonstrated that they were not aware of the closed status of the airstrips (e.g., 22 different comments compared to 38 by those demonstrating awareness).

Comments are presented relative to:

- Safety / Emergencies / Search and Rescue / Weather Reporting,
- Support for Maintaining Airstrips,
- Support for Decommissioning the Airstrips,
- Environment and Wildlife,
- Liability / Costs,
- Heritage Reasons,
- Mitigations Suggested, and
- Other.

Safety / Emergencies / Search and Rescue / Weather Reporting

The top two most frequent comments were the same by both respondents who demonstrated awareness and those who did not. These were:

- Safety concerns and the perceived need for the airstrips to provide an ongoing role for diversionary and emergency landings. This was stated by 364 or 21.8% of total comments by those demonstrating awareness of the closure, and by 66 or 38.2% of all comments by those demonstrating non-awareness.
- Support for the recommendation of the Air Risk Safety Assessment, as per the COPA interpretation, to keep the airstrips open. This was noted by 168 or 10.1% of all comments by those demonstrating awareness and by 24 or 13.9% of all comments by those demonstrating non-awareness.

Other comments related to safety concerns noted by both groups include:

- Both those demonstrating awareness (67 or 4.0% of all comments by those aware) and those not demonstrating awareness (2 or 1.2% of all comments by those not aware) felt strongly that highway landings are dangerous and alternatives are required for emergency landings, somewhat like runaway lanes on highways.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Reduced weather information reporting by Navigation Canada, inaccurate forecasts, and rapidly changing weather conditions were noted 86 times (5.2% of all comments by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status), and 1 time (0.6% of all comments by those demonstrating non-awareness).
- The concern that alternate airstrips were too far away was noted 18 times by those demonstrating awareness (1.1% of total aware) and once by those not demonstrating awareness (0.6%).
- The role of airstrips in supporting search and rescue access and reducing related costs was noted 24 times by those demonstrating awareness (1.4%) and once by those demonstrating non-awareness (0.6%).

Comments related to safety and emergency situations noted only by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status of the airstrips included:

- The airstrips have a potential role to play relative to Medivac and highway emergencies, fire fighting, disaster management and evacuation. This was noted 33 times, representing 2.0% of all comments from those demonstrating awareness.
- The comment that decommissioning the airstrips contradicts efforts to promote aviation safety was noted 10 times (0.6% of all comments from those demonstrating awareness).

Support for Maintaining Airstrips

The following comments were made by both respondents demonstrating awareness and those demonstrating non-awareness of the closed status of the airstrips:

- The comment to keep the airstrips open was noted 51 times by those demonstrating awareness of their closed status (3.1% of all comments by those demonstrating awareness) and 6 times by those demonstrating non-awareness (3.5%).
- The opportunity to maintain or expand the airstrips for tourism and recreation access was noted in 56 comments or 3.4% of those demonstrating awareness, and 19 comments or 11.0% of those demonstrating non-awareness.
- The benefits for tourism, recreation, the economy, and environmental awareness were identified 22 times, or 1.3% of all comments by those demonstrating awareness, and 9 times, or 5.2% of all comments by those demonstrating non-awareness.
- Concerns about closing air access over National Parks was noted in 62 comments by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status (3.7%), and twice by those not demonstrating awareness (1.2%).

Some comments in support of maintaining the airstrips were raised only by those respondents demonstrating awareness of the closed status, including:

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- The comment that the preferred VFR routes through the mountains were identified by government and that there is an obligation to maintain these, was noted 65 times by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status (3.9%).
- The comment that airstrips should be maintained for emergency or diversionary landings but not as destination strips was noted 17 times, representing 1.0% of all comments from those demonstrating awareness of the closed status.

Support for Decommissioning Airstrips

- A total of 18 of the 21 respondents supporting decommissioning of the airstrips demonstrated awareness of their closed status. This represents 1.1% of the comments made by respondents demonstrating awareness. No one demonstrating non-awareness supported decommissioning.

Other comments in support of decommissioning were noted only by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status. These include:

- The importance of grasslands in maintaining biodiversity and the potential for interpretation of restoration efforts was noted 30 times (1.8 % of comments made by those demonstrating awareness).
- It was noted in 18 comments (0.7% of all comments made by those demonstrating awareness) that there would be negative wildlife impacts if the airstrips are not decommissioned and positive impacts if they are decommissioned.
- The view that airstrips and other purely recreational activities such as ice climbing are inappropriate activities in National Parks was noted 15 times (0.9% of comments by those demonstrating awareness).
- The comment that decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety was made 11 times (0.7% of all comments made by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status).

Environment and Wildlife

- The comment that the airstrips have less of an environmental impact than the highway, railway and other activities was made 136 times by those demonstrating awareness (8.2% of all comments by those aware) and 12 times (6.9%) of those demonstrating non-awareness.
- A total of 97 comments (5.8% of those demonstrating awareness) and 8 comments (4.6% of those demonstrating non-awareness) noted that airstrips have limited impact on wildlife, and that Parks Canada practices of using helicopters for management practices was inconsistent with the desire to decommission the airstrips.

Liability / Costs

- The potential for lawsuits and legal responsibility on the part of Parks Canada was identified 56 times by those demonstrating awareness (3.4% of total comments by those demonstrating awareness) and twice by those demonstrating non-awareness (1.2%).
- Concerns with bureaucrats, government expenditures and political control for no reason were noted 23 times by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status (1.4% of all comments by those demonstrating awareness) and 2 times by those demonstrating non-awareness (1.2%).
- Both groups also noted that Parks Canada was too concerned with the costs of operation of the airstrips (18 or 1.1% of those demonstrating awareness, and 2 or 1.2% of those demonstrating non-awareness).
- The comment that the cost of trying to shut down the airstrips is too high was made 12 times by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status (0.7%). This comment was not made by those demonstrating non-awareness of the closed status.

Heritage Reasons

- Both those aware (27 or 1.6% of all comments from those demonstrating awareness) and those unaware (2 or 1.2% of all comments from those demonstrating unawareness of the closed status) noted that the airstrips are part of the heritage of both Banff and Jasper National Parks.

Mitigations Suggested

- Mitigations were only suggested by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status (18 or 1.1% of all comments from those demonstrating awareness).
- More detail regarding suggested mitigations is provided in Section IV.6.

Other

- Comments regarding the amount and validity of information provided in the study reports were noted 30 times, representing 1.8% of all comments by respondents demonstrating awareness of the closed status of the airstrips. This comment was not noted by those demonstrating non-awareness.
- The suggestion that Parks Policy allows for the designation of landing sites in Parks was noted in 10 submissions that demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips (0.6% of total comments from respondents indicating awareness of the closed status). This was not noted in any submissions that demonstrated they were not aware of the closed status of the airstrips.

Summary

Overall, a wider range of comments was presented by those respondents who demonstrated awareness of the closed status of the airstrips (e.g., 38 different comments) than by those who demonstrated non-awareness (22). Those respondents that did not clearly demonstrate their awareness were not considered in this aspect of the analysis.

The most noticeable difference was that 18 of the 21 respondents noting support for decommissioning of the airstrips demonstrated that they were aware of the closed status of the airstrips. Similarly, all comments that suggested positive results from decommissioning (e.g., restoration of grasslands and biodiversity, positive impacts on wildlife, minimal impact on safety, and that airstrips are an inappropriate activity in National Parks), were made only by those demonstrating an awareness of the closed status (or it was unable to tell from the submission).

While both groups provided comments regarding why the airstrips should be maintained, a wider variety of comments was made by those respondents demonstrating awareness of the closed status. This included support for maintaining the airstrips as emergency or diversionary landing sites, but not opening them up to recreational use, and the view that the government of Canada has an obligation to maintain the VFR routes through the mountains.

Suggestions for mitigation and comments regarding the validity and amount of data provided in the reports were noted only by those demonstrating awareness of the closed status.

