

Vince Hansen

From: "Carol E. Tuynman" <ctuynman@islc.net>
To: "Vince Hansen" <haljrcn@aptalaska.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 3:33 PM
Subject: Fw: Heli Ski Working Group and Ordinance

— Original Message —

From: Carol E. Tuynman
To: <mailto:steve.vick@gmail.com> ; <mailto:bflipper3@starband.net> ; oinkeriw@gmail.com ;
<mailto:blackdoghp@yahoo.com> ; <mailto:icozzi@haines.ak.us> ; <mailto:daymondhoffman@yahoo.com> ;
jhill@haines.ak.us
Cc: [Rob Goldberg](#)
Sent: 2011-02-08 15:04
Subject: Heli Ski Working Group and Ordinance

To the Honorable Mayor Jan Hill, Assemblymen Lapp, Rossman, Hoffman, Goodman, Vick, and Assemblywoman Waterman

I respectfully submit the following recommendations for consideration by the Haines Borough Assembly before tonight's vote on the Heli Ski Ordinance:

1. That the Borough Assembly allow the Working Group to continue the fact finding and consensus process before passing a new ordinance;
2. That the Borough Assembly request a Memorandum of Agreement from the Working Group stating the terms and conditions that have been established and the areas that require further information and discussion. This agreement would affirm each condition or point that is relevant to the concerns of all stakeholders and would serve as a clarifying document for the continued interest-based Working Group negotiations;
3. That the Borough Assembly direct permitted heli ski businesses to provide weekly GPS reports in the 2011 season;
4. That the Borough Assembly consider the value of interest-based negotiations between stakeholders for heli skiing and other contentious issues. This process has fostered better understanding between the parties and a willingness to find the best possible outcomes for all stakeholders;
5. Should the Borough Assembly deem necessary a new ordinance, I respectfully request the inclusion of a sunset provision for the ordinance to be revisited in six to eight months during which time the Working Group, DNR, Fish and Game and other stakeholders will have had sufficient time to address unresolved questions and issues.

Sincerely,

Carol Tuynman
6.5 Mile Mud Bay Road
Haines, Alaska 99827
907-766-3715
ctuynman@islc.net

2/8/2011

From: cindyb12@aol.com [mailto:cindyb12@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, February 07, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Julie Cozzi
Subject: comments for public hearing

Ms. Cozzi,

Sorry to get this out so close to the hearing. Please distribute to the assembly. I've attached a word doc, but also included the text below in case there is an issue with the document.

Thank-you,

Cindy Buxton

To: Haines Borough Council Members
Re: Heli-skiing Permits

February 7, 2011

I am concerned about the proposal before the borough regarding heli-skiing.

I am a strong believer in property rights. Heli-skiing activities are negatively impacting the property rights of a number of residents, many of whom have sacrificed the convenience of living close to town because they value a quiet lifestyle. They did not buy property near an airport or in town; they intentionally bought property away from town and the airport. I believe that if the borough council does not handle this issue with care and fortitude to preserve the property rights of residents or at least find some reasonable balance which respects residents, the heli-skiing will expand exponentially and will expand into the summer season as flight-seeing. Larger, more aggressive heli-skiing and helicopter flight-seeing companies will see the potential of moving into business in Haines. More and more residents will be impacted as the intensity and length of season increases. These companies will have very high priced lawyers and will likely challenge **any** restrictions to their businesses, requiring more expense and effort on the part of the borough. Juneau is a good example. There are few if any places in Juneau that are not within hearing of the constant helicopter flight-seeing in the summer.

For these reasons I am very strongly opposed to any increase in skier days. I am also very opposed to rewarding companies who have not honored past permits. This sends a message that the borough can be pushed around and isn't serious. The company in question signed an agreement then made a conscious decision to violate that agreement. I work in the mining industry, and I can't imagine a mining company purposely violating an agreement with the city or state and then being rewarded with a more favorable permit the next year. I am *especially* opposed to allowing heli-skiing companies to sell unused skier days. They did not buy those days from the borough, so why should they get to sell them? Such a policy will escalate the conflict in Haines over heli-skiing by giving the companies an incentive to apply for as many heli-skiing days as possible.

I lived for 10 years in Juneau. We left Juneau because the helicopters and floatplane traffic for tourism became so onerous we could no longer enjoy our home and property 20 miles from the airport. The flight-seeing increased dramatically during our years in Juneau. Huge numbers of

From: Richmond Tolles [mailto:santaak@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sunday, February 06, 2011 10:53 AM

To: Julie Cozzi

Subject: Heli-ski ordinance

Haines Borough Assembly;

Once again I feel I must make my feelings heard.

I realize that the heli-ski industry brings needed tourists and money to the valley at a time it is most needed. However I feel the business should be regulated, as it has been these past few years. I do not understand how you can consider the "peace and quiet" of the skiers and not give the same consideration to the residents most effected by them. Many residents feel beaten down, and have given up on speaking out or attending meetings. I feel like my comments are nothing more than a fart in a wind storm, but here they are all the same.

Thank You

Rich Tolles

From: jonasazi@aol.com [mailto:jonasazi@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 06, 2011 10:47 PM
To: Julie Cozzi; climb@alaskamountainguides.com
Subject: Alaska mountain Guides heli Permit

Hi,

My name is Jon hirsh, and I want to encourage the Borough of Haines to accept Alaska Mountain Guides request for a commercial heliski permit. have been a living in Haines for over 10 years. I have also known the Gaffney's and Ely (owners of Alaska Mountain Guides) for that time as well. They are very reputable, honest, hardworking business people. Adding AMG into the equation of heli-skiing in Haines would be a good move for Haines. For one I trust them. They are conscience of the community's needs and I feel confident they will provide an up front, honest operation. Two, they are also skilled and competent. Thirdly, AMG has the history of providing exceptional opportunities for local youth. The borough should be proud to give a heliski permit to these guys. These qualities in a business will help to improve Haines' heliski reputation and should be seriously considered for the 2011 ski season.

