

APPENDIX A

Time History Noise Event Plots


Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 1:56:00 PM to March 9, 2015 2:02:00 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/9/2015 2:00:46 PM	222	208	100.1	115.2
2-Home by Helipad	3/9/2015 2:00:39 PM	189	166	83.8	98.6
3-Roadway	3/9/2015 2:00:47 PM	73	57	72.9	78.2
4-Neighboring Estate	3/9/2015 2:01:00 PM	281	221	64.1	74.5




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 2:10:00 PM to March 9, 2015 2:24:00 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/9/2015 2:21:19 PM	578	563	102.3	118.0
2-Home by Helipad	3/9/2015 2:21:13 PM	579	556	84.9	100.9
3-Roadway	3/9/2015 2:21:22 PM	59	43	71.6	77.9
4-Neighboring Estate	3/9/2015 2:21:30 PM	97	63	64.0	74.7




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 4:44:00 PM to March 9, 2015 4:51:20 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/9/2015 4:45:54 PM	281	28	100.3	115.7
2-Home by Helipad	3/9/2015 4:45:59 PM	279	35	87.3	99.5
3-Roadway	3/9/2015 4:49:55 PM	10	3	61.8	68.7
4-Neighboring Estate	3/9/2015 4:57:17 PM	18	5	68.6	76.6




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 5:00:40 PM to March 9, 2015 5:04:20 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{MAX}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/9/2015 5:01:57 PM	119	32	100.2	110.4
2-Home by Helipad	3/9/2015 5:01:58 PM	94	39	84.0	95.2
3-Roadway	3/9/2015 5:01:40 PM	18	7	63.1	69.5
4-Neighboring Estate	3/9/2015 5:01:34 PM	108	36	60.6	70.4




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 11, 2015 8:06:00 AM to March 11, 2015 8:14:00 AM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/11/2015 8:12:11 AM	312	297	100.9	118.2
2-Home by Helipad	3/11/2015 8:12:11 AM	261	244	86.3	100.0
3-Roadway	3/11/2015 8:12:14 AM	79	60	68.7	76.5
4-Neighboring Estate	3/11/2015 8:12:24 AM	27	17	67.8	78.4




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 14, 2015 11:13:00 AM to March 14, 2015 11:18:00 AM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/14/2015 11:15:01 AM	117	39	100.3	112.4
2-Home by Helipad	3/14/2015 11:15:01 AM	117	61	84.9	97.4
3-Roadway	3/14/2015 11:14:46 AM	58	25	65.2	77.0
4-Neighboring Estate	3/14/2015 11:12:35 AM	18	15	88.0	92.8




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 14, 2015 3:23:00 PM to March 14, 2015 3:30:40 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/14/2015 3:28:21 PM	251	216	100.5	116.2
2-Home by Helipad	3/14/2015 3:28:37 PM	210	189	81.8	96.7
3-Roadway	3/14/2015 3:28:44 PM	51	32	62.2	72.3
4-Neighboring Estate	3/14/2015 3:28:48 PM	250	211	66.8	76.0




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 14, 2015 4:16:00 PM to March 14, 2015 4:21:40 PM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{MAX}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/14/2015 4:18:15 PM	110	38	102.7	113.4
2-Home by Helipad	3/14/2015 4:18:15 PM	114	59	83.0	95.3
3-Roadway	3/14/2015 4:17:55 PM	69	22	63.7	75.9
4-Neighboring Estate	3/14/2015 4:17:45 PM	114	44	65.5	74.8




Sample Time History Noise Plot of Helicopter and Ambient Noise

Borough of Haines

Period: March 15, 2015 8:15:00 AM to March 15, 2015 8:22:40 AM

Sites: All

Description	Time _{Max}	Duration (sec)	Start to Peak	L _{MAX}	SEL
1-Helipad	3/15/2015 8:21:29 AM	329	308	103.7	120.9
2-Home by Helipad	3/15/2015 8:21:31 AM	290	267	84.7	99.9
3-Roadway	3/15/2015 8:21:37 AM	98	75	67.7	79.4
4-Neighboring Estate	3/15/2015 8:21:25 AM	112	73	71.1	82.0



APPENDIX B



DNL Contribution and Lmax Distribution Results

DNL Contribution and Lmax Distribution Results

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 1 - Helipad





DNL Contribution and Lmax Distribution Results

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 2 - Home by Helipad





DNL Contribution and Lmax Distribution Results

Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 3 - Roadway




DNL Contribution and Lmax Distribution Results


Borough of Haines

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 4 - Neighboring Estate



Total Number of Measured Aircraft Noise Events



APPENDIX C

Hourly LEQ Aircraft and Total Noise Data

Hourly Noise Level Site Report

Haines Borough

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 1 - Helipad

Metric: Aircraft LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	75	84	55	80	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Mar 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Mar 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Mar 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	77	0	0	0	81	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Mar 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	74
Energy Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	49	68	0	66	76	73	74	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

Metric: Total LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	59	37	35	75	84	55	80	75	42	27	25	25	27	24	75
Mar 10	24	31	38	26	23	22	22	32	30	69	34	30	33	54	53	42	26	30	50	24	24	26	24	25	55
Mar 11	23	24	25	26	24	23	24	42	83	44	39	33	34	35	31	43	31	30	25	23	23	22	23	24	69
Mar 12	24	24	24	23	22	21	21	26	25	22	29	28	24	56	38	24	30	29	22	21	19	20	21	22	42
Mar 13	20	25	30	27	33	36	27	39	41	43	46	32	35	34	39	44	35	33	32	25	24	25	24	24	40
Mar 14	25	24	24	23	23	23	27	45	34	58	58	77	44	34	35	81	78	31	26	23	23	23	24	23	70
Mar 15	23	23	24	24	24	24	26	42	85	35	38	35	32	41	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	74
Energy Average	24	26	32	25	27	29	25	41	79	61	53	68	37	66	76	73	74	67	43	24	23	24	24	24	69

Hourly Noise Level Site Report

Haines Borough

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 2 - Home by Helipad

Metric: Aircraft LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	56	67	58	64	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Mar 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Mar 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Mar 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	62	0	0	0	61	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Mar 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	53
Energy Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	47	53	0	52	59	55	58	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