Table 17
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Awareness

Comment	Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments by Respondents Demonstrating Awareness of Closed Status	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversions/Emergency Landings	329	23.5%	21	11.8%	14	15.4%	364	21.8%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	162	11.6%	3	1.7%	3	3.3%	168	10.1%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	118	8.4%	10	5.6%	8	8.8%	136	8.2%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint	78	5.6%	12	6.7%	7	7.7%	97	5.8%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	74	5.3%	8	4.5%	4	4.4%	86	5.2%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Highway Access?	57	4.1%	2	1.1%	3	3.3%	62	3.7%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Having Highway Run Off Lanes	57	4.1%	7	3.9%	3	3.3%	67	4.0%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	56	4.0%	7	3.9%	2	2.2%	65	3.9%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	52	3.7%	1	0.6%	3	3.3%	56	3.4%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	48	3.4%	3	1.7%	5	5.5%	56	3.4%

Table 17 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Awareness

Comment	Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments by Respondents Demonstrating Awareness of Closed Status	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Keep Airstrips Open	43	3.1%	4	2.2%	4	4.4%	51	3.1%
Other	28	2.0%	4	2.2%	7	7.7%	39	2.3%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	26	1.9%	2	1.1%	2	2.2%	30	1.8%
Heritage Reasons	23	1.6%	1	0.6%	3	3.3%	27	1.6%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	23	1.6%	-	-	1	1.1%	24	1.4%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/ Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	20	1.4%	-	-	2	2.2%	22	1.3%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/ Political Control for No Reason	20	1.4%	2	1.1%	1	1.1%	23	1.4%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/ Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	19	1.4%	10	5.6%	4	4.4%	33	2.0%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	17	1.2%	1	0.6%	-	-	18	1.1%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	14	1.0%	4	2.2%	-	-	18	1.1%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversions Landings but not as Destination Strips	13	0.9%	4	2.2%	-	-	17	1.0%
Mitigations Suggested	11	0.8%	6	3.4%	1	1.1%	18	1.1%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	11	0.8%	3	1.7%	2	2.2%	16	1.0%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Access	11	0.8%	1	0.6%	-	-	12	0.7%

Table 17 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Awareness

Comment	Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments by Respondents Demonstrating Awareness of Closed Status	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	10	0.7%	1	0.6%	1	1.1%	12	0.7%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	9	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-	10	0.6%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	9	0.6%	-	-	1	1.1%	10	0.6%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	9	0.6%	19	10.7%	2	2.2%	30	1.8%
Inappropriate Activity/Park Should Not Cater to Recreational Interests (Airstrips, Ice Climbing)	9	0.6%	6	3.4%	-	-	15	0.9%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	8	0.6%	-	-	-	-	8	0.5%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	7	0.5%	1	0.6%	2	2.2%	10	0.6%
Support Decommissioning	6	0.4%	10	5.6%	2	2.2%	18	1.1%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	6	0.4%	2	1.1%	2	2.2%	10	0.6%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission	5	0.4%	13	7.3%	-	-	18	1.1%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	4	0.3%	7	3.9%	-	-	11	0.7%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	3	0.2%	1	0.6%	1	1.1%	5	0.3%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	3	0.2%	-	-	1	1.1%	4	0.2%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	-	-	1	0.6%	-	-	1	0.1%
Total Aware Comments by Airstrip	1,398	100.0%	178	100.0%	91	100.0%	1,667	
Total Aware Comments		83.9%		10.7%		5.5%		100.0%

Table 18
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Non-Awareness

Comment	Non-Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments by Respondents Demonstrating Non-Awareness of Closed Status	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	63	39.6%	3	21.4%	-	-	66	38.2%
Support Air Safety Risk Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	24	15.1%	-	-	-	-	24	13.9%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	12	7.5%	-	-	-	-	12	6.9%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.6%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	8	5.0%	1	7.1%	-	-	9	5.2%
Keep Airstrips Open	6	3.8%	-	-	-	-	6	3.5%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Highway Access?	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	17	10.7%	2	14.3%	-	-	19	11.0%
Heritage Reasons	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.6%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Having Highway Run Off Lanes	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	3	1.9%	-	-	-	-	3	1.7%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%

Table 18 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Closure Non-Awareness

Comment	Non-Awareness of Closed Status of Airstrips							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments by Respondents Demonstrating Non-Awareness of Closed Status	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.6%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.6%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	1	0.6%	2	14.3%	-	-	3	1.7%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint	7	4.4%	1	7.1%	-	-	8	4.6%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason	2	1.3%	-	-	-	-	2	1.2%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Access	-	-	1	7.1%	-	-	1	0.6%
Other	-	-	4	28.6%	-	-	4	2.3%
Total Unaware Comments by Airstrip	159	100.0%	14	100.0%	-	-	173	
Total Unaware Comments		91.9%		8.1%		-		100.0%

IV.4. Number of Comments Per Submission

Did the type of comments vary depending on whether there was only one comment or if there were two or more specific comments?

Table 19 presents a frequency count of the number of times each comment was noted when there was only one comment provided, and the number of times each was provided when there were two or more comments.

- A total of 4,363 specific comments were provided in the 1,512 submissions.
- Of these, a total of 428 submissions provided only one comment, or 9.8% of all specific comments. This accounted for just over one quarter of the total 1,512 submissions (28.3%).
- A total of 1,084 submissions provided 2 or more comments, accounting for 3,935 specific comments.
- The most frequently noted comment overall was support for maintaining the airstrips for safety, diversionary and emergency landings. This accounted for 196 or 45.8% of all responses that provided only one comment.
- This comment was noted 912 times in submissions with 2 or more comments, accounting for 23.2% of the total 3,935 comments provided.
- The second most frequently noted comment was support for the Air Safety Risk Assessment Study recommendations, as per the interpretation of COPA. This was identified 162 times in submissions providing only one comment (37.9% of the 428 single comments).
- It was also noted 429 times in submissions including two or more comments (10.9% of the total 3,935 comments), a significantly smaller percentage than when only one comment was provided.
- The next most often noted comment by those submissions providing one comment was to keep the airstrips open. This was noted 32 times, or 7.5% of all responses having only one comment. It was noted 161 times in submissions having two or more comments (4.1%).
- The only other comment made more than 3 times in submissions with one comment was the opportunity to maintain or expand the airstrips for tourism and recreation access. This was noted 11 times in single comment submissions (2.6%), and 167 times in submissions with two or more comments (4.2%).
- None of the submissions with one comment only indicated support for decommissioning of the airstrips.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Table 19
Frequency of Comments By Submissions With One and Two or More Comments

	Total Separate Comments		Submissions with One Comment		Comments In Submissions with Two or More Comments	
	#	% of Total Comments	#	% of One Comment Submissions	#	% of Two or More Comments/ Submission
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	1,108	25.4%	196	45.8%	912	23.2%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	591	13.5%	162	37.9%	429	10.9%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	394	9.0%	1	0.2%	393	10.0%
Limited Impact of Airstrips on Wildlife Inconsistent Practices by Parks	210	4.8%	1	0.2%	209	5.3%
Keep Airstrips Open	193	4.4%	32	7.5%	161	4.1%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	178	4.1%	11	2.6%	167	4.2%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Highway Run Off Lanes	152	3.5%	-	-	152	3.9%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What Highway Access?	149	3.4%	3	0.7%	146	3.7%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Services / Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	148	3.4%	3	0.7%	145	3.7%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	141	3.2%	2	0.5%	139	3.5%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/ Obligation to Maintain	115	2.6%	1	0.2%	114	2.9%
Heritage Reasons	78	1.8%	1	0.2%	77	2.0%
Other	75	1.7%	2	0.5%	73	1.9%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	65	1.5%	-	-	65	1.7%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/ Recreation/ Environmental Awareness/ Reporting Fires	61	1.4%	2	0.5%	59	1.5%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/ Evacuation/ Fires/Disasters/ Disaster Management Plan	53	1.2%	-	-	53	1.3%

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Table 19 (Continued)
Frequency of Comments By Submissions With One and Two or More Comments