I support the heliski business here in Haines, and I also want to enjoy the peace and solitude here in our surrounding wilderness. My support for the heliskiing depend solely on the fact that these companies will follow the guidelines that the community has set...I trust AMG to follow the guidelines. I have heliskied and believe there is some big country that could easily be shared by three companies ,

Thank You

sincerely
Jon Hirsh

From: Stanley Jones [mailto:snjones@aptalaska.net]
Sent: Friday, February 04, 2011 10:17 PM
To: Julie Cozzi
Cc: climb@alaskamountainguides.com
Subject: heli-skiing

Julie Cozzi

Haines Borough

We support the efforts to increase heli-skiing in the Haines area. This is an important addition to the Haines economy at a time of the year when it is desperately needed by the restaurants and housing facilities. It also benefits the grocers that provide food, our sales tax base, water and sewer revenues to the borough as the commercial businesses are metered and the community in general as it advertises Haines! Where can you get better free advertising of our natural beauty and fine tourist destination? Alaska Mountain Guides is a truly professional organization that conducts tours in many places around the world. We encourage the borough to permit AMG to provide this additional tour as they are highly qualified and will provide some additional Haines employment. We do not think the number of days of skiing should be limited to 1200 for all providers. Let's promote Haines as a tourist friendly destination!!!!!!!!!! Why kill the goose that may lay a golden egg?

Stan Jones & Kathy Pardee-Jones

From: zach@guidesinalaska.com [mailto:zach@guidesinalaska.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2011 4:45 PM
To: Julie Cozzi
Cc: climb@alaskamountainguides.com
Subject: Heliskiing

Haines Borough,

I am writing to express my support of opening the heli-skiing industry in the Haines borough to more operators. I feel there is an adequate amount of environment within the borough to issue additional permits to guides who are interested in adhering to borough operating regulations. I believe Alaska Mountain Guides to be such a company worthy of a borough heli-skiing permit. They are safe, responsible, and respectful to guidelines under which they must operate. They also have a large reputation which will help to bring focus to Haines as they attract new clients.

--- Zachary Sheldon, 38-Mile Haines Highway

To Mayor Hill and Members of the Haines Borough Assembly,

I feel compelled to take the opportunity to inform you why the addition of a third heli-ski permit in the Haines Borough is a bad idea. I have both lived and worked as a ski guide in South America, Valdez, Cordova, Juneau, and Haines. I have been in Alaska in the heli-ski industry for over ten years as both a heli-ski guide and as a helicopter pilot. I have seen first hand how over saturation of competing heli-ski operators in a region can have a negative effect on the industry as a whole. I urge you to understand that there is not enough room for another operator and that the addition of a third will most likely do severe damage to the current heli-ski industry in Haines. Not only does it first and foremost constitute a safety hazard due to a higher volume of traffic in flight corridors and a concentration of usage due to weather restrictions, it also spreads the short season profits of the regional industry so thin that the success of any one business becomes very difficult. Haines is a very unique place and with the existing heli-ski companies working hard to keep this resource from becoming overly congested or overloaded. The positive evolution of this industry is in the balance. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Christian
Cabanilla
206-979-5581

RECEIVED Haines Borough

FEB 03 2011

Clerk's Office

Dear Borough Assembly,

I am writing to share my insights about the heli-ski industry. I have been heli-skiing quite often over the past 15 years and have made 10 trips to Alaska since 2000. My first 5 trips were to Valdez, during that time my experience became increasingly less positive. The number of skiers "in-town" and the number of helicopters in the field grew and what was supposed to be a remote wilderness experience became a more competitive experience where different operators overlapped in the same area of operations. I read a comment on a skiing blog recently that said "Valdez has changed so much it almost feels like a ski resort". It is unbelievably disappointing to ferry into the field 10 or more minutes (at great cost) only to discover that the general area you're planning on riding was skied the previous day and the obvious landable peaks are tracked. Although the terrain around Valdez is quite vast by 2005 I often saw other helicopters while in the field. Based on a recommendation of a friend I ventured to Haines to experience a more remote, quieter "Alaskan" backcountry experience. After one trip with S.E.A.B.A, I fell in love with the town of Haines and have come back every year. From a client perspective the two operators currently providing service appear to have a system worked out which does not compete and best serves the interest of the clients. I would much prefer that the current operators increase the scope of their operations rather than see a third operator introduced to the area thus making coordination more complicated. It seems that Haines has developed a perfect system and the two existing companies co-exist and cooperate to provide the best Alaskan big mountain experience in the industry.

Another serious consideration is the economic viability of the industry. Heli-skiing is quite expensive and difficult economic conditions will have a huge effect on client availability. In Valdez, too many operators competing for fewer clients during the recession have resulted in the need to offer huge discounts to fill seats and stay in business. I don't want to think heli-companies are financially on the edge and forced to cut costs in order to stay in business. I prefer to be with financially viable companies that provide a stable, safe product. Fewer operators with the ability to run more than one helicopter during good years provide greater flexibility to meet the variable demand that will always exist in this industry. It will also provide Haines with a more stable product. Successfully operating a heli-ski business away from a lift operated resort is a very difficult proposition and a third operator in my opinion would not be in the best interest of Haines, the current operators or clients. I believe you currently have the best product in the industry and I hope you maintain the status quo. Please feel free to contact me at the below address should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

David Learned

23 Wilkins Lane

Carlisle, Massachusetts 01741

dkl.learn@gmail.com

508-344-2769

RECEIVED Haines Borough

FEB 03 2011

Clerk's Office

FEB 03 2011

To Mayor Hill and Members of the Haines Borough Assembly:

Clerk's Office

My name is William A. Spilo; I have been involved in the Helicopter Ski Industry for the better part of 15 yrs. I have worked as lead guide of field operations and helicopter logistics in Valdez AK, Chile South America, and am now a proud member of the S.E.A.B.A team here in Haines.

I am writing to you in regards to the application for a permit to operate a Helicopter Ski Operation by Alaska Mountain Guides.

I would like to address a series of issues ranging from environmental impact, safety, impact on the citizenry of the Haines Borough and overall personification of the Helicopter Ski industry as a whole.

First, as we know, the Haines Borough has been concerned with the environmental impacts of the Helicopter Skiing since its inception. Ranging from the "noise" effects on migratory and kidding patterns of local species to the disturbance of hibernation terms. As proven by the C.N.F.F.E.I.S, Helicopter ski operations can be mitigated to avoid effects on the environment through carefully managed land use and restrictions concerning flight paths and areas of operation.

As the Haines Borough has often stated these terms of usage were to be in conjunction with respect to "skier days" i.e. the number of clients traveling through the said area in order to further mitigate those "potential" environmental threats.

It is these same flight paths and areas of operation that have also been of concern to the local citizenry in regards to "noise" and disturbance of the wilderness setting of the Haines Borough. It appears by the terms of usage of the existing permit issued to S.E.A.B.A that both the Haines Borough and S.E.A.B.A have come to amicable terms of how to mitigate their operations to avoid such disturbances in accordance to flight paths and overall usage.