Metric: Total LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	37	57	67	58	64	60	36	36	36	36	36	36	59
Mar 10	36	38	43	36	35	34	35	35	35	49	35	36	39	62	44	46	35	35	44	35	35	35	35	35	50
Mar 11	35	36	36	38	35	35	40	37	64	48	37	37	39	40	37	46	36	37	37	36	36	36	36	36	51
Mar 12	36	35	35	34	31	28	26	26	28	26	33	33	30	56	51	30	47	33	28	28	26	28	30	30	45
Mar 13	30	31	32	32	34	38	34	38	41	41	50	37	40	41	42	48	40	35	34	34	34	34	34	34	43
Mar 14	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	43	40	48	56	62	42	40	39	61	60	37	34	34	34	34	34	34	53
Mar 15	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	43	64	37	38	38	38	37	47	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	53
Energy Average	35	35	38	35	34	35	36	39	60	46	49	54	39	55	59	55	58	52	38	34	34	34	35	35	52

Hourly Noise Level Site Report

Haines Borough

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 3 - Roadway

Metric: Aircraft LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	27	46	31	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Mar 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Mar 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	46	40	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	35
Mar 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	32
Energy Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	33	0	19	38	38	34	26	0	0	0	0	20	0	30

Metric: Total LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	53	36	38	47	43	41	38	35	30	34	23	26	24	44
Mar 10	20	31	44	30	23	23	24	31	33	47	49	30	28	38	44	44	33	27	39	33	35	25	27	24	43
Mar 11	19	24	21	21	19	19	36	35	42	44	30	31	35	37	36	42	23	31	36	35	32	17	20	24	37
Mar 12	25	22	24	19	18	18	19	22	24	45	50	25	28	32	42	24	28	24	29	33	19	18	18	22	39
Mar 13	17	20	22	22	26	28	28	45	44	48	39	43	46	37	41	41	35	31	30	27	36	31	19	19	40
Mar 14	19	19	19	19	19	19	30	34	35	47	38	43	33	31	36	48	41	36	19	29	29	27	30	18	39
Mar 15	19	19	26	27	20	20	26	29	45	34	37	41	36	35	43	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	38
Energy Average	21	25	37	25	22	23	30	38	41	46	46	46	39	36	43	43	37	33	34	32	33	26	26	22	41

Hourly Noise Level Site Report

Haines Borough

Period: March 9, 2015 to March 15, 2015

Site: 4 - Neighboring Estate

Metric: Aircraft LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	27	58	0	41	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Mar 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Mar 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mar 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	61	0	0	0	49	39	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Mar 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	35
Energy Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	34	53	0	18	50	41	35	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

Metric: Total LEQ

DATE	Hour Of The Day																							DNL	
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		23
Mar 9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54	33	58	45	44	36	23	23	21	33	25	24	49	
Mar 10	20	29	40	26	21	17	16	23	32	50	34	32	25	49	44	37	25	21	25	18	19	22	23	22	42
Mar 11	18	20	22	25	21	20	21	32	45	47	39	42	29	26	29	45	26	26	29	26	27	17	22	28	38
Mar 12	30	21	21	19	19	18	18	26	34	51	46	48	30	22	44	23	20	20	20	21	25	19	19	19	41
Mar 13	17	24	32	31	38	41	42	43	42	49	33	47	49	38	39	43	28	31	54	24	51	20	18	19	47
Mar 14	20	18	17	17	18	18	26	40	43	47	47	61	39	38	30	51	43	61	34	17	18	18	19	18	50
Mar 15	18	19	19	21	20	20	22	32	47	36	45	48	40	32	43	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	41
Energy Average	24	24	33	26	31	34	35	38	43	49	43	54	47	42	50	45	39	53	47	23	43	26	22	23	46

APPENDIX D

Public Comments

From: [Ady Milos](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Correction to my noise study comments
Date: Friday, June 19, 2015 4:22:30 PM

Julie,

I was mistaken with my assertion that I lived near Site 4. Looking more closely at the aerial image, I realize I am actually located south of Site 3. Ms. Platchta resides southeast of Site 3.

Please attach this correction to my previous comments, with my apologies.

Thank you,
Ady Milos

From: [Ady Milos](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: 26 Mile Noise Study Comments
Date: Friday, June 19, 2015 10:48:05 AM

Julie,

I am glad this study was done. We now know, with scientific evidence, what most of us out here have thought all along. That Ms. Platchta's complaints are much to do about nothing. I live in the area the study designates as Site 4, "Neighboring Estate", alongside Site 3, "Roadway". I can barely hear the helicopters. Residents Jessica Platchta and her partner, Nicholas Szatkowski live farther into the "Neighboring Estate"; nowhere near testing Site 4, farther away than I am.

While I am glad for the study (and pleased that the Borough is asking for a dismissal), I am enraged that we Borough residents have to pay to defend such a frivolous claim. The Borough could be using the money used to defend this suit to FIX THE DAMNED CHILKAT LAKE ROAD! One would think the claimants would spend their energies on something much more worthwhile and necessary for the neighborhood (not to mention our vehicles' shocks!). They'd certainly get more support from their neighbors!

Maybe someone should explain to the claimants that Frivolous lawsuits are defined as "those filed by a party or attorney who is aware they are without merit, because of a lack of supporting legal argument or factual basis for the claims. Frivolous lawsuits waste time, money, and judicial resources, *and fines and/or sanctions may be imposed upon a party or their attorney for filing such a claim.*"

Just sayin'.....

Thanks for the opportunity to comment,

Ady Milos

From: [Weishahn](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Cc: [David Sosa](#); [Janhill](#); [Dave Berry](#); [George Campbell](#); [Thecases](#); [Joanne Waterman](#); [Diana Lapham](#); [Ron Jackson](#)
Subject: Comments on Helicopter Noise Study
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 4:21:30 PM
Attachments: [Helicopter Noise Study, Comments, 6-26-15.docx](#)

Hello Julie,

Please find my comments on the draft helicopter noise study attached.

Thank you,

Carolyn Weishahn

June 26, 2015

Comments re the Helicopter Noise Study

Due to the highly technical nature of this report, I suggest that after the study consultants present the webcast as described in “Task 4 -- Presentation of Results” of the study contract, the borough have another comment period. There are bound to be further comments in response to the webcast.

There are several things to keep in mind about this noise study.