	Total Separate Comments		Submissions with One Comment		Comments In Submissions with Two or More Comments	
	#	% of Total Comments	#	% of One Comment Submissions	#	% of Two or More Comments/ Submission
Government/Political Control for no Reason	52	1.2%	1	0.2%	51	1.3%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	49	1.1%	-	-	49	1.2%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	45	1.0%	1	0.2%	44	1.1%
Need More Airstrips Across Country/Key Means of Access	45	1.0%	-	-	45	1.1%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	45	1.0%	-	-	45	1.1%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	36	0.8%	1	0.2%	35	0.9%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	34	0.8%	-	-	34	0.9%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	32	0.7%	-	-	32	0.8%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency Landings / Not Destination Strips	29	0.7%	1	0.2%	28	0.7%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	28	0.6%	-	-	28	0.7%
Mitigations Suggested	22	0.5%	-	-	22	0.6%
Base for Fighting Forest Fires/Natural Disasters/Emergency Access	22	0.5%	-	-	22	0.6%
Support Decommissioning	21	0.5%	3	0.7%	18	0.5%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	20	0.5%	-	-	20	0.5%
Park Fees/Pilot Willing to Pay/ Maintain	18	0.4%	-	-	18	0.5%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/ Expenditures/ Political Control for no Reason	18	0.4%	2	0.5%	16	0.4%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	16	0.4%	-	-	16	0.4%
Negative Wildlife Impact if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	13	0.3%	-	-	13	0.3%
Decommissioning Supports Parks Mandate & Goals to Maintain or Restore Ecological Integrity	13	0.3%	-	-	13	0.3%

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Table 19 (Continued)
Frequency of Comments By Submissions With One and Two or More Comments

	Total Separate Comments		Submissions with One Comment		Comments In Submissions with Two or More Comments	
	#	% of Total Comments	#	% of One Comment Submissions	#	% of Two or More Comments/ Submission
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	12	0.3%	-	-	12	0.3%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	11	0.3%	-	-	11	0.3%
Park Environment Should not Cater to Purely Recreation (Airstrips & Ice Climbing), Inappropriate Activity	11	0.3%	-	-	11	0.3%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	11	0.3%	-	-	11	0.3%
Training Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	10	0.2%	-	-	10	0.3%
Negative Environmental Impact of Maintaining, Clearing, Cutting Airstrip	7	0.2%	-	-	7	0.2%
Transport Canada Role in Closure	7	0.2%	-	-	7	0.2%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	5	0.1%	-	-	5	0.1%
Seeking information	4	0.1%	1	0.2%	3	0.1%
Decommissioning will Result in Opportunities for Interpretation	3	0.1%	-	-	3	0.1%
Aircraft Inappropriate Activity in Parks	3	0.1%	-	-	3	0.1%
Need Disaster Management Plan	3	0.1%	-	-	3	0.1%
Concern About Government/Political Expenditures	2	0.0%	-	-	2	0.1%
Maintaining Route for Recreational VFR Fliers not National Transportation Issue	1	0.0%	-	-	1	0.0%
Access for Disabled	1	0.0%	-	-	1	0.0%
Use for Removing Garbage	1	0.0%	-	-	1	0.0%
Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	1	0.0%	-	-	1	0.0%
Neutral	1	0.0%	1	0.2%	-	-
Total By Number of Comments	4,363		428	100.0%	3,935	100.0%
Total Comments		100.0%		9.8%		90.2%

IV.5. Comments by Place of Residence

Did the type of comments provided differ depending on the place of residence of respondents?

Comments were sorted by place of residence of respondent based on collapsed comment codes and collapsed place of residence for Canada and the United States. In addition, they were sorted on a regional basis for Alberta. As noted earlier, identification of place of residence was not required, and this information was obtained from addresses or information provided in the submission.

Tables 20 and 21 present the collapsed codes sorted by place of residence for all areas and for Alberta regions only, ranked based on the frequency of all responses.

Appendix 2 includes tables showing the ranking of collapsed codes by place of residence as follows:

- Appendix 2.2: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence For “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked by Total Alberta
- Appendix 2.3: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence For “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta
- Appendix 2.4: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence For “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked by Total Alberta
- Appendix 2.5: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Alberta Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked by Total Alberta
- Appendix 2.6: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Alberta Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked by Total Alberta
- Appendix 2.7: Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Alberta Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips: Ranked by Total Alberta.

Responses from respondents with different places of residence were compared to identify any distinct differences

- There were few distinct differences in types of comments based on place of residence.
- The most significant differences were noted relative to comments either specifically supporting decommissioning of the airstrips or related to perceived positive benefits that would result if they were decommissioned.
- A total of 18 of the 21 comments indicating support for decommissioning were from Alberta. Of the remaining three comments, one was from British Columbia, one from other, and one was unknown.
- Of the 18 comments from Alberta, 14 were from Red Deer South and Banff/Canmore, and only 4 were from Red Deer North and Jasper.
- A total of 29 specific comments relating to the role that restoring grasslands has in maintaining biodiversity and providing interpretive opportunities were noted in submissions from Alberta (2.1% of all comments from Alberta), and once from British Columbia. These comments were only noted in the 21 submissions indicating support for the proposed decommissioning of the airstrips.

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

- Of these, 24 comments were from Red Deer and South and Banff/Canmore and only 5 were from Red Deer North and Jasper.
- The comment that impacts on wildlife would be negative if the airstrips weren't decommissioned or positive if they were was noted 15 times, all by Albertans (1.1% of all comments from Albertans). Again, most of the comments were from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore (13), compared to only 2 from Northern Alberta and Jasper.
- Comments that airstrips and ice climbing are purely recreational interests that are inappropriate in National Parks were noted 14 times by Albertans only (1.0% of all Alberta comments). Of these, 10 were noted by residents of Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore, and only 4 were noted by residents of Northern Alberta and Jasper.
- The suggestion that decommissioning the airstrips would have a low to minimal impact on safety was noted 9 times by Albertans (0.6% of all Alberta responses) and once by a resident of British Columbia. Of the Alberta submissions, 7 were from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore, and only 2 were from Northern Alberta and Jasper.
- Mitigations were most often suggested by respondents from Alberta (20 or 1.4% of comments from Alberta), and 2 were suggested by respondents from other areas. Of the Alberta residents, 16 were from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore, and 4 were from Northern Alberta and Jasper.
- Respondents from Alberta (21 or 1.5% of total Alberta comments) questioned the amount and validity of information almost three times more often than those in British Columbia (7) or Other (8). In Alberta, more respondents from Northern Alberta and Jasper (13 or 2.3% of all respondents in that area) noted this comment than from Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore (8 or 1.0% of comments from that area).
- One other regional difference related to higher recognition in Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore of the potential economic / tourism / recreation / environmental awareness benefits of maintaining the airstrips (10 times or 1.2% of all comments in that area compared to 4 comments or 0.7% of all comments in Northern Alberta and Jasper).

Summary

There were only a few distinct differences noted related to place of residence. These were primarily comments indicating support for decommissioning of the airstrips which were provided by residents of Alberta.

A few regional differences also were noted within Alberta, most corresponding to those differences on a provincial/territorial level regarding support for decommissioning of the airstrips.

Other regional differences included more questions regarding the amount and validity of data from residents in Northern Alberta and Jasper, and more suggestions for mitigations from residents in Southern Alberta and Banff/Canmore.

Table 20
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		BC		Other (Prairies, Ontario & East, US)		Total	
	Total	% of Total Alberta	Total	% of Total BC	Total	% of Total Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	293	21.1%	227	25.2%	389	27.6%	909	24.6%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	156	11.2%	133	14.8%	250	17.7%	539	14.6%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	113	8.1%	88	9.8%	135	9.6%	336	9.1%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint	101	7.3%	36	4.0%	50	3.5%	187	5.1%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/Weather Changes Rapidly	62	4.5%	36	4.0%	33	2.3%	131	3.5%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	54	3.9%	45	5.0%	53	3.8%	152	4.1%
Costly and Short Sighted to Close Airstrips	52	3.7%	34	3.8%	37	2.6%	123	3.3%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	51	3.7%	26	2.9%	45	3.2%	122	3.3%
Keep Airstrips Open	44	3.2%	32	3.6%	67	4.7%	143	3.9%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	38	2.7%	46	5.1%	40	2.8%	124	3.4%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	38	2.7%	10	1.1%	18	1.3%	66	1.8%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	37	2.7%	31	3.4%	32	2.3%	100	2.7%
Other	30	2.2%	12	1.3%	30	2.1%	72	1.9%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/Interpretation	29	2.1%	1	0.1%	-	-	30	0.8%
Heritage Reasons	27	1.9%	9	1.0%	35	2.5%	71	1.9%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs	22	1.6%	7	0.8%	20	1.4%	49	1.3%