With this being said, it would appear that another operation would completely encumber all of the previous terms of usage and operation by potentially doubling the amount of helicopters, skiers and overall traffic on the said area.

To exemplify these points and how additional Helicopter Skiing operators can effect pre standing agreements from an existing situation we can look at the example of Valdez Alaska.

Valdez Alaska started with one Helicopter Skiing operator in conjunction with land use permits issued by the state of Alaska. The town of Valdez was merely involved in issuing the business licenses required in order to operate. In the following years 4 more operators were issued business licenses by the city of Valdez as well as permits by the state of Alaska. These licenses and permits were done with limited to no E.I.S performed by the city or state (at the time) thus unleashing the sport of Helicopter Skiing on the local environment. With no way of retracting these licenses and permits the Thompson pass corridor was now the victim of an overabundance of Helicopter Ski traffic.

The implications of this to many operators was the inability to deny one operator use of specific areas verse the other resulting in a greater level of air traffic and skier traffic in a specific area thus leading to a greater impact on the environment and all citizenry within the flight paths and areas of operation. This led to restrictions of flight paths and land use areas otherwise deemed usable by the authorities that issued the permits. This led to operators incurring greater costs by having to travel either further

routes or distances to their areas of operation. It is a careful formula of operating expense to client costs that allows the slim margined sport of Helicopter skiing to exist without compromising the elements of client satisfaction and most importantly client/operations safety.

It presents itself that it is in the best interest of the environment, local citizenry, safety and the standard of excellence in the helicopter ski industry, with which S.E.A.B.A upholds that the Haines Borough seriously considers not issuing another permit to operate a Helicopter Ski Business in the Haines Borough.

Thank You
William A. Spilo

From: Matthew Borish [mailto:matt@skiseaba.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2011 8:41 AM
To: Julie Cozzi
Subject: Letter to Haines Borough Assembly regarding AMG heli-skiing permit request

Feb. 3rd, 2011

Dear Madame Mayor, Haines Borough Assembly Members, and Haines Borough Employees,

Let me begin by saying that it's refreshing to see the recent collaboration of the Haines Borough, its residents, and the heli-skiing industry. Through civil discussion, all parties more clearly understand the extremely convoluted challenges we face from a variety of angles. The commitment of many hard working individuals is laudable and continues to bring us closer towards reaching the ideal ratio for providing world class skiing opportunities, maintaining a paramount part of Haines' winter economy, and minimizing heliskiing externalities. In spite of the progress, there are still some lingering issues which need more examination; the most pressing being the Alaska Mountain Guides desire for a heli-skiing permit.

I was pleased to hear a report of a flight the borough manager and some assembly members recently took with Drake Olson. I believe actually viewing the spectacular mountains we have from up close is an important step with respect to the majority of peoples' goals. While on the surface it may seem the currently permitted areas provide an overabundance of skiing terrain available, capable of supporting another company in the mix. However, a more revealing look indicates otherwise. To those unfamiliar with backcountry skiing, it might appear that it's plausible to ski just about anywhere there is snow across the vast landscape surrounding Haines. However, reality dictates an entirely different scenario.

In the United States, avalanches kill more people each year on average than earthquakes, landslides, or other mass movement events (Voight et al., 1990). During the 2009-2010 season alone, 36 people were killed by avalanches in our country (avalanche.org, 2010). Sadly, many of these tragedies could have been prevented by adhering to strict avalanche safety protocols. Here in Haines, we draw visitors from all over the world to access our renowned "extreme" terrain, yet due to the high level of training the current SEABA and Alaska Heliskiing guides possess, we have been able to ski here for years with very few serious injuries and no fatalities. In contrast to developed ski areas that employ active avalanche programs which use explosives to constantly blast slopes into submission, we must rely on passive techniques that drastically reduce our true amount of skiable terrain. Choosing safe ski runs for us is a very complex process focused upon a dynamic relationship between weather, snowpack, terrain, and clients' skill levels.

Some of you may recall heli-skiing's infancy in Haines, when essentially all of the participants involved were professionals well versed in avalanche safety. As a result of their pioneering efforts, over a number of years, many of the safe and economically feasible areas in the mountains around Haines were delineated in a proprietary manner. As the industry grew, this information was passed down in an apprentice type fashion to new guides, at a rate conducive towards supporting a gradual skier traffic increase and a slowly lessening client skill level. At our current state, we are close to reaching the carrying capacity of a sustainable industry striving

to reach the goals stated in the first paragraph. Bringing in another company with an entirely new guide team possessing little to no local expert knowledge of historical microclimate weather patterns, snowpack, and terrain, who wish to rapidly take many skiers into the mountains around Haines is a downright dangerous proposition.

In conclusion, permitting AMG to operate heliskiing out of Haines will undoubtedly jeopardize the safety of both guides and clients as they are pushed into unsafe areas to find untracked powder desired by demanding clients. Competition in the heli-skiing industry is already fierce, especially in these difficult economic times. Diminishing guest experiences will tarnish Haines' reputation as the world's premier heliskiing destination and ultimately drive clients to other areas in a manner similar to which already occurred in the Valdez vicinity. Additionally, tipping the scales with another local operation will stress the fragile consensus residents and the industry has worked so hard to build over the years. I urge you to please consider these facts carefully before making a decision with such massive implications, especially in light of the harsh consequences issuing another heliskiing permit will inevitably bring.

Sincerely,

Matthew Borish, SEABA Avalanche Forecaster and Guide

ROBERT W. BAKER
8752 Bitner Ranch Road
Park City, Utah 84098
435-640-7152

February 3, 2011

Haines Borough Assembly
Julie Cozzi, CMC, Borough Clerk
Administration Building
103 Third Avenue S.
P.O. Box 1209
Haines, AK 99827

Re: Heliskiing in Haines Borough

Dear Borough Assembly,

I am a heliskiing client of S.E.A.B.A. and have been a regular guest since 2006. In this period, I have very favorably observed the Company and its related operations (Seward Inn, cat skiing) slowly achieve stability, despite unfavorable economic circumstances.

S.E.A.B.A. has informed me about the plans of the Borough Assembly to develop a regulatory regime with respect to heliskiing. I am not writing to suggest that any regulation is undesirable or inappropriate, rather to address the possible impacts of the proposed regulatory scheme related, in particular, to S.E.A.B.A. and, in general, related to the thoughtful development of a viable heliski industry in Haines. In doing so, I do not pretend to be aware of every factor within the knowledge of the Assembly, but I hope that these comments will serve to cast light on the views of heliski visitors to Haines who, certainly on some level, contribute to the future of your wonderful community. As such, I am very grateful to have this opportunity to express my views.