First, the study often uses the 65 DNL metric, however it clearly states that the site DNLs can't be directly compared to the FAA 65 DNL significance threshold:

For this Study, the measured DNL from the sites above cannot be directly compared to the 65 DNL significance threshold because the annual average was not modeled using Integrated Noise Model. However, the measured average levels at the three sites during the study period (outside of the helipad itself) are generally below what measurements would be expected at the significant 65 DNL or higher level.

Second, even if the study had modeled an annual DNL average using the Integrated Noise Model, the FAA make it clear that the 65 DNL threshold for residential land use is not intended to substitute federal guidelines for local planning for noise compatible land uses. In other words, while the feds use one set of guidelines, each local community determines its own noise compatible land uses.

http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/environmental_desk_ref/media/desk_ref_chap17.pdf

14 CFR Part 150 land use compatibility guidelines. FAA established land use compatibility guidelines relative to certain DNL noise levels in 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150. Chapter 5, Table 1 of this Desk Reference provides a copy of the Part 150 Land Use Compatibility guidelines.

(1) Different local land use compatibility standards. Although residential land uses are considered compatible with noise exposure levels below DNL 65 dB under 14 CFR Part 150:

“The responsibility for determining the acceptable and permissible land uses ...rests with the local authorities...Part 150 is not intended to substitute federally determined land uses for those determined to be appropriate by local authorities in response to locally determined needs and values in achieving noise compatible land uses. “ -14 CFR Part 150, Table 1.

~~~~~

This study uses the A-weighting scale (dBA) which does not completely characterize helicopter sound. Since the A-weighting scale eliminates low and high frequency sounds, the FAA has questioned its use for assessing helicopter sound which has a low-frequency component. As the

FAA points out in the document below, another weighting scale, the C-weighting scale, is useful for measuring wall vibration energies that can occur from helicopter noise.

[http://www.faa.gov/regulations\\_policies/policy\\_guidance/envir\\_policy/media/04nov-30-rtc.pdf](http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/04nov-30-rtc.pdf)

### 3.5.3 Is A-weighting the optimum weighting for assessing helicopter sound?

As discussed above, there is some evidence that the A-weighting metric may not fully characterize human reactions to noise events with substantial low-frequency content.

.....

The C-weighting has been used in the United States for almost 30 years to assess blast noise and sonic booms in order to account for the noise-induced rattles generated by these sounds, and currently, several other countries also use the C-weighting for this purpose. It is primarily the sound energies in the 10 to 30 Hz ranges that induce wall vibrations. The C-weighting could be used to identify those helicopter sound energies that will induce wall vibrations.

.....

Helicopters, with their distinctive sound character, appeared to be more noticeable than other sounds for the same A-weighted sound exposure level.

.....

As discussed in “effects on individuals” (Section 3), there are multiple noise metrics utilized to assess noise (EPNL, ASEL, DNL, etc). However, civil helicopter annoyance assessments utilize the same acoustic methodology adopted for airplanes with no distinction for helicopter’s unique noise character. **As a result, the annoyance of unaccustomed, impulsive helicopter noise has not been fully substantiated by a well-correlated metric. The FAA favors the chartering a technical effort to focus on low-frequency noise metric to evaluate helicopter annoyance.** (emphasis added)

~~~~~

Another sound component of helicopter noise that this study does not include is helicopter ‘blade slap.’

One issue that this study does confirm is that the neighborhood where SEABA wants to put a heliport is a **very quiet neighborhood.** (at L90, dBA measures at the 4 sites: 21.8, 29.9, 17.5, and 16.9)

Another issue is that while SEABA reported 4 heliski user days for March 9, data was collected on other days as well during the study. Were these helicopter flights taken while “fully loaded” as required by the study contract? Were the landings and take-off made in compliance with permit flight requirements to obtain elevation as quickly as possible? Residents have reported that the flights were conducted at very low elevations.

I feel that the use of this study as a basis for changing the way the borough assesses heliport impacts in any particular neighborhood is not appropriate due to the lack of confidence in DNL when evaluating helicopter noise and the incomplete nature of calculating the DNL in this study.

Please notify me when the webcast by the contracted company will be available. Again, I feel another comment period is necessary after the public has had a chance to view the webcast.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Weishahn

From: [Weishahn](#)
To: [David Sosa](#)
Cc: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Re: Noise Study Contract
Date: Monday, June 22, 2015 1:46:28 PM
Attachments: [doc10760520150619171917.pdf](#)

Hello David,

I notice in the noise study report that Task 4, Presentations of Results, will be accomplished by a Webcast. Do you know when that will occur? Will it be interactive so that questions may be asked during the Webcast? Will it be available to the public as well as borough officials?

Thank you for checking on this part of the noise study process.

Cary Weishahn

On 2015-06-19 16:03, David Sosa wrote:

Documents as requested

-----Original Message-----
From: System Administrator
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2015 4:19 PM
To: David Sosa
Subject: Scan from AdminKyocera

Taskalfa 5500i

From: [Carol Tuynman](#)
To: [David Sosa](#)
Cc: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Noise Study comments due June 26, 2015
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:59:20 PM

Dear David,

I am submitting comments as the creative director of Alaska Arts Confluence. My comments are in reference to the cultural norms and social/political background related to helicopter presence in Haines.

Before the 26 Mile heliport was permitted, there was general consensus that the airport is the appropriate location for helicopter take off and landing and that a heliport at 26 Mile would become a noise issue for residents in that area. Despite knowledge of this problem and considerable public objection from people outside of the study area, the heliport was permitted and went into operation. The Borough's unwillingness to find a resolution of the helipad location that would satisfactorily address the public concern has led to the challenge to the 26 Mile helipad.

The study uses standards and assumptions generally not appropriate to the Chilkat Valley. The level of noise people become accustomed to is a factor of conditioning. For example, the noise created by chainsaws is an accepted part of our culture. Chainsaws are used to cut down trees to provide firewood necessary for heating many of our homes. People here accept higher noise levels that relate to our daily lives. A number of years past the Haines Borough voted not to allow helicopter sightseeing tours during the summer tourism season when they saw how intrusive and disruptive the helicopter tours were in Juneau. Helicopter flights for hell skiing by the existing tour operators would be acceptable and appropriate if they used the airport and stayed within the designated flight paths.

We value our natural environment and the general quiet of a rural community. Although it is a small number of people who are negatively affected by the helicopter paths evaluated in the study, those residents should have the benefit of the same protection from helicopter noise that was established by the Borough.