Table 20 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		BC		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Alberta	Total	% of Total BC	Total	% of Total Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Question Amount & Validity of Information	21	1.5%	7	0.8%	8	0.6%	36	1.0%
Mitigations Suggested	20	1.4%	-	-	2	0.1%	22	0.6%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason	20	1.4%	17	1.9%	21	1.5%	58	1.6%
Support Decommissioning	18	1.3%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	20	0.5%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	17	1.2%	11	1.2%	8	0.6%	36	1.0%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/ Positive if Decommission	15	1.1%	-	-	-	-	15	0.4%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/ Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	14	1.0%	15	1.7%	27	1.9%	56	1.5%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	14	1.0%	8	0.9%	16	1.1%	38	1.0%
Inappropriate Activity/Park Should Not Cater to Recreational Interests (Airstrips, Ice Climbing)	14	1.0%	-	-	-	-	14	0.4%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	13	0.9%	8	0.9%	4	0.3%	25	0.7%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers to Access Parks	11	0.8%	11	1.2%	17	1.2%	39	1.1%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	10	0.7%	8	0.9%	9	0.6%	27	0.7%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	9	0.6%	1	0.1%	-	-	10	0.3%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversions Landings but not as Destination Strips	7	0.5%	4	0.4%	13	0.9%	24	0.6%
Park Fees / Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	7	0.5%	7	0.8%	1	0.1%	15	0.4%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Access	7	0.5%	12	1.3%	18	1.3%	37	1.0%
Conflicting Parks Mandate (Protect & Enjoy)	6	0.4%	4	0.4%	6	0.4%	16	0.4%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	6	0.4%	1	0.1%	3	0.2%	10	0.3%

Table 20 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		BC		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Alberta	Total	% of Total BC	Total	% of Total Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	4	0.3%	1	0.1%	-	-	5	0.1%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	3	0.2%	6	0.7%	13	0.9%	22	0.6%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	3	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	0.2%	11	0.3%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	1	0.1%	-	-	7	0.5%	8	0.2%
Total Comments by Place of Residence	1,387	100.0%	900	100.0%	1,411	100.0%	3,698	100.0%

Table 21
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments for Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments for South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments for North of Red Deer & Jasper
Safety/Diversiary/Emergency Landings	293	21.1%	172	20.8%	121	21.5%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	156	11.2%	91	11.0%	65	11.6%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/ Other Activities	113	8.1%	63	7.6%	50	8.9%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks /Remove Human Footprint	101	7.3%	59	7.2%	42	7.5%
Nav Canada Reduced Weather Information/Inaccurate Forecasts/Weather Changes Rapidly	62	4.5%	40	4.8%	22	3.9%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	54	3.9%	26	3.2%	28	5.0%
Highway landings dangerous; need alternatives	52	3.7%	36	4.4%	16	2.8%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	51	3.7%	32	3.9%	19	3.4%
Keep Airstrips Open	44	3.2%	27	3.3%	17	3.0%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	38	2.7%	21	2.5%	17	3.0%
Medivac / Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/ Disasters / Disaster Management Plan	38	2.7%	19	2.3%	19	3.4%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	37	2.7%	22	2.7%	15	2.7%
Other	32	2.3%	16	1.9%	14	2.5%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/ Protection/Interpretation	29	2.1%	24	2.9%	5	0.9%
Heritage Reasons	27	1.9%	17	2.1%	10	1.8%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	22	1.6%	13	1.6%	9	1.6%

Table 21 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments for Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments for South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments for North of Red Deer & Jasper
Question Amount & Validity of Information	21	1.5%	8	1.0%	13	2.3%
Mitigations Suggested	20	1.4%	16	1.9%	4	0.7%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason	20	1.4%	15	1.8%	5	0.9%
Support Decommissioning	18	1.3%	14	1.7%	4	0.7%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	17	1.2%	8	1.0%	9	1.6%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/ Positive if Decommission	15	1.1%	13	1.6%	2	0.4%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/ Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	14	1.0%	10	1.2%	4	0.7%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	14	1.0%	7	0.8%	7	1.2%
Inappropriate Activity/Park Should Not Cater to Recreational Interests (Airstrips, Ice Climbing)	14	1.0%	10	1.2%	4	0.7%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	13	0.9%	3	0.4%	10	1.8%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	11	0.8%	7	0.8%	4	0.7%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	10	0.7%	6	0.7%	4	0.7%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	9	0.6%	7	0.8%	2	0.4%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversionary Landings but not as Destination Strips	7	0.5%	4	0.5%	3	0.5%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	7	0.5%	2	0.2%	5	0.9%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	7	0.5%	4	0.5%	3	0.5%
Conflicting Parks Mandate (Protect & Enjoy)	6	0.4%	3	0.4%	3	0.5%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	6	0.4%	3	0.4%	3	0.5%

Table 21 (Continued)
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence Ranked Based on Total Alberta

Comment	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments for Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments for South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments for North of Red Deer & Jasper
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	4	0.3%	3	0.4%	1	0.2%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	3	0.2%	1	0.1%	2	0.4%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	3	0.2%	2	0.2%	1	0.2%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	-	-
Total Comments by Place of Residence	1,389	99.7%	825	99.9%	562	100.0%

IV.6. Comments Suggesting Mitigations

A total of 22 mitigations (0.5% of all comments) were suggested, including the following:

Continued maintenance of the airstrip

- The National Parks Aircraft Access Regulations (NPAAR) can be fully implemented by following the preferred mitigation option as recommended in the Air Safety Risk Assessment report. This preferred option is:
 1. The physical structures at the airstrips are removed except for the runway markers, windsocks and signs with instructions to pilots.
 2. The runways are maintained by cutting the grass when greater than 6 inches and plowing the snow when greater than 6 inches deep.
 3. The airstrips continue to be posted in the Canadian Flight Supplement with notations that their use is for emergency and diversionary landings only, unless by permission of the Park Superintendent.
 4. The airstrips continue to be marked on the navigational charts and included in GPC databases.
- Buildings for storage of aircraft (e.g., hangars) should be banned, except for those for emergency aircraft and licensed tour operators. Licensed tour operators would have very strict operating rules based upon environmental protection strategies. No flying schools or charter operations would be allowed on the airstrips, and air operations would be suspended during wildlife migratory periods.
- Decommissioning of the airstrips should be contingent on Parks Canada demonstrating why they cannot accept the simple removal of the windsocks, access road, old hangars and current aerodrome “resident” and keep the trees from growing where people have landed since 1934, as an alternative strategy to decommissioning

Grasslands for Emergency Landings

- Maintenance of the area of the airstrips as open grassland through the use of prescribed fire once they are decommissioned will still provide pilots with a soft field landing area for emergency landings. Several related comments observed that these open fields would likely be functional for true emergency landings, even if not maintained.

Grassland Restoration

- The recommendations for monitoring and follow-up provide great potential to learn valuable lessons about restoration of native grasslands in mountain areas.
- Special attention should be given to ensuring past fuelling areas are appropriately investigated and mitigated.

- While measures to address Canadian Thistle are welcomed, safer alternatives to Glyphosate applications are encouraged, given the variety of unique and special plant species in the area.

Improved Weather Reporting Services

- Decommissioning of the airstrips and removing them from flight planning literature offers an opportunity for the federal government to follow up on the weather office closures and encourages risk avoidance through conservative flights planning and fly/no fly decisions by pilots.
- Establishing weather reporting facilities in critical locations, such as the Exshaw Gap, would be an important mitigation measure if decommissioning and reclamation projects have an unacceptable impact on aviation safety. National Parks ecological integrity dictates this choice over the provision of environmentally disruptive airstrips.
- Decommissioning of the airstrips should be contingent on an improved weather reporting system be in place so that pilots can avail themselves of real time weather information that is partially now available through the system of existing weather stations used for avalanche analysis and other scientific purposes.