In many areas, heliskiing is not regulated at all, and not much is known about models for establishing effective regulation. I am certainly not an expert on this subject; however, I have in-depth heliskiing experience in Alaska and British Columbia. In addition, I am a resident of Park City UT, and I am very familiar with the issues related to heliski operations in the central Wasatch Mountains, where Wasatch Powderbird Guides has operated since 1973 and is currently licensed by the U.S. Forest Service to provide, using two helicopters, 1600 skier days over a season from December 15 to April 15, for 10 years.

Based on my experience and my fondness for coming to Haines, I wish to express these main points:

- The prospects for growth in the heliski industry and the Haines "product" are uncertain.
- Limits on numbers of client days, flights or landing areas could have unintended negative consequences.

Nature and Quality of Heliskiing Experience in Haines

Everyone recognizes that heliskiing operations currently offered in and around Haines provide a precious and unique experience to clients who demand challenging mountaineering, safe operations and access to vast natural beauty. Compared to heliskiing in the Chugach, Haines is another world—a better one, in my opinion—both in terms of skiing and in-town living. The contrast between the in-country experience around Haines, on the one hand, and around the Chugach and British Columbia on the other hand, is stark. Heliskiers appreciate nature too, and I think most would agree that the volume of heliskiing around the Chugach has resulted in "over-crowding". In town, Valdez feels like a ski resort. Heliskiers who appreciate Haines like the town

as it is and look forward to patronizing its local shops, restaurants and bars. I believe Haines heliskiers would not appreciate a "resort" feel in town.

Heliskiing is by its nature a high-risk activity. Selection of landing and routes is always limited by changing weather and snow conditions. One of the benefits of heliskiing in Haines is that there is no real competition for the better landing zones and ski routes. Based on my experience in Valdez, competition for LZs is caused by too many operators in the area. Competition creates an increased risk because guides are forced to find less desirable options for LZs and downhill routes, and at the same time, there is more pressure to land and ski or ride.

Industry Growth and Future

I could find no published statistics on the size and growth of the heliskiing industry, but there is no doubt that heliskiing is becoming more accessible, and the number of helicopters and operators is growing. It is well known that heliskiing around U.S. ski resorts has expanded. Operators in the backcountry of the U.S. and British Columbia have increased in number, and with the expanding client base, the type of skier has become less skilled and more in search of a luxury experience. In addition, I have heard rumors of interest among luxury resort operators in establishing lavish backcountry lodges in Alaska, much as in British Columbia.

Haines Operations.

Heliskiing in the current Haines model (in-town lodging) is not a luxury vacation, and the clientele of your current operators reflects that. I believe that Haines has a defined niche, which can be successfully promoted and exploited, but I also believe that this niche is limited. There is probably a growing number of heliskiers who are interested in Haines due to growth in backcountry skiing interest. The operators in Haines have engaged in very limited promotion compared to those in the Chugach and British Columbia. This may well reflect the limited profitability of operating heliskiing in Haines. Aggressive promotion and expansion of heliskiing in Haines may attract more heliskiers, but that is probably many years away.

I do not have access to financial information concerning the two existing operators in Haines, but I would be surprised if they would be considered deeply capitalized and financially stable. Certainly, S.E.A.B.A. is a micro size heliski operation compared to the most successful operations in North America. Offering an "esoteric" product in a limited market, Haines operators are, perhaps, even more subject to the vagaries of weather and economic conditions than most business, even in Alaska. In any event, I doubt that these two operators are risk-proof, and their financial future is, therefore, uncertain.

My particular experience with S.E.A.B.A. has been very positive because of the small size of its operations, the high quality of dedicated guides it is able to attract and the meticulous attention to safety afforded by the unique circumstances in which it is allowed to operate. I believe that all of these features are at risk due to the fragile nature of heliskiing operations in general and the early state financial condition of the Company.

Any investor looking at S.E.A.B.A. or Alaska Heliskiing would be discouraged by limitations imposed by regulation.

Implications for Regulation

The Assembly, in deciding to regulate heliskiing, pursues a course that carries considerable risk for Haines heliski operators, and they are justified in being concerned. More broadly, however, regulation of heliskiing in Haines poses some risk to the community itself. No one has a crystal ball, and everyone is aware of the law of unintended consequences. Decisions that limit growth opportunities of heliski operators could result in their demise. There could be an increased risk of market collapse, if the Assembly attempts to both limit operations and at the same time allow another competitor to operate on a limited stage. This latter possibility seems especially threatening to both S.E.A.B.A. and Alaska Heliskiing.

I question whether a regulatory body could—at this time—accurately and rationally assess the many factors that are implicated in a heliskiing regulatory scheme. Is there an adequate scientific or factual basis for finding that a specific limiting metric is appropriate or meaningful? If the Assembly seeks to regulate based on environmental concerns, has there been adequate fact finding to support specific determinations? See, for example, the kinds of factors entailed in supporting the Decision Memo of the U.S. Forest Service in connection with the special use authorization given to Wasatch Powderbird Guides.¹

Conclusion

I urge the Assembly to take a cautious, staged approach to developing a regulatory scheme for heliskiing operations in Haines. I see little to be gained by moving too quickly to establish too many limitations on this nascent industry. Is Haines better off with heliskiing than not? I would not presume to make a choice for Haines, but from my perspective the answer is clearly YES.

Better it would be, in my opinion, for the Assembly to allow—indeed, encourage—orderly and incremental expansion of the current operations of the two existing operators, rather than to impose too many regulations that might unnecessarily limit orderly growth. If too much expansion of heliskiing does occur in the future, and there are, in fact, tangible negative effects, there will be time and opportunity for the regulatory regime to address those impacts appropriately and based on actual experience.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments to you. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,



Robert W. Baker

¹ See http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5106133.pdf

Hi Julie, Would you please put this letter in the packet for the February 8, 2011 Borough Assembly meeting?

To: Haines Borough Assembly members, Mayor Jan Hill, Manager Mark Earnest
From: Katey Palmer and Eric Holle
Re: Ordinance no. 10-10-243
February 2, 2011

The following are our comments on the substitute ordinance #2.