The noise study, though scientific by FAA standards for the rest of the country is not appropriate for the Haines Borough. Regularly scheduled airplanes and helicopters should originate only from the Haines Airport, where the noise levels of helicopters would be totally within acceptable noise levels.

Please enter my comments into the record for public comment on the Noise Study, 2015.

Sincerely,
Carol Tuynman
Creative Director
Alaska Arts Confluence
Post Office Box 1664
Haines, Alaska 99827
907.303.0222

From: [Derek Poinsette](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#); [Ron Jackson](#); [Joanne Waterman](#); [Mike Case](#); [Jan Hill](#); [George Campbell](#); [Diana Lapham](#); [Dave Berry](#); [David Sosa](#)
Cc: sunny@seaba-heli.com
Subject: Helicopter Noise Study
Date: Saturday, June 20, 2015 10:53:26 AM

Haines Borough Assembly and Administration:

I live on Mosquito Lake Road. I have read the results of the helicopter noise study, and I have some specific comments.

The ambient noise level of the general neighborhood was measured at ~21 dBA (L50 from Table 4-1). This is a level of sound that is less than bird song. The sound of a helicopter measured at the most DISTANT measuring location ("neighboring estate") registered at 90 dBA, equivalent to a DC-10 take-off. At the helipad itself, measurements exceeded 104 dBA (Lmax from Table 4-1). To the human ear, 90 dBA is 128 times louder than 20 dBA. In actuality, 90 dB is 10 million times 20 dB. That's not how it sounds to us, but it may very well sound that way to other creatures.

The study computed the ambient average daily noise level (DNL) in the neighborhood and found it to be 30 to 51 DNL, including the helicopter activity. The SEABA property came in at 69 DNL. The FAA classifies "wilderness residential" as 35 DNL. "Urban row housing on a major avenue" is 68 DNL.

So, we can conclude from this study that the addition of a heliport to the neighborhood moves the character of the place from "wilderness residential", past "rural residential", past "agricultural land", on past "wooded residential" and "old urban residential", all the way up to "urban row housing on a major avenue".

No one who has invested time, money, sweat and tears building a home up here ever thought that one day the Upper Valley was going to have sound characteristics similar to those of downtown Chicago. My place is exactly two miles from the SEABA heliport as the crow flies (according to Google Earth). There is a small mountain between us (Ski Hill), and yet I can hear, as plain as if we were next-door neighbors, all of the helicopter activities that occur there. I don't know exactly how loud it is, but it is loud enough to be heard through hearing protection and over the noise of my wood shop equipment. And it is much louder than the DOT chip sealing that is going on right now just 3/4-mile away.

This is a very quiet place up here; unlike the lower valley, we don't even have wind noise on most days. When you add something like regular helicopter activity into this environment, it completely changes the character of the place--from wilderness to urban row housing. And now we have the numbers to prove it.

Sincerely,

Derek Poinsette
Mosquito Lake
Box 555
Haines, AK 99827
767-5414

poinsette.ak@gmail.com

CC: Scott Sundberg

From: [george figdor](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: comments on helicopter noise study
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 4:04:29 PM

RE: Comments on 26-mile helicopter noise study

The deadline is fast approaching, so i just wanted to get these brief comments to you before that. i have read some of the research from various places in the U.S. concerning the impact of helicopter noise on local residents. Several interesting points seem to emerge in many of the studies.

1. The concern over impacts of helicopter noise is not just a local one in the Chilkat Valley. Throughout the nation, nearby resident are quite frequently opposed to helicopter activities near their homes. And generally residents are passionate about wanting to end the disturbance.
2. Helicopter noises are perceived to be noisier than their decibel reading. In other words, the unique quality of the noise makes it result in the same perceived disturbance as a noise with higher decibel reading. So, many studies argue that in some ways one can't measure the impact helicopter noise with a meter.
3. The nature of helicopter noise has been shown to have a wide range of health impacts---particularly among young children. This can include brain and emotional damage. Thus helicopter activities must be evaluated in public health terms as well as the usual parameters. And these health impacts occur even when the activity is not regular. In fact, the stress caused by unpredictable nature of certain activies often caused greater health impacts related to stress.
4. The emerging consensus seems to be that residential areas and helicopter traffic do not mix well, and that helicopter traffic is most often best located in places where people do not live---liket in commercial airport areas.

George Figdor
Box 612
Haines, AK

From: [Gretchen Roffler](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: comments noise study
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 9:32:47 AM

Dear Ms. Cozzi and the Borough of Haines,

I appreciate that the Borough has taken into consideration the collection of sound data to help inform a decision about SEABA's proposed CUP. It appears the Mead and Hunt team have done an adequate job; however the sampling data are sparse, and likely not remotely representative of the noise that would be experienced during a normal heli ski operating period.

I was dismayed by the poor interpretation of the noise data in this study. The DNL is a worthless noise metric as it unrealistically averages noise over a 24 hour period. The logic behind relying on this metric is flawed. Instead of accounting for the helicopter SEL and the number of takeoff and landing events, it actually merely washes them out over a longer period of time to devalue the numbers. Additionally, because these helicopters do not operate after civil twilight and before dawn, factoring in nighttime noise levels is a meaningless exercise. The DNL may be the FAA standard for residential noise assessment, and it might be convenient to use these values because they portray lower noise volumes, but I would hope that the Haines Borough would maintain higher standards than this.

Evaluating the values of the SEL and Lmax metrics, we can see that the noise disturbance caused by helicopters is in fact very high for all the recording sites, particularly those that are closest to the proposed heli pad, exceeding recommended levels for residential zones. These are the values that should be taken into the highest consideration, and not the 24 hour mean.

It is also important to consider that the actual time of very loud SEL and Lmax (and by default DNL) would be extended considerably during a normal heli ski day. There would be landings and takeoffs of multiple helicopters continuously throughout the day, in addition to lengthy refueling time. This study does not accurately capture this level of disturbance that would be present in a realistic operating scenario.