Other Recreational Use of the Airstrips

- Decommissioning of the airstrips should be contingent on all other recreational activity on the aerodrome ceasing and that Parks Canada be compelled to fulfill its stated mitigations within a specific period of time and that a public reporting system regarding this be implemented.
- In Section 5.8 on Recreational Use, the consultants noted an important recreational use of the area was off-leash dog walking, which is prohibited under the National Parks Act. Continued use of this area as a recreational dog walking area will do much to erode the ecological benefits of airstrip decommissioning. Parks should take concrete steps to implementing an ecological closure in the airstrip area to ensure restoration efforts are effective.

Alternative Airstrips

- Another suggestion might be to put a strip beside the highway as has been done along the Alaska Highway.
- In terms of Banff, there appears to be sufficient land available to build an airstrip adjacent to the Bow River, between Canmore and Dead Man's Flats. While costing more, it would provide for safer landing conditions for aircraft, given the locations relatively equidistant from the two adjacent mountain slopes. As well, the approach and departure routes are not hindered by rapidly rising terrain, as exists at the present Banff airstrip. This option would also allow for commercial use.
- Another alternate emergency airstrip could be situated in the vicinity of Healy Pass between the Bow River and the Sunshine Ski Area interchange on the Trans Canada Highway.

Wildlife Corridor

- If it is environmentally beneficial to widen the animal corridor in Banff between the Banff Airstrip and Cascade Mountain, the parking area could be removed and the airstrip moved closer to the Trans Canada Highway. Realigning the strip into the prevailing wind would also make approaches easier. A similar comment notes that there is sufficient space on the SW side, especially at the NE end of the airstrip, to relocate the airport infrastructure, including the fueling station, hangar space, tie downs and vehicle parking. This would open up the Norquay-Cascade Corridor for better wildlife transit of the area, and fencing could also be provided.
- An animal backtrack map shows most of the tracks in the vicinity of the Banff airstrip crowded into a narrow strip between the airstrip and Cascade Mountain. At first glance one might conclude that the airstrip is preventing the animals from using the whole corridor. But if the people analyzing the data also spent a few hours on the airstrip site, they would have no choice but to realize that it is not the airstrip that is pushing the wildlife up against the mountain, but the terrible noise from the Texas Gate combined with the highway and train traffic. As a result, the more skittish species would likely prefer to remain in the shelter of the trees next to the mountain, as far away from the noise as possible.

Developing a Cooperative Solution to Share the Park

- By working with the general aviation community, all parties could share the park and advance its aims, taking into account the historical significance and its importance to the advancement of flight safety.

Requirement for Adequate Mountain Flying Experience

- On the subject of risk assessment in flying, many of the recreational pilots flying in the mountains have little to no specific training in the hazards and different safety considerations required for mountain flying. As a mitigative measure to reduce mountain flying risk, recreational pilots seeking to open or close a VFR flight plan traveling through the mountain areas, and especially National Parks, should be required to have taken adequate mountain flying experience.

APPENDIX 1: Comment Codes

Appendix 1.1: Comment Codes (Full List)

Appendix 1.2: Collapsed Comment Codes

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Appendix 1.1: Comment Codes (Full List)

Code	Comment
1	Safety/emergency/diversionary landings due to weather or other emergency/particularly in mountain environment/pilots need to plan and be aware of options
2	Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to keep airstrips open for emergency and diversionary use
3	Medivac/highway emergencies/evacuation
4	Less of an environmental impact than highway traffic/RR/other activities (e.g., campfires); why allow cars and trains; why allow foreign tourists
5	Alternate landing strips not considered/too far away
6	Wildlife impacts (limited or positive) if maintain strips/inconsistent view by Parks (e.g., management practices use helicopters, etc)
7	Wildlife and environmental impacts (negative if don't decommission)/positive if decommission
8	Positive benefits for tourism/economy/recreation of leaving airports open or improving them; help to increase environmental awareness; pilots report fires
9	Keep airstrips open
10	Support decommissioning
11	Too concerned with cost of operation; could charge a voluntary fee to land
12	Concern about closing all our access over parks; Heritage Canada (government) wants control of airspace over parks; picking on air access over other types of access; interest in finding out what concerns there are with highway access
13	Contradicts efforts to promote aviation safety
14.1 (61)	Concerns with bureaucrats
14.2 (62)	Costs of search & rescue if airports closed; provide access for search and rescue; concern over search and rescue in mountains
14.3 (63)	Highway landings are dangerous; need alternatives; emergency air strips are like providing run off lanes on highway
14.4 (64)	Very costly and short sighted to close airstrips now and have to rebuild later; short sighted to put impediments in way; take steps backward
14.5 (65)	Should open up more air strips across the country, especially in mountain areas; not enough air strips
14.6 (66)	Government of Canada has identified these routes as preferred routes; obligation to maintain only VFR routes through mountains
14.7 (67)	Conflicting mandate of Parks Canada (protect and enjoy)
14.8 (68)	Navigation Canada has reduced weather information services available to pilots; weather forecasts not always correct; rapidly changing conditions are the norm
14.9 (69)	Lawsuits are likely if strips closed and there are accidents; much to answer for; cost of loss of life; potential to die; irresponsible/NOTAM and use at own risk; Parks responsibility
14.11 (70)	Has Transport Canada been consulted about the closure
14.12 (71)	Comment about other government and political expenditures
14.13 (72)	Base for fighting forest fires/natural disasters/emergency access
14.14 (73)	Costs of trying to shut down too high
14.15 (74)	Aviation for children vs drugs etc.; training for future pilots; mountain flying training
14.16 (75)	Concern about Park fees; pilot willingness to pay; clubs/local operators could maintain
14.17 (76)	Government control for no reason; political
14.18 (77)	Provide access for handicapped

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Appendix 1.1: Comment Codes (Full List Continued)

Code	Comment
14.19 (78)	Parks seem to support extreme lobby (both for and against)
14.21 (79)	Other
14.22 (80)	Should manage each park based on its individual needs & resources; consistency issue
14.23 (81)	Right of Canadians/taxpayers for access to Parks
14.24 (82)	Use for removing garbage
14.25 (83)	Need Disaster Management Plan
14.26 (84)	Remove human footprint, air survey only
15	Question factual information in report (e.g., number of emergency landings); lack of information; should do full Environmental Impact Assessment
16	Opportunity to maintain/expand air strips; bring people to Parks for recreation, etc.; use reservations systems for use of strip
17	Don't support use of airstrips as destination strips; maintain for emergency or diversionary landings; recognize environmental concerns
18	Heritage reasons; why built in first place
19	Neutral
21	Seeking contact information
22	Importance of grasslands in maintaining biodiversity/protecting areas often overlooked
23	Decommissioning will result in opportunities for interpretation
24	Negative impacts on safety will be low to minimal if decommission
25	Airstrips serve purely recreational interests (VFR)/like ice climbing – why should park environment be altered to manage recreation use
26	Maintaining a route for recreational VFR fliers is not a national transportation route issue
27	Mitigations suggested (various)
28	Parks mandate to maintain or restore ecological integrity; decommissioning supports Parks goals and objectives
29	Aviation is a key means of access in Western and Northern Canada
31	Aircraft inappropriate activity in parks
32	Airstrip maintenance/clearing/cutting has negative environmental impact; not following directive
33	Parks policy allows for designation of landing sites in parks; concern with application in whole parks system

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Appendix 1.2: Collapsed Comment Codes