1. Section 4 Legislative Findings: The borough attorney's memo that accompanied this ordinance said that he included additions suggested by SEABA in C., E., and H. It is outrageous and unethical (and perhaps illegal) to allow SEABA to add language to an ordinance whose purpose is to regulate the industry. If SEABA was given that opportunity, all other interested and affected parties should have been allowed an equal opportunity. This action betrayed the trust of all parties who have been participating in this process in good faith. All language from SEABA should be struck from the ordinance.

Especially alarming is the unsubstantiated claim in 4C that goat populations have increased since heli skiing began. We question the value of an attorney who does not fact check information he adds to an ordinance, in particular when the source is the industry being regulated. Had ADFG biologist Ryan Scott not been present at the 1/26 meeting and had Steve Vick not questioned him on the accuracy of this statement, it could easily have become accepted as fact and result in a very skewed picture.

The legislative findings read like a promotional brochure for the heli-ski industry. They do not give an accurate picture of the Haines community. Missing are the voices of residents who value and choose to live here for the peace and quiet, backcountry users who want to use some of the same areas as the heli skiers, backcountry users who value quiet and empty spaces, Klukwan residents, subsistence hunters, hunting guides, the wildlife etc.. Those voices as well as the facts that Haines residents voted against summer heli tours and voted for managed heli skiing should be included in section 4 to give an accurate picture of the situation here.

2. The ordinance must, as Steve Vick requested on 1/26, include language defining all potential violations, the means to verify each, and the consequences/penalties for each violation. Penalties need to be serious enough that they deter the violations.

These should be spelled out clearly in 5.18.070. The procedures in HBC5.04.120 which are referenced are too vague, subjective, and inadequate for this situation. Had they been adequate, SEABA would have been penalized for flagrantly exceeding their skier day limit last spring.

3. The ordinance must include a deadline date for permit applications for the following season. All data required on skier days, GPS locations, etc. must have been analyzed and evaluated by the Borough before permit applications and renewals are considered. The date should be in early summer especially if hearings are required on allocations or new

permit applications. The early deadline will also give the public adequate time to participate and the industry adequate time to prepare for its next season.

4. Section 5.18.080 D. Initial Allocations is confusing. The language needs to be clarified so that it is clear if an initial application applies to all operators or only to a new operator who has never had a permit?

Each of the factors a) – h) used to make a determination on allocation to each permittee must be weighted by importance, perhaps using a point system, so that the allocation is as objective as possible. This should be specifically laid out in the ordinance so that the manager's job is clearcut and there is a decreased chance for subjectivity and favoritism.

In addition to weighting the factors, they need revision. Criterion g) the applicant's past record of compliance should be at the top of the list. If the applicant has been out of compliance (refer to new language needed on violations and consequences in 5.18.070), that application should be put aside and the applications by operators in compliance and from new operators should be considered first.

Criterion b) the economic impact of the allocation on the permittee should be deleted. It is not the responsibility of the Borough to make allocations, exceptions, regulations, etc. on behalf of or based on the needs of a particular private business. The Borough should not concern itself with the financial status of any private business. That reeks of both favoritism and socialism, neither of which is acceptable.

Criterion e) the interests of the Borough in the promotion of tourism: What does this mean? How is this measured? Evaluated?

Criterion h) the existence and terms of any voluntary agreement between the Borough and the applicant pertaining to operational practices of the applicant: What does this mean? How is this measured? evaluated?

Why was criterion f) the sound recreational and ecological use of the Borough's natural resources removed from previous draft 7A and not included in substitute ordinance 2?

Other factors should be included in determining allocations each year. Feedback from all segments of the community who are affected should be evaluated. This should include feedback from subsistence goat hunters and hunting guides, from ADFG biologists with new data on goat populations, from backcountry users, Klukwan residents, etc.

5. Section 5.18.080 E. Future Allocation is also confusing. The language needs to make clear if a subsequent allocation refers to additional days given to an operator during the **current** season when the operator exceeds his permit allocation.

There should be (written in the ordinance) a cap on the total number of additional days that may be allocated to all permittees. The additional allocation must only be for the current season. DELETE: Subsequent allocations shall be for a two year term.

6. Section 5.18.080 G. General Permit Conditions and Regulations: 2. Add to clarify the language that 30 is the total number of additional days for all permittees, not for each permittee, to fly during additional daylight hours.

Add back in the language from version 7A: Any operations outside normal hours must be noted in the annual operations report.

G. 4. c. All references to distances helicopters must maintain from goats should follow the Northern Wild Sheep and Goat Council's recommendations from their 2004 Position Statement on Helicopter-Supported Recreation and Mountain Goats. They have very specific recommendations based on studies. They recommend that no helicopter activity should occur within 1.5 km of occupied/suspected nursery group or crucial winter range habitats.

7. DELETE language near the top of page 3 under Section 5. Amendment of Chapter 5.04.020 that state "Commercial helicopter tour" means a commercial helicopter operation...." This needs to be deleted because residents voted against summer helicopter tours and this could potentially open the door to that.

8. Helicopter pilots should be required to submit their load manifests twice a week to insure that operators accurately report their skier days.

9. Regardless of whether this ordinance is finalized for this heli-ski season, it is imperative that operators provide GPS data to the Borough. Unless GPS data is provided now at the start of the season, the operators should not be flying.

It is also imperative that violations and consequences be clearly defined.

10. The heli-ski working group has been a big disappointment. The make-up of the group was very lopsided, weighted towards the industry with 3 of 6 members, and it did not include Klukwan, backcountry users, hunters, and others.

Although at the 1/26 Borough meeting there was a lot of congratulating about the great compromises achieved by the heli-ski working group, it is not clear what compromises have been achieved. It appears that the industry got a huge increase in territory but it is not clear what any other interested party got.

Thank you for your attention,
Sincerely,
Katey Palmer and Eric Holle

From: Thom Ely [mailto:akthome@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2011 7:52 PM

To: artstudioalaska@yahoo.com; weis@aptalaska.net; joe@joeordonez.com; daymondhoffman@yahoo.com; blackdoghp@yahoo.com; seandog@alaskaheliskiing.com; sean@alaskamountainguides.com; Mark Earnest; Scott Sundberg; Jan Hill

Cc: Julie Cozzi; Canal Conservation Lynn; Jerry Lapp; Greg Goodman; Steve Vick

Subject: Heli-ski revisions

Dear Heli-Ski Working Group,

The season has started but there is still much work to be done. For tomorrows meeting please resolve the map issue by extending some areas and removing others. Areas to remove are along the front range of the Chilkat Inlet; Telemark Ridge, Rainbow Glacier, Pyramid Valley and the Kicking Horse.