At the heart of the issue is promotion of one business over the residential way of life in the neighborhood. We purchased our property (adjacent to the proposed SEABA helipad) because we wanted to have a quiet place to occupy in a peaceful neighborhood. SEABA did not disclose their intention to build a helipad at the time of the land transfer. I am not opposed in any way to heli skiing (I have partaken in this activity), but I am opposed to landing helicopters in a residential neighborhood. The justification for supporting this plan by the Borough relies on faulty logic that it will promote economic development for the community. Consider that keeping heli skiers within Haines proper (at SEABA's current lodging at Ft. Seward) actually provides more of an economic pulse to businesses in the community than containing them in our neighborhood, where there is nowhere to spend money. If SEABA develops this land and builds an "all inclusive" heli ski lodge the clients will only be supporting one business, and not all of the stores and restaurants in Haines. See Cordova's Points North as an example of how to *not* create a sustainable business that benefits the greater community. This is not the model that Haines should want to follow.

I hope that you consider these comments in the decision process. There should be a way that heli skiing can flourish in Haines and benefit the majority of the community economically (not just the owners of one business) while at the same time allowing residents to maintain a peaceful way of life. Please consider creation of a helipad outside of residential neighborhoods (through land transfers or otherwise), or promotion of the multitude of heli pads that already currently exist.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gretchen Roffler

From: [Heidi Robichaud](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: noise study report
Date: Thursday, June 18, 2015 11:22:54 AM

To the Borough Clerk,

I am shocked and disappointed by not only the outrageous expenditure of borough funds on a helicopter noise study but also by the unhelpful, convoluted and almost irrelevant results of this study. The only meaningful things established by the report are that the neighborhood surrounding the proposed heliport is normally extremely quiet, and that the helicopters are really loud. (Appendix A. Sound Exposure Levels during the test period range from a (loud) low at the furthest test site of 69.5 dBA to a (painfully loud) high of 120.9 dBA at the nearest.)

Ironically, because of the way DNL was figured, the quieter the ambient noise of the neighborhood, the lower the DNL, even though the helicopter noise remains at the same level, very loud. A 2011 FAA technical report contained the following caution, "DNL has another major practical limitation. It doesn't work particularly well as a predictor of aircraft noise impacts."

Using DNL as its justification, the Haines Noise Report asserts that if you take a very quiet place and add a very loud noise for a relatively short period of time, you get a moderately quiet place, when actually, what you get is a very quiet place with a very loud thing in it. If someone bonks you on the head really hard in the morning, and then refrains from bonking your head for the rest of the day, did they actually just touch you gently the whole time? Obviously not.

Additionally, the study did not test the noise levels during regular operations that would include easily 90 landings or even more (2 helis per day, all day, times 6 days). So the average sound (DNL) would have been be enormously higher had a realistic scenario been studied. We should find it disturbing that professional sound consultants we paid about \$45,000, would make conclusions about the appropriateness of a particular development under conditions like this, where they clearly don't have measurements reflecting the actual level of use likely to occur with the establishment of a heliport there.

Even with the dampening effects of A-weighting, the noise levels measured ranged from 77.4 to 104.3 dBA. All of these noise levels are above reference ranges for

residential noise standards, standards preserving healthy hearing, and national and international standards protecting public health. (See Anchorage municipal codes, EPA Noise Control Act of 1972, and World Health Organization Guidelines for Community Noise.)

I urge the borough to file this report, write off the outrageous expenditure and listen to the concerns of the residents of the area.

Most respectfully,

Heidi Robichaud

From: [bearded pigeon](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: noise report comment
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:56:04 PM

I am a resident in the area of the **SEABA** noise report. I find the data in this report inconclusive and more data would need to be recorded to get a full understanding of the noise levels in the area. I also find this study a political tool for the validation of one companies agenda. if any laws are passed or permits given based on the data in this report it would be insulting to those that would like to continue to live and enjoy a quiet existence.

Thanks for hearing my comment,
Josh Grimm

From: [John Norton](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Fw: Noise Study comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 6:31:24 PM
Attachments: [w\Emoticon-smilef11.png](#)
[Helicopter noise study 2015.doc](#)

From: [John Norton](#)
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2015 11:17 AM
To: jcozzi@haines.ak.us
Subject: Noise Study comments

Hi Julie, Finally; a rainy day so I can get some correspondence taken care of 😊. I've attached a few comments regarding the Noise Study that I'd appreciate you forwarding to the appropriate staff. Cheers, John Norton

Borough Staff and Assembly Members,

Thank you for the extended comment period of the 2015 Noise Study. I believe that the Lmax measurements are the most important metric in the discussion of allowing the development of a heliport in the Chilkat Lake Road area. The Lmax represents the loudest sound experienced during an event and in my opinion should form the foundation for deciding the impact of noise in that area. If my reading of that document is correct it appears that noise levels of 90dBA or greater occurred during helicopter flights in the monitored area.. These noise levels are categorized as "Very Loud" and I believe that this metric is key to understanding the concerns that the local homeowners have brought to the Borough. I am in agreement that this level of aircraft noise, in an area that is attractive to residential homeowners due to it's quiet, rural character, is inappropriate.

I agree with comments made by others that the DNL metric is not helpful in this discussion as the DNL averages over a 24 hour period a small number of loud events within an area that is normally very quiet. This is especially inappropriate where darkness precludes aircraft flights to less than half of that 24 hour period. To use the DNL figures to base ones decision would misapply that metric which is more appropriately applied to noise from a busy freeway, industrial site or large airport. An analogy would be to average the fatal burns received in the flash fire from fuel thrown into the woodstove with the pleasant warmth of the slowly burning fire over 24 hours. It is the single event that is useful in guiding our behavior, not the averaged data.

To conclude, I would like to suggest that the appropriate staff and Assembly members take a few minutes to experience 90+dBA sound levels during discussion of this issue. It may be as simple as bringing a boom-box into the assembly chambers and turing the volume to full . That simple exercise would be very helpful in understanding why local homeowners are so opposed to the development of a heliport near their homes. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards, John Norton
Haines, AK

From: [Joe Ordonez](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: comments on noise study
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2015 10:15:25 PM

Greetings,

I have looked over the noise study. It was rather technical and not easy reading for me. I have a college degree, and I'm not sure what percentage of our community has post-secondary education. Perhaps in the future, when the Borough hires an outside firm to perform a technical study, part of the contract should be for the firm to host a public presentation where they explain the methodology and the results. An informed public should be the goal.

One thing I noticed is that the noise study indicates that the ambient noise level is at the low end of the scale for a 'wooded area.' That is what people live there and who moved there are used to, and have come to expect. Even with the helicopter activity, the average noise level was low. With an average of 51 being the norm for wooded areas, and the noise level in the study area being 30-51, this tells me that this is a quiet neighborhood. So introducing a noisy activity into that type of environment would be particularly intrusive.

