

131859

THOMAS R. DUFRESNE  
P.O. BOX 722  
LAYTON, UTAH 84041-0722

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION  
01 JUN -5 PM 12:14

May 26, 2001

The Docket Management System  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Room PL401  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590-0003

FAA-01-8690-23

SUBJECT: FAA Docket-2001-8690, Notice 01-01, RIN 2120-AF46

To Whom It May Concern:

I think that the altitude of 5,000 feet AGL is extremely unreasonable and unnecessary for the following reasons:

- Most people, including me, have seen it happen all too often where a rule will be enacted for a certain population. Then "creep" sets in and before people become aware the rule applies to all kinds of other things and people. Government is famous, or I should say infamous, for that sort of thing.
- Once this rule is enacted for the air tour industry, pretty soon the government bureaucrats will try and force it onto the entire general aviation population.
- You bureaucrats are probably not aware of this but many of the general aviation aircraft do not perform very well at high altitudes because of what is called density altitude. I am referring to those of us who fly aircraft with normally aspirated engines. By enacting a 5,000-foot rule that is what you are forcing is to do.
- The only alternative for us would be to make long, costly and time-consuming deviations around the airspace.
- In Utah we have 5 national parks. That means a lot of deviating. I suspect that in terms of the square miles in our state that we have a very high percentage of our state inside national parks. Much more so than many other states.
- We are required to vertically clear wild life refuges, etc. by only 2,000 feet. Why 5,000 feet AGL for national parks? It doesn't make any sense to me.

I think 2,000 feet AGL is a reasonable altitude over national parks.

Sincerely,