Code	Comment
1	Safety / emergency / diversionary landings due to weather or other emergency / particularly in mountain environment / pilots need to plan and be aware of options
2	Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to keep airstrips open for emergency and diversionary use
4	Less of an environmental impact than highway traffic / RR / other activities (e.g., campfires); why allow cars and trains; why allow foreign tourists
5	Alternate landing strips not considered / too far away
8	Positive benefits for tourism / economy / recreation of leaving airports open or improving them; help to increase environmental awareness; pilots report fires
9	Keep airstrips open
10	Support decommissioning
11	Too concerned with cost of operation; could charge a voluntary fee to land
12	Concern about closing all our access over parks; Heritage Canada (government) wants control of airspace over parks; picking on air access over other types of access; interest in finding out what concerns there are with highway access
13	Contradicts efforts to promote aviation safety
14.2 (62)	Costs of search & rescue if airports closed; provide access for search and rescue; concern over search and rescue in mountains
14.3 (63)	Highway landings are dangerous; need alternatives; emergency air strips are like providing run off lanes on highway
14.4 (64)	Very costly and short sighted to close airstrips now and have to rebuild later; short sighted to put impediments in way; take steps backward
14.6 (66)	Government of Canada has identified these routes as preferred routes; obligation to maintain only VFR routes through mountains
14.7 (67)	Conflicting mandate of Parks Canada (protect and enjoy)
14.8 (68)	Navigation Canada has reduced weather information services available to pilots; weather forecasts not always correct; rapidly changing conditions are the norm
14.9 (69)	Lawsuits are likely if strips closed and there are accidents; much to answer for; cost of loss of life; potential to die; irresponsible / NOTAM and use at own risk; Parks responsibility
14.14 (73)	Costs of trying to shut down too high
14.15 (74)	Aviation for children vs drugs etc.; training for future pilots; mountain flying training
14.16 (75)	Concern about Park fees; pilot willingness to pay; clubs/local operators could maintain
14.19 (78)	Parks seem to support extreme lobby (both for and against)
14.22 (80)	Should manage each park based on its individual needs & resources; consistency issue
14.23 (81)	Right of Canadians / taxpayers for access to Parks
15	Question factual information in report (e.g., number of emergency landings); lack of information; should do full Environmental Impact Assessment
16	Opportunity to maintain / expand air strips; bring people to Parks for recreation, etc.; use reservations systems for use of strip
17	Don't support use of airstrips as destination strips; maintain for emergency or diversionary landings; recognize environmental concerns

Analysis of Public Input on the Comprehensive Studies
for the Decommissioning of the Airstrips in Banff and Jasper National Parks of Canada, Alberta

Appendix 1.2: Collapsed Comment Codes Continued

Code	Comment
18	Heritage reasons; why built in first place
19	Neutral
24	Negative impacts on safety will be low to minimal if decommission
27	Mitigations suggested (various)
33	Parks policy allows for designation of landing sites in parks; concern with application in whole parks system
90 (3, 14.13 & 14.25)	Medivac / highway emergencies / evacuation / fires / disasters / disaster management plan
91 (6 & 14.26)	Wildlife impacts (limited or positive) if maintain strips / inconsistent view by Parks (e.g., management practices use helicopters, etc) / remove human footprint / air survey only
92 (7 & 32)	Wildlife and environmental impacts (negative if don't decommission) / positive if decommission / Airstrip maintenance / clearing / cutting has negative environmental impact; not following directive
93 (14.1, 14.11, 14.12 & 14.17)	Concerns with bureaucrats / Government expenditures / political control for no reason / Transport Canada role in closure
94 (14.5 & 29)	Should open up more air strips across the country, especially in mountain areas; not enough air strips / Key means of access
95 (14.18, 14.21, 14.24 & 21)	Other / Provide access for disabled / Use for removing garbage / seeking contact information
96 (22, 23 & 28)	Importance of grasslands in maintaining biodiversity / protecting areas often overlooked / Decommissioning will result in opportunities for interpretation / Parks mandate to maintain or restore ecological integrity; decommissioning supports Parks goals and objectives
97 (26 & 31)	Maintaining a route for recreational VFR fliers is not a national transportation route issue / Aircraft inappropriate activity in parks

APPENDIX 2

- Appendix 2.1:** **Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked By “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrip”**
- Appendix 2.2:** **Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**
- Appendix 2.3:** **Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**
- Appendix 2.4:** **Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence by Both Banff and Jasper Airstrip(s) Ranked By Total Alberta**
- Appendix 2.5:** **Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**
- Appendix 2.6:** **Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**
- Appendix 2.7:** **Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Provincial Origin by “Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips” Ranked By Total Alberta**

**Appendix 2.1:
Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked Based on “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”**

Comment	Frequency of Comment							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversionsary/Emergency Landings	1,046	26.5%	38	14.0%	23	15.8%	1,107	25.4%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	579	14.7%	5	1.8%	8	5.5%	592	13.6%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	367	9.3%	16	5.9%	11	7.5%	394	9.0%
Limited Impact of Airstrips on Wildlife Inconsistent Practices by Parks	182	4.6%	16	5.9%	12	8.2%	210	4.8%
Keep Airstrips Open	170	4.3%	11	4.1%	12	8.2%	193	4.4%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	165	4.2%	6	2.2%	7	4.8%	178	4.1%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	140	3.5%	4	1.5%	5	3.4%	149	3.4%
Highway Landings Dangerous/Need Alternative Like Highway Run Off Lanes	139	3.5%	10	3.7%	3	2.1%	152	3.5%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots / Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	128	3.2%	14	5.2%	6	4.1%	148	3.4%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	128	3.2%	5	1.8%	8	5.5%	141	3.2%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	102	2.6%	11	4.1%	2	1.4%	115	2.6%
Heritage Reasons	67	1.7%	6	2.2%	5	3.4%	78	1.8%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	60	1.5%	4	1.5%	1	0.7%	65	1.5%
Other	58	1.5%	10	3.7%	7	4.8%	75	1.7%

**Appendix 2.1:
Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked Based on “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”**

Comment	Frequency of Comment							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	55	1.4%	4	1.5%	2	1.4%	61	1.4%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	46	1.2%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	49	1.1%
Government/Political Control for no Reason	46	1.2%	3	1.1%	3	2.1%	52	1.2%
Need More Airstrips Across Country/Key Means of Access	43	1.1%	2	0.7%	-	-	45	1.0%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	43	1.1%	2	0.7%	-	-	45	1.0%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/ Disaster Management Plan	42	1.1%	3	1.1%	8	5.5%	53	1.2%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	40	1.0%	3	1.1%	2	1.4%	45	1.0%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	30	0.8%	4	1.5%	2	1.4%	36	0.8%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	30	0.8%	1	0.4%	1	0.7%	32	0.7%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	29	0.7%	4	1.5%	1	0.7%	34	0.8%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	25	0.6%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	28	0.6%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversions Landings but not as Destination Strips	25	0.6%	4	1.5%	-	-	29	0.7%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for no Reason	17	0.4%	1	0.4%	-	-	18	0.4%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	17	0.4%	-	-	1	0.7%	18	0.4%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	16	0.4%	2	0.7%	2	1.4%	20	0.5%

**Appendix 2.1 (Continued):
Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked Based on “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”**

Comment	Frequency of Comment							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Base for Fighting Forest Fires / Natural Disasters / Emergency Access	15	0.4%	5	1.8%	2	1.4%	22	0.5%
Mitigations Suggested	14	0.4%	7	2.6%	1	0.7%	22	0.5%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	9	0.2%	1	0.4%	-	-	10	0.2%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	8	0.2%	1	0.4%	2	1.4%	11	0.3%
Support Decommissioning	7	0.2%	12	4.4%	2	1.4%	21	0.5%
Transport Canada Role in Closure	7	0.2%	-	-	-	-	7	0.2%
Park Environment Should not be Altered to Cater to Purely Recreational Interests like Airstrips & Ice Climbing/Inappropriate Activity	6	0.2%	5	1.8%	-	-	11	0.3%
Negative Wildlife Impact if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	5	0.1%	8	3.0%	-	-	13	0.3%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	4	0.1%	12	4.4%	-	-	16	0.4%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	4	0.1%	7	2.6%	-	-	11	0.3%
Decommissioning Supports Parks Mandate & Goals to Maintain or Restore Ecological Integrity	4	0.1%	7	2.6%	2	1.4%	13	0.3%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	4	0.1%	-	-	1	0.7%	5	0.1%
Seeking information	3	0.1%	1	0.4%	-	-	4	0.1%
Aircraft Inappropriate Activity in Parks	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	-	-	3	0.1%

**Appendix 2.1 (Continued):
Frequency of Full List of Comments Ranked Based on “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips”**