Also, to use averaging to try to describe the impact of noise events is misleading. One serious noise event can ruin some people's entire day, and setting up a helipad with multiple take-offs and landing on a daily basis is sure to change the character of the neighborhood. And the study was only for 9 "operations" over a six-day period. How does this compare to the number of "operations" allowed if this was to become a true base of operations for SEABA and how would that compare with the data collected? I do not see that information in the study but it is a critical piece of information. Was it included somewhere but I missed it?

I also note that they have said there is no "noise standard" for the Haines Borough. Without setting a standard, there is no way to decide whether or not this noise level is excessive. For us to accept the FAA standard without public discussion and involvement would not be fair nor wise. We have a history of preferring to make our own decision as a community when possible, rather than allowing the federal government to decide what our standards should be.

The reason conditional use permits were required and strict criteria set in place for helicopter landing pads is because helicopter activity can have a profound negative affect on local residents. Putting a helicopter pad in a quiet area is not a good idea. We have an airport for noisy air activity, and that is one of the designated landing places for helicopters. There are three other dedicated areas for helicopter use.....the airport, 18 mile and 33 mile. I also understand that helicopters are taking off from the Big Nugget mine in Porcupine, even though it is not one of the designated areas but has been somehow "grandfathered" in. These are places that people moving into the area can expect will have helicopter noise and activity.

I am worried about the precedent that allowing a helicopter pad in a quiet neighborhood will set. If the conclusions gleaned from this study are that helicopter noise is a "nonissue, ' as one of our Assembly members was quoted in the CVN, what is to stop helipads from turning up all over the Borough? Certainly it makes

sense from the economic standpoint of a helicopter tour operator to have their lodge and heliport on their private property. There are presently three helicopter ski companies in Haines, and no limit on the potential number of companies allowed to operate. If SEABA gets permission to put a helipad at their lodge, they will have a competitive advantage over the other two operators. The logical next step will be for the other two operators to build helipads on their private property and so we will have more helipads in the Borough. The original intent of requiring a conditional use permit for helipads was to limit their proliferation in the borough and contain their growth. Certainly, there is some point where we would have too many heliports in our valley. Many of our citizens believe we have already reached that point.

I am also concerned about SEABA's involvement with the study. SEABA has a documented history of not following rules that they have agreed upon. How do we know that they followed the rules for this study? How much of the information for this study was provided by them and how do we know if it is accurate? How do we know that they will follow the rules in the future? How many Borough resources will need to be utilized to keep track of whether or not they are following the rules, and what sort of penalties will they received when/if they are caught breaking the rules? And will these penalties be serious enough to ensure that they follow the rules in the future? These are serious questions which I have been asking since I was on the Helicopter Advisory committee in 2011 and they have never been adequately addressed.

Another serious concern I have is the allegation that the flights used in the study were flown at an elevation of 200 feet above ground level. It says in the newspaper that these allegations were dismissed as "unsubstantiated." I would hope that there is accurate GPS data from the 9 flight operations that took place during the study. If this information was not recorded or is not available to the public, then the results of the study are at best, inconclusive, and, at worst, seriously flawed. For what we paid, I would think that the citizens have a right to know if this allegation is true or not. The elevation of the flight has a significant effect on the noise signature.

I am open-minded and hope to hear more from the Borough about the study and how the results planned to be used. I recommend that we consider this study preliminary and proceed with extreme caution before we base any sort of planning or policy decisions on this dubious exercise.

Sincerely and thanks,

Joe Ordonez

--

Joe Ordonez

Rainbow Glacier Adventures LLC

P.O. Box 1103

Haines, Alaska 99827

Phone: [907-766-3576](tel:907-766-3576)

Fax: [907-766-3580](tel:907-766-3580)

joe@joeordonez.com

www.tourhaines.com

From: [Joy and Pete Paquet](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Cc: [Joy and Pete Paquet](#)
Subject: Attention Borough Clerk, Re: Comments Regarding Haines Noise Study Report
Date: Friday, June 19, 2015 7:09:05 AM

To: Haines Borough

Did we really need to spend 52K to conclude Helicopters are loud on both take-offs and landings? How much taxpayer money is still being spent on Borough Attorney fees defending a Conditional Use permit appeal?

The Plaintiff in the CUP appeal has more expertise and knowledge , of what the base noise level of the Chilkat Lake Road area is than the FAA? Interesting.

This isn't about noise or Helicopters, Heli-Pads, or a Ski Lodge. Nor is this about the lovely quiet rural life style some of us have here.

This is about a couple of people trying to force their life style choices on their peaceful , hard working and quiet neighbors, and it will never stop. They will never be happy, or satisfied until we all live under a pile of brush. More frivolous lawsuits, more petitions , more complaint forms. More time spent from the Assembly to the Planning Commission, and the Borough staff wasting countless hours, defending itself.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this
Regards,

Maria Paquet,
Eagle Bluff Drive

From: [Jessica Meadow](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#); [Nicholas Szatkowski](#)
Subject: Noise Comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:34:25 PM
Attachments: [PlachtaNoiseComments2015.pdf](#)

Hi Julie,

My comments on the Draft Haines Noise Report are attached.

Thanks,

Jessica Plachta

Comments re. Draft Haines Noise Report 2014

Jessica Plachta
HC 60 Box 2621
Haines, AK 99827
jessica.meadow@gmail.com

While there are a few useful data sets contained within the Draft Haines Noise Report, its assumptions, methodology and conclusions are mostly problematic to the point of being inoperable. Some of these problems are not the fault of Mead and Hunt, but derive from the actions of the commercial heliski operator, Southeast Alaska Backcountry Adventures, (SEABA). Some of the problems derive from the difficulties inherent in attempting to apply an urban (public airport) equation to a rural (wilderness residential) setting. And still others of the problems may derive from factors unknown to this commenter.

Problems with Methodology:**Insufficient Data**

Nine flights is an overwhelmingly insufficient amount of data from which to draw conclusions, especially since-- according to SEABA's biweekly flight operations report-- the 4 flights on the first day of the study were the only flights that were actually part of their commercial tour operations. Nine flights over the course of seven days are being used to calculate the expected impacts of a heliport at the site. The data has been misused. What should be calculated is the sonic impact of two to four helicopters using the site constantly from the hours of 8 am to 6 pm, for three months. With that amount of use, the sound of helicopters almost never goes away.