Why? These are areas that are within a day ski of Haines for folks that hike and they are within earshot of residential areas. At least push the boundary back the same amount as it will be extended elsewhere to accommodate the industry.

Before any new operators are permitted, the issue of allocating skier days needs to be resolved. There needs to be a system in place that is not arbitrary. The operators and the public need to know how many days each company will receive before the season begins.

Recommend to the Assembly that the Al Gilliam clause allowing summer helicopter tours originating from his property in the Tsirku River Valley be removed from the Ordinance revision. That should sunset with the transfer of the property. The only reason it was there is because of stated historical use dating back to the early 90's with an LAB helicopter.

There are many other aspects of this Ordinance that I would like to see added or changed, but one has to compromise. So far I have seen very little compromise on the part of the industry.

Sincerely,
Thom Ely
Haines, Alaska

Kip Kermoian
PO Box 1024
Haines, AK
766-2606

Feb. 1, 2011

Mayor Hill and Assembly Members
Haines Borough

Reviewing the proposed Substitute Ordinance #2, 10-10-243 for Commercial Helicopter Tours and Heli-Ski Operations raises so many questions. I believe it would be in the Borough's best interest to postpone finalizing this ordinance until it can be given the needed time and attention a document as important as this one deserves.

I would, however, recommend that the Borough issue temporary permits to qualifying operators for the 2011 Heli-skiing season to include the following requirements among others:

- 1) GPS is used to document all takeoffs, landing and flight paths
- 2) The industry must pay all costs incurred by the Borough for processing and analyzing the data
- 3) It is essential that consequences for violating the terms of a permit is clearly articulated and be of sufficient consequence to dissuade future violations

The following text in **BOLD/underline** are my recommendations

Section 4. Legislative Findings

Q: Why does a proposed ordinance begin with a promotional pitch for this business sector? Did the Borough, i.e., Haines taxpayers, pay the Borough Attorney to author this introduction, and if so, why? Do other Business sectors receive this type of biased promotion associated with relevant ordinances?

The Jan 25, 2011 Borough meeting packet included a letter from the borough attorney: "Attorney Memo re. changes to Ordinance". This letter states that the addition to Section 4 C was suggested by SEBA. Where did SEBA get this unverifiable information regarding their statement: "*...mt. goats increased in overall numbers since the beginning of commercial ski tours*"? Why were these false statements included in Legislative Findings?

This section states: "The Assembly finds as follows:" It appears that the Assembly had little to do with a number of these changes let alone the Section in its entirety.

Part E. should read "...wolves, bald eagles, **moose and peace and quiet.**

Section 4 F, G, I, J and K

Each of these subsections advocates the benefits of limited numbers of permitted operators and number of skier days. Will this be a consideration when existing operators apply for additional skier days, or only as it relates to permitting new operators, i.e., competition? Ordinances should eliminate bias and double standards, not promote them.

J. "The quality...strict adherence to safe **and legal** practices ..." and "...provided to operators **who have operated in compliance with the terms of their operating permit** with previous ...in the Borough."

Section 5 pg 3

"commercial helicopter tours" once defined, it should be stated that they are not allowed within the Haines Borough as voted upon by the residents.

Section 6 pg 3

5.18.020 Number of Permits available.

"...who have not **been out of compliance with,** or had their permits revoked...applications."

This is a critical point and needs to be considered anytime one company is given an opportunity to participate in a limited permitted activity. Operators must be held to the highest standard when it comes to compliance. Knowing the penalty for non-compliance will be the loss of skier days and that those forfeited skier days will be allocated to another operator should be incentive to remain in compliance. See comments 5.18.070

5.18.060 Renewal

Regarding expansion of tours requiring a hearing *only if the expansion exceeds 25%* of the permitted tour would allow an operator to expand an operation by 24% annually, essentially doubling (96% increase) the business every 4 years without a hearing. There needs to be a mechanism to assess impacts of such increases annually in light of potential changes in the community such as demographics, the addition of other operations, businesses, recreational activity, etc.

5.18.070 Revocation, suspension, reduction of skier days

This sections references HBC 5.04.120 as the means to assess the severity of noncompliance by intrusting a great deal of subjectivity to the borough manager, i.e., subsection “ A. 1. *Substantial* noncompliance...of the permit,..” I believe this ordinance should have very precise consequences for specific infractions to eliminate any ambiguity. *Substantial*, is too nebulous a term to be used in the context of a regulation without being defined, and serves to perpetuates conflict in the future rather than to mitigate it.

As I understand it, this week SEBA has decided that the competition they had publicly welcomed only days ago, is no longer welcome, ostensibly, to create a better experience for clients, mt. goats and our EMS crews. As such, they are supporting and benefiting from an essentially, limited entry arrangement with the Borough. In light of SEBA’s historical unwillingness to “conform to the provisions and purposes set out in title 5” (HB 5.18.050) I believe that the Borough needs to be particularly diligent in ensuring SEBA remains in compliance with the terms of this permit.

To best inspire compliance, I suggest penalties for infractions result in a forfeiture of skier-days. Skier days are the currency of the Heliskiing business, and as such, are the appropriate means to promote compliance. I suggest that forfeited skier days be made available to the next company on the waiting list.

Should a company have multiple infractions in a season, I believe their permit should be suspended, their remaining skier days be awarded to the next operator and their permit not be renewed the following year.

The Borough and numerous residents have spent countless hours and money on this issue. To continue in a relationship with a business who blatantly disregards the Mayor, this Assembly, residents and this process, would place an unwarranted burden upon all of us.

Penalties should be levied for the following infractions, to name a few:

- 1) not reporting biweekly GPS data in a timely manner
- 2) falsifying or manipulating GPS data
- 3) falsifying reports of number of skier days
- 4) exceeding the number of permitted skier days
- 5) flying closer than permitted to, or harassing, wildlife
- 6) flying and/or skiing outside the designated permitted boundaries

5.18.080 B. Skier day limits

1. “*Low Impact Areas*” and any reference to “*no limit to the number of skier days*” regardless of area, should be deleted from this document. This inclusion mitigates the intent of all those who have invest countless hours

in this process. There has not been adequate assessment to define any area as “Low Impact”. Using such terminology with little evidence to support it can lead to dangerous assumptions resulting in unforeseen consequences.

2a. b., C. and all other subchapters with references to ‘*initial*’ allocations, should be referred to as **permitted** allocation(s).