Comment	Frequency of Comment							
	Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips		Banff Airstrip Only		Jasper Airstrip Only		Total Comments	
	Total	% of Comments for Both Banff & Jasper	Total	% of Comments for Banff Only	Total	% of Comments for Jasper Only	Total	% of Total Comments
Concern About Government/Political Expenditures	2	0.1%	-	-	-	-	2	0.0%
Neutral	1	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1	0.0%
Decommissioning will Result in Opportunities for Interpretation	1	0.0%	2	0.7%	-	-	3	0.1%
Maintaining a Route for Recreational VFR Fliers is not a National Transportation Route Issue	1	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1	0.0%
Negative Environmental Impact of Maintaining, Clearing, Cutting Airstrip	1	0.0%	6	2.2%	-	-	7	0.2%
Access for Disabled	1	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1	0.0%
Use for Removing Garbage	1	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1	0.0%
Need Disaster Management Plan	-	-	3	1.1%	-	-	3	0.1%
Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	-	-	1	0.4%	-	-	1	0.0%
Total by Airstrip		100.0%	271	100.0%	146	100.0%		
Total Comments	3,946	90.4%		6.2%		3.3%	4,363	100.0%

**Appendix 2.2:
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments from Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	18	11.6%	1	2.6%	-	-	19	7.7%
Safety/Diversions/Emergency Landings	14	9.0%	7	17.9%	12	23.1%	33	13.4%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	12	7.7%	1	2.6%	3	5.8%	16	6.5%
Support Decommissioning	11	7.1%	-	-	-	-	11	4.5%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/ Disaster Management Plan	10	6.5%	1	2.6%	-	-	11	4.5%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	10	6.5%	-	-	-	-	10	4.1%
Mitigations Suggested	7	4.5%	-	-	-	-	7	2.8%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather	7	4.5%	4	10.3%	2	3.8%	13	5.3%
Less Env Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	6	3.9%	5	12.8%	5	9.6%	16	6.5%
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	6	3.9%	3	7.7%	1	1.9%	10	4.1%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	5	3.2%	1	2.6%	-	-	6	2.4%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	5	3.2%	2	5.1%	2	3.8%	9	3.7%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	5	3.2%	-	-	-	-	5	2.0%
Park Environment Should Not be Altered to Cater to Purely Recreational Interests Like Airstrips and Ice Climbing/ Inappropriate Activity	5	3.2%	-	-	-	-	5	2.0%

**Appendix 2.2 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments from Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Keep Airstrips Open	4	2.6%	2	5.1%	3	5.8%	9	3.7%
Other	4	2.6%	2	5.1%	5	9.6%	11	4.5%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	3	1.9%	1	2.6%	-	-	4	1.6%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	3	1.9%	1	2.6%	-	-	4	1.6%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	2	1.3%	1	2.6%	2	3.8%	5	2.0%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	2	1.3%	-	-	1	1.9%	3	1.2%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	2	1.3%	-	-	2	3.8%	4	1.6%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	2	1.3%	1	2.6%	2	3.8%	5	2.0%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversiory Landings but not as Destination Strips	2	1.3%	1	2.6%	1	1.9%	4	1.6%
Heritage Reasons	2	1.3%	1	2.6%	3	5.8%	6	2.4%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	2	1.3%	-	-	1	1.9%	3	1.2%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	1	0.6%	1	2.6%	-	-	2	0.8%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	1	0.6%	-	-	-	-	1	0.4%

**Appendix 2.2 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments from Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/ Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	1	0.6%	1	2.6%	-	-	2	0.8%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	-	-	-	-	4	7.7%	4	1.6%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	-	-	1	2.6%	-	-	1	0.4%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	-	-	1	2.6%	-	-	1	0.4%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	-	-	-	-	2	3.8%	2	0.8%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	-	-	-	-	1	1.9%	1	0.4%
Total Comments	155	100.0%	39	100.0%	52	100.0%	246	100.0%

**Appendix 2.3:
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From Total BC	Total	% of Total Comments From Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversiory/Emergency Landings	16	14.3%	2	15.4%	-	-	18	14.1%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	10	8.9%	1	7.7%	-	-	11	8.6%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	8	7.1%	1	7.7%	-	-	9	7.0%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	8	7.1%	1	7.7%	-	-	9	7.0%
Keep Airstrips Open	7	6.3%	1	7.7%	-	-	8	6.3%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	7	6.3%	-	-	-	-	7	5.5%
Other	7	6.3%	-	-	-	-	7	5.5%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	6	5.4%	1	7.7%	-	-	7	5.5%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	6	5.4%	2	15.4%	-	-	8	6.3%
Heritage Reasons	5	4.5%	-	-	-	-	5	3.9%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	5	4.5%	1	7.7%	-	-	6	4.7%
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	3	2.7%	-	-	-	-	3	2.3%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Support Decommissioning	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%

**Appendix 2.3 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Codes by Place of Residence for “Jasper Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From Total BC	Total	% of Total Comments From Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	2	1.8%	1	7.7%	-	-	3	2.3%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	2	1.8%	-	-	-	-	2	1.6%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	1	0.9%	-	-	-	-	1	0.8%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	1	0.9%	-	-	1	33.3%	2	1.6%
Mitigations Suggested	1	0.9%	-	-	-	-	1	0.8%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	1	0.9%	-	-	1	33.3%	2	1.6%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	1	0.9%	-	-	1	33.3%	2	1.6%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	1	0.9%	-	-	-	-	1	0.8%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	1	0.9%	-	-	-	-	1	0.8%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	1	0.9%	-	-	-	-	1	0.8%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/ Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	-	-	2	15.4%	-	-	2	1.6%
Total Comments	112	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	128	100.0%

**Appendix 2.4:
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked by Total Alberta**

Comment	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments From Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	263	23.5%	218	25.7%	377	27.8%	858	25.8%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	148	13.2%	131	15.4%	248	18.3%	527	15.9%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	99	8.8%	82	9.7%	130	9.6%	311	9.4%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/ Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	79	7.1%	34	4.0%	47	3.5%	160	4.8%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	50	4.5%	31	3.7%	31	2.3%	112	3.4%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	45	4.0%	44	5.2%	51	3.8%	140	4.2%
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	43	3.8%	31	3.7%	36	2.7%	110	3.3%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	40	3.6%	24	2.8%	45	3.3%	109	3.3%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/ What About Concerns with Highway Access?	34	3.0%	45	5.3%	38	2.8%	117	3.5%
Keep Airstrips Open	33	2.9%	29	3.4%	64	4.7%	126	3.8%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	30	2.7%	29	3.4%	30	2.2%	89	2.7%
Heritage Reasons	20	1.8%	8	0.9%	32	2.4%	60	1.8%

**Appendix 2.4 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked by Total Alberta**

Comment	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments From Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	20	1.8%	8	0.9%	18	1.3%	46	1.4%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	19	1.7%	7	0.8%	19	1.4%	45	1.4%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	19	1.7%	14	1.7%	21	1.5%	54	1.6%
Other	19	1.7%	10	1.2%	25	1.8%	54	1.6%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	16	1.4%	6	0.7%	8	0.6%	30	0.9%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	15	1.3%	11	1.3%	7	0.5%	33	1.0%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	12	1.1%	15	1.8%	23	1.7%	50	1.5%
Mitigations Suggested	12	1.1%	-	-	2	0.1%	14	0.4%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	12	1.1%	7	0.8%	4	0.3%	23	0.7%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	11	1.0%	11	1.3%	15	1.1%	37	1.1%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	10	0.9%	8	0.9%	15	1.1%	33	1.0%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/Interpretation	9	0.8%	-	-	-	-	9	0.3%
Park Environment Should Not be Altered to Cater to Purely Recreational Interests Like Airstrips and Ice Climbing/Inappropriate Activity	9	0.8%	-	-	-	-	9	0.3%
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	7	0.6%	7	0.8%	9	0.7%	23	0.7%

**Appendix 2.4 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Place of Residence for “Both Banff and Jasper Airstrips” Ranked by Total**

Comment	Total Alberta		British Columbia		Other		Total	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From BC	Total	% of Total Comments From Other	Total	% of Total Comments
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	7	0.6%	12	1.4%	17	1.3%	36	1.1%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	6	0.5%	7	0.8%	1	0.1%	14	0.4%
Support Decommissioning	5	0.4%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	7	0.2%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversiory Landings but not as Destination Strips	5	0.4%	3	0.4%	12	0.9%	20	0.6%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	5	0.4%	-	-	-	-	5	0.2%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	4	0.4%	-	-	-	-	4	0.1%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	4	0.4%	3	0.4%	5	0.4%	12	0.4%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	3	0.3%	1	0.1%	3	0.2%	7	0.2%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	3	0.3%	1	0.1%	-	-	4	0.1%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	2	0.2%	5	0.6%	12	0.9%	19	0.6%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	2	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	0.2%	10	0.3%
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	-	-	-	-	7	0.5%	7	0.2%
Total Comments	1,120	100.0%	848	100.0%	1,356	100.0%	3,324	100.0%