Inaccurate Data

Even the data recorded from the nine flights aren't representative of lawful commercial tour operations from the site. SEABA was observed consistently and dramatically violating their flight rules, by skimming the treetops between the CUPLZ and mountaintops. This further skewed the results of the noise study by altering the profile and duration of each helicopter noise event. Sound Exposure Levels, LEQs, and DNLs are all highly related to the duration of noise events. SEABA's unlawful flight behavior corrupted the results of the study by artificially curtailing the duration and intensity of noise detected by the measuring devices.

Missing "Raw" Data, 1/3 Octave Data

The contract Mead and Hunt signed with the Haines Borough says that they will "include unweighted, "raw" sound data measured in decibels." The Draft Report includes only A-weighted (dB(A)) sound data. The official contract between Mead and Hunt and the Haines Borough also specified that they would include "1/3 octave sound level measurements at each location from which noise levels are measured and such ratings will be included in a standard sound measurement report." Presumably, the 1/3 octave sound measurements would show us what frequencies are emitted by the helicopter, and what percentage of the total noise is low-frequency noise. This information might be useful, but has not been provided by the Consultant. Mead and Hunt contracted to prepare the following metrics: DNL, SEL, LMAX, and Time Above," using the FAA's Integrated Noise Model. This also was not done.

Omitting the raw, unweighted data might be considered an breach of contract with the citizens of the Haines Borough, who payed for the Noise Study. Omitting the raw data is especially egregious when Mead and Hunt acknowledge that A-weighting carves off as much as 50 decibels from the decibel number of low-frequency sounds, because its purpose is to de-emphasize the impact of low-frequency sound. Helicopters obviously make abundant low frequency sound. The World Health Organization says that low-frequency sound emitters should be effectively penalized for their additional health and annoyance effects by adding decibels, not subtracting them.

Low frequency sound has particular effects on structures, human health and stress disorders, birds and wildlife, and has even been developed into a tool for fighting fire. Low frequency noise, aimed at the base of a fire, can extinguish the flame. Conducting a noise study which specifically excludes measuring the particular effects of low frequency sound, when assessing the impacts of a low frequency noise emitter like a helicopter, is

simply inadequate, ultimately misleading, and cannot be considered authoritative.

Problems with Assumptions/Sources for Information:

The Draft Noise Report claims that, "There are no local noise standards in effect, so in comparison, the only federal standard for noise and land use compatibility is from the Federal Aviation Administration. This standard is based on the DNL, which identifies the acceptability of various types of land use with aircraft noise exposure. Under this standard:

Residential uses are compatible with noise up to 65 DNL and up to 70 DNL with sound insulation; "

In fact, "**The FAA does not regulate aircraft noise**," according to Ian Gregor, the public affairs manager for the Pacific region of the FAA. "If a noise complaint involved an allegation that an aircraft was flying improperly low or unsafely, we would investigate the safety component of that complaint." Furthermore, the FAA plays absolutely no role in local planning decisions regarding questions of compatibility with residential uses. The 65DNL standard is an averaged noise level that the FAA believes is compatible with areas surrounding urban airports, and has no relevance whatsoever in rural Alaska. Mead and Hunt's suggestion that this would be an appropriate standard here undermines their credibility and professionalism, and begs the question, "Are they impartially gathering data, or are they preparing a report to suit the boss?"

Meanwhile, there are **other federal agencies that have generated standards for noise** and land use compatibility, such as the EPA, which is charged with protecting public health. Congress adopted the **Noise Control Act of 1972**, which set out much stricter guidelines than those recommended by the FAA. This federal law indicates for rural residential areas a standard of 35-45 dB.

Mead and Hunt could have looked closer to home for guidance. Other municipalities in Alaska do have noise regulations. The **city of Anchorage has noise regulations** prohibiting noise of 60 dB or greater from crossing residential property lines. Allowing a heliport at this site would regularly submit the nearest neighbors to sonic impacts that are more than 100 times greater than those allowed in urban Anchorage! Obviously, this constitutes "undue noise."

The city of Los Angeles has even more protective noise regulations. In residential areas of that city, sounds above 50 dB during day and 45 dB during night are unlawful. The more than 100 private properties within the mile radius around SEABA's heliport would be subjected to sound levels between 50 and 100 decibels--all levels that would be unlawful in urban Los Angeles.

Let's remember now that **70 dB is 10 times louder than 60 dB, and that 80 dB is 100 times louder. 100 dB is 1000 times louder than 70 decibels**, while 70 dB will already cause hearing loss. No one should be subjected to that kind of noise in their own homes, on their own private properties, against their will, and for no appreciable benefit.

In 1979, the **EPA's "Noise Effects Handbook"** implicated noise in a number of health problems, including strokes, ulcers, heart disease and high blood pressure, as well as other stress-related disorders and mental health issues. International health organizations have recognized extensive effects of noise on human health. The **World Health Organization** has determined that, besides hearing loss, noise can cause loss of concentration, cognitive and behavioral problems, and stress disorders, especially in children and other sensitive populations.

Problems with Conclusions:

DNL:

Mead and Hunt erroneously diluted (via misapplication of DNL metrics) the extremely loud helicopter noise impact with the ambient neighborhood quiet, rather than merely impartially reporting the contrast, as they should

have done.

"Undue Noise:"

Haines Borough law instructs the PC to determine whether a CUP applicant has proven an absence of undue noise on neighboring properties. No part of the HBC suggests that an "average" (more accurately a dilution) of impacts at locations arbitrarily chosen by Borough administration can be used as a substitute for the standards outlined in HBC.

It is the job of the Haines Borough Planning Commission and affected citizens to determine whether the noise is "undue," not the job of a hired consultant. It seems inappropriate for a technical sound consultant to draw conclusions regarding what level of noise impact should be considered acceptable in a community. Furthermore, Hunt et. al.'s suggestion that the FAA's standard of 65 decibels for communities surrounding (primarily urban) airports should be applied in a quiet residential area in rural Alaska is downright ludicrous.