The term *initial* implies that there *will be additional* days to follow as a forgone conclusion, biasing any discussion on awarding additional skier days.

D. 2

This leaves far too much subjective power in the hands of one individual, in this case, the Borough manager, and lacks a mechanism for considering change, unforeseen, or otherwise.

The *number one priority* in any assessment of awarding additional skier days should be *past compliance* with the permit.

- a) should be replaced by “g” if the borough wants to send a clear message to operators as to our priority, followed very closely by safety.
- b) Why is the Borough in the business of concerning itself with the economic impacts of allocations to operators? **Remove**
- d) “historic...by **permittee who have remained in compliance with the ordinance**”
- e) if “*the interests*” are to be used as a criteria, they need to be **defined or this line eliminated entirely**. Residents need to have a voice in deciding if the Borough manager’s assessment is the same as ours.

h) is particularly worrisome. What “*terms*” and “*agreements*” are being referred to here? This need to be before the public, particularly if the manager is using them in an assessment for issuing additional skier days

Why are there no line items such as these the following?

- a. **the economic impacts to home owners whose property values have declined due to repeated helicopter traffic in ear shot of their home at one of the most pleasant times of year to be outside**

- b. the impacts to quality of life to those residents who were established in the soundscape that helicopters now occupy
- c. the impacts that issuing additional skier days may have upon residents, other businesses or other unforeseen additional activities that may evolve over time
- d. impacts to wildlife in light of data provided by the operators or additional information from wildlife managers, etc

5.18.080 continued

E. Future allocation of skier days and photographer days

“Subsequent allocations shall be for a two (2) year term”

This mitigates an essential process that deals with one of the most contentious issues surrounding heli ski permitting.

Again, one individual subjectively allocating additional skier days THAT THEN ARE AUTOMATICALLY AWARDED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS, is entirely contrary to the intent of our of community’s involvement in determining our future. **This must not be included in this ordinance.**

F. Transfer of Allocated Skier Days and Photographer Days

Any allocated skier days should not become the property of the operators. These are assets essentially owned by the Borough and as such can not be given equitably to individual businesses, to then be sold or traded at the will of the operator. Is it the Borough’s intent to sell these *assets* (skier days) to the highest bidder, to generate income from these *assets* or simply to give them away? An inappropriate use of our Borough assets.

G. 4c page7 top

Should read: “...minimum distance **of 1.5k** from wildlife...” as recommended by *northern* sheep and goat *council* position statement July 9 2004

Thank you for all of your time an effort in this matter,

Sincerely,

Kip Kermoian

RECEIVED Haines Borough

FEB 03 2011

Clerk's Office

January 31, 2011

To Mayor Hill and Members of the Haines Borough Assembly,

I have been a helicopter ski guide in Alaska for 15 winters and have seen a lot of good and bad changes. My guiding experience began in Valdez in 1996-2005, took me to Girdwood from 2006-2007 and now I have been guiding in Haines from 2007-present. In addition to Alaska, I also helicopter ski guide in Greenland, Chile, New Zealand, Sweden and Italy.

I would like to share my opinion of why allowing an additional helicopter ski operator out of the Haines Airport would be detrimental to the community. It is my belief that an additional operator will create a sense of competition that may hasten judgment and create a new danger that has not existed in the past. As the nature of this business is to offer clients fresh tracks, a commodity that is limited by the number of people who are in pursuit of virgin snow, an additional operator will push the boundaries of what is available. As an example, after each storm, slopes will be skied sooner than usual in order to beat the competitor to virgin power. Additional time is absolutely necessary for snow stability to set in thus creating a safer skiing environment.

Even though it appears that there is a great deal of ski terrain available it is actually more limiting than one would think as good snow conditions are defined by the available terrain. This terrain is influenced by avalanche hazards, winds affected snow, and lack of new powder during dry periods.

While working in Valdez I was able to experience first hand the repercussions of too many helicopter ski companies in one area. Competition is good if there is enough room but if there isn't, everyone will suffer. Drawing clients to high quality helicopter skiing, such as what exists in Haines, is a very competitive business as there are equally unique operations in other areas of the world.

It is my sincere belief that bringing in another helicopter ski operator will degrade the quality and lower the safety of skiing in Haines thus tarnishing the reputation of the town itself. I hope that you will take my comments into consideration as you make a critical decision about whether or not to allow another helicopter ski operation into this area.

Sincerely,
Kent McBride
UIAGM/IFMGA Guide
307-690-7205

January 31, 2011

To: Haines Borough Assembly Members, Mayor, and Manager
From: Carolyn Weishahn
Re: Ordinance 10-10-243

Before making some specific comments about this ordinance, I want to emphasize that the borough should take a carefully balanced view of the how borough public lands, or the commons, are utilized by commercial interests. While I recognize the need for economic activity in the valley, there is ultimately a limited amount of area in the borough and although it is a large one, the areas that heli-ski operators prefer are close to the several heli-ports, residences, and areas that can be accessed by snowshoers and skiers. It is the borough's responsibility to ensure that residents, non-motorized recreationists, and wildlife are protected from the negative impacts of heli-skiing. If changes are made to the map, we need heli-free areas that are accessible in winter to residents and visitors for health promoting, non-motorized outdoor activities.

Ordinance 10-10-243 needs a lot of revision. Some changes are needed for clarity; other changes I believe are needed to have a balanced use of public lands. Also, there needs to be a section clearly stating the consequences for non-compliance.

Legislative Findings:

C. delete: "all of which have had consistent healthy populations and in some species, (mountain goats) have increased in overall numbers since the beginning of commercial ski tours."

This assertion is not based in fact according to ADF&G biologist, Ryan Scott.

M. include: In an advisory vote, the Haines community supported heli-skiing if it was managed. Because heli-skiing has been controversial among residents, the borough has included specific conditions in heli-ski tour permits. These conditions are intended to mitigate the undesirable impacts of heli-skiing to residents, recreationists, and wildlife while allowing these tours to continue.

5:04.020

Delete: "Commercial helicopter tour" means a commercial helicopter operation, other than a heli-skiing operation, commercial ski tour or commercial ski production that provides a helicopter-assisted tour to or through an area. It is a commercial tour and requires a permit."

This section of code refers to tours that were proposed for the upper Tsirku River area but have never occurred. This definition should be removed and the area in the upper Tsirku River should be removed from the map. If it is left in, the "General Permit Conditions and Regulations" should apply to "commercial helicopter" tours and the following stipulation, which is currently in code, should be included the ordinance.