**Appendix 2.5:
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From Red Deer South & Banff Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/Interpretation	18	11.6%	18	11.7%	-	-
Safety/Diversionary/Emergency Landings	14	9.0%	13	8.4%	1	100.0%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	12	7.7%	12	7.8%	-	-
Support Decommissioning	11	7.1%	11	7.1%	-	-
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	10	6.5%	10	6.5%	-	-
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	10	6.5%	10	6.5%	-	-
Mitigations Suggested	7	4.5%	7	4.5%	-	-
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/ Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	7	4.5%	7	4.5%	-	-
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	6	3.9%	6	3.9%	-	-
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	6	3.9%	6	3.9%	-	-
Decommissioning will have Low/Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	5	3.2%	5	3.2%	-	-
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/ Obligation to Maintain	5	3.2%	5	3.2%	-	-
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	5	3.2%	5	3.2%	-	-
Park Should Not be Altered to Cater to Purely Recreational Interests Like Airstrips and Ice Climbing/Inappropriate Activity	5	3.2%	5	3.2%	-	-
Keep Airstrips Open	4	2.6%	4	2.6%	-	-

**Appendix 2.5 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Banff Airstrip Only” Ranked By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Other	4	2.3%	4	2.6%	-	-
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	3	1.9%	3	1.9%	-	-
Question Amount & Validity of Information	3	1.9%	3	1.9%	-	-
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand for Tourism & Recreation Access	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversiory Landings but not as Destination Strips	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Heritage Reasons	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	-	-
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Training for Mountain Flying/Future Pilots	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	-	-
Total Comments	155	100.0%	154	100.0%	1	100.0%

**Appendix 2.6:
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Jasper Airport Only” Ranked by Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff / Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Safety/Diversionsary/Emergency Landings	16	14.2%	2	20.0%	14	13.6%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	10	8.9%	-	-	10	9.7%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	8	7.1%	1	10.0%	7	6.8%
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	8	7.1%	-	-	8	7.8%
Keep Airstrips Open	7	6.2%	2	20.0%	5	4.9%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism/ & Recreation	7	6.2%	2	20.0%	5	4.9%
Other	7	6.2%	-	-	7	6.9%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	6	5.3%	-	-	6	5.9%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	6	5.3%	-	-	6	5.9%
Heritage Reasons	5	4.4%	-	-	5	4.9%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	5	4.4%	-	-	5	4.9%
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	3	2.7%	1	10.0%	2	1.9%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	2	1.8%	1	10.0%	1	1.0%
Support Decommissioning	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%

**Appendix 2.6 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Jasper Airport Only” Ranked by Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff/Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff/ Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Question Amount & Validity of Information	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/ Obligation to Maintain	2	1.8%	1	10.0%	2	1.0%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/Interpretation	2	1.8%	-	-	2	1.9%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Contradicts Aviation Safety	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Mitigations Suggested	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	1	0.9%	-	-	1	1.0%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Comments	113	100.0%	10	100.0%	103	100.0%

Appendix 2.7

Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips” By Total Alberta

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Safety/Diversions/Emergency Landings	263	23.5%	157	23.8%	106	23.1%
Support Air Risk Safety Assessment to Keep Airstrips Open	148	13.2%	89	13.5%	59	12.9%
Less Environmental Impact than Highway/Railroad/Other Activities	99	8.8%	56	8.5%	43	9.4%
Limited Impact on Airstrips on Wildlife/Inconsistent Practices by Parks/Remove Human Footprint, Air Survey Only	79	7.1%	47	7.1%	32	7.0%
Navigation Canada Reduced Weather Information Services for Pilots/Inaccurate Forecasts/Rapidly Changing Weather Conditions	50	4.5%	33	5.0%	17	3.7%
Opportunity to Maintain/Expand Airstrips for Tourism & Recreation Access	45	4.0%	22	3.3%	23	4.0%
Highway landings dangerous / need alternatives like runaway lanes	43	3.8%	29	4.4%	14	3.1%
Potential Lawsuits/Legal issues/Parks Responsibility	40	3.6%	27	4.1%	13	2.8%
Concerns About Closing Air Access Over Parks/What About Concerns with Highway Access?	34	3.0%	19	2.9%	15	3.3%
Keep Airstrips Open	33	2.9%	21	3.2%	12	2.6%
Preferred VFR Routes Through Mountains Identified by Government/Obligation to Maintain	30	2.7%	16	2.4%	14	3.1%
Heritage Reasons	20	1.8%	15	2.3%	5	1.1%

**Appendix 2.7 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips” By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		Red Deer South & Banff /Canmore		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff/ Canmore	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Medivac/Highway Emergencies/Evacuation/Fires/ Disasters/Disaster Management Plan	20	1.8%	9	1.4%	11	2.4%
Too Concerned with Operational Costs/Charge Voluntary Fees	19	1.7%	11	1.7%	8	1.7%
Concerns with Bureaucrats/Government Expenditures/ Political Control for No Reason/Transport Canada Role in Closure	19	1.7%	14	2.1%	5	1.1%
Other	19	1.7%	12	1.8%	7	1.5%
Question Amount & Validity of Information	16	1.4%	5	0.8%	11	2.4%
Search & Rescue Access/Costs	15	1.3%	7	1.1%	8	1.7%
Benefits for Tourism/Economy/Recreation/Environmental Awareness/Reporting Fires	12	1.1%	9	1.4%	3	0.7%
Mitigations Suggested	12	1.1%	9	1.4%	3	0.7%
Costs of Trying to Shut Down Too High	12	1.1%	3	0.5%	9	2.0%
Right of Canadians/Taxpayers for Access to Parks	11	1.0%	7	1.1%	4	0.9%
Costly & Short-Sighted to Close Airstrips	10	0.9%	5	0.8%	5	1.1%
Grasslands Role in Maintaining Biodiversity/Protection/ Interpretation	9	0.8%	6	0.9%	3	0.7%
Park Environment Should Not be Altered to Cater to Purely Recreational Interests Like Airstrips and Ice Climbing/Inappropriate Activity	9	0.8%	5	0.8%	4	0.9%

**Appendix 2.7 (Continued):
Frequency of Collapsed Comments by Alberta Place of Residence for “Both Banff & Jasper Airstrips” By Total Alberta**

Comments	Total Alberta		South of Red Deer & Banff		North of Red Deer & Jasper	
	Total	% of Total Comments From Total Alberta	Total	% of Total Comments From South of Red Deer & Banff	Total	% of Total Comments From North of Red Deer & Jasper
Alternate Strips Too Far Away	7	0.6%	3	0.5%	4	0.9%
Need More Air Strips Across Country/Key Means of Access	7	0.6%	4	0.6%	3	0.7%
Park Fees/Pilot Willingness to Pay/Maintain	6	0.5%	2	0.3%	4	0.9%
Support Decommissioning	5	0.4%	3	0.5%	2	0.4%
Maintain Airstrips for Emergency/Diversions Landings but not as Destination Strips	5	0.4%	2	0.3%	3	0.7%
Negative Wildlife Impacts if Don't Decommission/Positive if Decommission	5	0.4%	3	0.5%	2	0.4%
Decommissioning will have Low to Minimal Negative Impact on Safety	4	0.4%	2	0.3%	2	0.4%
Conflicting Mandate of Parks Canada (Protect & Enjoy)	4	0.4%	2	0.3%	2	0.4%
Parks Support of Extreme Lobby (For & Against)	3	0.3%	2	0.3%	1	0.2%
Manage Each Park Based on Individual Needs & Resources	3	0.3%	3	0.5%	-	-
Contradicts Aviation Safety	2	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
Policy Allows for Designation of Landing Sites in Parks	2	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
Total Comments	1,120		661		459	