"A permit for commercial helicopter tours shall require client access to and from the area by fixed wing aircraft, water vessel, or by another form of surface transport."

Include in the definition of "Commercial ski production:"
Commercial ski production requires a permit.

Change #3 in the definition of "Commercial ski tour:"

3) "includes guided skiing or snowboarding supported by helicopter transportation. It is a commercial tour and requires a permit."

5.18.020 Number of Permits available.

Include: The number of available tour permits, other than the number of permits for a commercial ski tour, commercial ski production, **or special ski competition**, may be set by the assembly.....

5.18.060 Renewal.

Include: 3) proposes to expand the capacity of an existing tour other than a commercial ski tour, **commercial ski production, or special ski competition** by 25% or more....

5.18.080

A. Number of Permits

Change: #1 and #3 to state **2** commercial ski tour permits and **2** applicants

We currently have 2 heli-ski companies with permits. Dividing the heli-ski days among 3 companies isn't realistic and there should be no increase in skier-days. This is the time to start a waiting list for other companies interested in a permit.

B. Skier Day Limits

Delete:

"1. Low Impact Areas

There shall be no limits to the number of skier days in areas identified as "Low Impact" on the attached map."

The whole concept of 'low impact' has not been thought through. No standards have been developed for what constitutes a 'low impact' area. Without standards, designating what is a 'low impact' area would be very arbitrary. If standards are developed, one of them should be that access would be from the **airport only**.

2. Moderate Impact Areas

Change a. Base Limits—No more than a total of 1200 skier days for participants in a commercial ski tour will be authorized **for the term of the permit**.

Delete: "No more than a total of ___ skier days for participants in a commercial ski production will be authorized in an initial allocation of skier days."

The small number of skiers being filmed can be included in the 1200 skier days.

D. [Delete: Initial] Allocation of Skier Days and Photographer Days—Moderate Impact Areas

The reference to 'initial allocation' and 'initial application' should be dropped completely from this ordinance. It is very confusing and isn't necessary. If this ordinance goes into effect, all applicants will be initial applicants and the skier days will be allocated as directed in the ordinance.

The first time skier/photographer days are allocated using this new system, the term should be for **1 year**. This would allow the manager to evaluate permittee compliance after one year of GPS reporting. Subsequent terms would be 2 years.

Delete D.b) "The economic impact of the allocation on the permittee"

This is an arbitrary factor that should not be used to allocate skier days. It can't be applied in an equitable way to all permittees. Other businesses that receive permits are not evaluated for the economic impact on the permittee.

Delete:

"F. Transfer of Allocated Skier Days and Photographer Days

A permittee may sell or transfer a portion of his or her skier days or photographer days allocation for a designated season to another permittee holding an allocation upon the review and approval of the manager."

HBC allows for transfer of a permittee's entire business interest under the permit, not parts of a permit. (see below) Heli-ski days should not be allocated and then used by a permittee for profit.

HBC 5.04.080

D. Transferability.

1. A permit issued under this title, and any rights or privileges thereunder, may be assigned or transferred by the permittee, together with any right of renewal; provided, that such transfer includes the permittee's entire business interest in activities conducted under the permit.

Add a new section:

F. The borough manager will consult with ADF&G biologists on a yearly basis regarding the most recent information on mountain goats and other wildlife in the Haines area. This information will be used to update the heli-ski map.

G. General Permit Conditions and Regulations

Add:

The following permit conditions and regulations apply to all operators of commercial ski tours, commercial ski productions, and special ski competitions:

Numbers 1-11 apply to all three. This would streamline the language of the ordinance.

Change 4.c.

c. maintain a minimum distance of one mile from wildlife on public lands and shall not hover over, circle or harass wildlife.

ADF&G biologists recommend a one mile separation from observed goats when landing.

Add to #5:

....and a copy of any accident reports submitted to the permittee's insurance carrier.

All in all, I think this ordinance needs a lot of work. I hope the assembly takes the time to correct the omissions, inconsistencies, and arbitrary parts of this ordinance.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Carolyn Weishahn, 30-year resident, 40 mile

From: Renaldo Esp. [mailto:renaldoesperand@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2011 5:32 PM

To: Julie Cozzi; jhill@haines.ak.us; daymondhoffman@yahoo.com; steve.vick@gmail.com; blackdoghp@yahoo.com; oinkeriwass@gmail.com; bflipper3@starband.net; Mark Earnest; weis@aptalaska.net

Subject: Comments on Ordinance 10-10-243

Subject: Ordinance 10-10-243...to change heli-ski requirements

Hello, (** note to :Julie...please provide a hard copy of this to the assembly, the manager, mayor and CVN, thanks, Ron**)

Dear Mayor, Manager, Borough Assembly & CVN,

As there are considerable Expansionist ideas inserted into Ordinance 10-10-243, it is appropriate to consider Contractionist ideas as a balancing concept. Here then are my 7 points:

1. I ask that, instead of the proposed expansion to 3 heli-ski companies, that there be allowed 1 company that can consolidate, from the 2 present companies back into the 1 that operated originally.
2. I ask that, instead of the proposed expansion to more skier days per company and in some instances to unlimited skier days in so called low impact areas, that there be a return to 1000 skier days total for all heli-skiing activities.
3. I ask that, instead of the proposed expansion to a wider skiing area, that there be allowed flights from The Haines Airport only... out over the Chilkat River and straight into that area, wild life areas protected, and no flights toward the town nor up the highway from there. This contraction would result in no other heliports but THE airport.
4. I ask that, if heli-flights continued to be allowed in hearing range of residents, that those residents' property taxes, at a minimum, be totally eliminated as compensation for devalued property values and that new taxes, as head or other taxes, be added to the heli-industry and those that promote it, to compensate the borough for the taxes eliminated to damaged property owners.
5. I ask that grandfathered winter time quiet RIGHTS be upheld and restored to residents who had long enjoyed those experiences prior to the invasion of heli-skiing.
6. I ask that, at a minimum, the Jarvis area of the upper valley be totally off limits to heli-skiing and that no heli-skiing be allowed to go beyond Flower Mountain. Additionally, no summer heli-recreation would be allowed.
7. I ask that the regulated heli-ski regulations, as is, be maintained with these added stipulations (1-7), add GPS data reporting, as approved, and add \$1000 infraction fines per each infraction that disregards any regulations.

Thank-you,

Ron Weishahn

30 year continuous resident