Useful Components of the Noise Report:

Despite the significant problems marring the usability of the Haines Noise Report, there are some refreshingly simple truths reflected therein. One, the background noise in **the neighborhood is inarguably quiet.** Quieter than any category available in the Consultant's charts. This simple fact should lay to rest forever the false assertion that this neighborhood is somehow a pre-existing industrial area that is already so loud that helicopters won't be noticed above the din of all the other industrial activities. There are, in fact, no other industrial activities in the neighborhood. The other undeniable fact is that **helicopters are extremely loud;** represented in the Noise Study by the Lmax numbers. Despite the reduction imposed by A-weighting, the numbers show that **the heliport would not be allowed** in any municipality that has noise regulations, nor would it be allowed by national or international regulatory bodies. The development of a heavy industrial activity like a commercial heliport is not compatible with a "wilderness residential" area, and is not excused in any way by the \$42,000 spent on this report. The Haines Borough should make a note to listen to its citizens next time a question like this comes up, and save itself some dough.

Conclusion:

Haines Borough Code 18.30.010 specifies under "Finding," "A permit approval shall include a written finding that the proposed use can occur consistent with the comprehensive plan, harmoniously with other activities allowed in the zone and **will not disrupt the character of the neighborhood.**"

Regardless of how much of the taxpayer's money the Haines Borough spends on outside studies, the proposed use **cannot comply with Borough code.** A heliport in this neighborhood is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it cannot coexist harmoniously with other activities allowed in this zone, and it will absolutely disrupt the character of the neighborhood. The heliport was unlawfully allowed by the Haines Borough Assembly, and unlawfully operated by SEABA. This is why there has been **consistent, vigorous, widespread opposition to allowing the heliport,** and there will continue to be opposition until the issue is put to rest.

From: [Kip Kermoian](#)
To: [David Sosa](#)
Cc: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Draft Haines Noise Study comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 4:15:42 PM
Attachments: [K. Kermoian draft Haines Noise Study comments 62615.doc](#)

Dr. Mr. Sosa,

Please find my comments regarding the Draft Haines Noise Study comments attached.

Thank you,

Kip

Kip Kermoian
PO Box 1024
Haines, AK
99827

June, 26, 2015

Mr. D. Sosa
Manager
Haines Borough

Re: Helicopter noise study

Dear Mr. Sosa,

I am assuming that you feel strongly about the integrity of all of those serving in the borough while conducting borough business and support the precept that personal biases should be put aside when, in this instance, a scientific study has been commissioned to objectively assess impacts to residents living adjacent to the proposed helicopter operation at .6 mile Chilkat Lake Rd. It is, after all, what each of us rely upon if a democracy is to function effectively.

If my above assertion is accurate, the results of the noise study do not accurately reflect their intended purpose, but rather, serve to support an obvious bias.

Who in the borough administration responded to Jessica Plachta and Nicholas Szatkowski's confirmed allegation - using GPS data of the helicopter test flights – that the helicopters were “flying at less than 200 feet above ground level during most of the 16-mile roundtrip between the helipad and a drop-off point.” (Source: Chilkat Valley News, Thursday, June 18, 2015), which is contrary to the borough's flight operation agreement requiring helicopters to “attain as quickly as practicable after takeoff and maintain a minimum elevation of 1,500 feet above ground level while in flight”, characterizing their concern as “unsubstantiated allegations”?

If the GPS data is confirmed to be accurate, this assessment by the borough administration mitigates the purpose of the noise study and casts doubt on not only the findings, as the results do not accurately reflect noise levels should helicopters abide by the borough's agreed upon flight standards, but raises the question of unethical bias within the borough administration.

To base any assessment of the impacts of this impending noise upon residents that will permanently and negatively impact the quality of their lives, on a manipulated methodology, only serves to disenfranchise all those who have contributed to this process in good faith.

I hope that you will conduct a fair assessment of the methodology, and insist that only an accurate measure of real impacts be used to support a position on this issue by the borough.

Sincerely,
Kip Kermoian

From: [Kathleen Menke](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Comments on Noise Study Report
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 9:38:00 AM

Regarding the Borough's noise study report:

Grade: F

The Borough lost its way when public officials who are supposed to serve the folks who live here decided to ignore those very people they have sworn to serve.

A midnight reconsideration of a vote after the public had left a Borough meeting?

Stating that public comments on the rezoning for of a residential neighborhood for a commercial heliport were not given "much consideration"?

By making back-room deals with any business entity that walks in the manager's door while treating the general public as if their comments do not matter?

By spending thousands to "justify" a poor decision with a meaningless report?

By thinking that a measurement of decibels has anything to do with the constant intrusion that a heliport represents over others living within a neighborhood?

The Borough would be just as wise to do a decibel study on a tent full of mosquitoes, rather than ask those in the tent whether or not the mosquitoes were interfering with the peace and quiet of their lives.

Borough public officials need to take a giant step backwoods and remember the public that they have sworn to serve. Develop of system whereby folks can listen to each other and share ideas before plunging forward with plans that do not have community support.

It will take some practice, but we can do it..listen to each other and work together toward common goals and a healthy, sustainable community that serves all its residents.

Regards, Kathleen Menke

From: [lauren](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Comments on the Haines Noise Report
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:31:57 PM

Hello,

I have just read the results of the noise report and deem it somewhat irrelevant to the decision at hand; whether or not to grant SEABA permission to use their property as a heliport. Helicopters are loud, obnoxiously loud. This report hints at this when discussing the single noise events i.e. SEL and Lmax, but really misses the mark when using the DEL metrics to measure an average noise increase over a 24 hour period. You can not average a noise, especially a loud relatively short noise over a 24 hour period. It doesn't make sense to me and I consider the findings here a moot point, a very expensive moot point in my opinion. The numbers here are based on nine flights over 5 days. Even if one were to use the DEL metric system the results here do not indicate a normal day of flying for SEABA. I have heard, that at least 9 (that is the whole data set for a week used in this report) flights would leave and return to the SEABA property per day. The average or DNL is not only the wrong metrics to be using to determine if helicopters are annoying and disruptive, but the results were created based on low number of flights per day which is also does not accurately reflect what will occur here.

Another point I would like to note is we are using federal averages to as a baseline comparison however we, as residents of a small community in rural Alaska are in no way close to being comparable to federal regulations. It seems to me that most live here, especially out the highway, to be as far away from the normal standards of living especially to those living in the lower 48. I understand the federal averages are being used for lack of anything better, but do they accurately reflect the reality of living at 26 mile? I would not think so.

As a resident and property owner in the proposed heliport neighborhood, I do not want to be hearing a helicopters two months out of the year- a especially quiet and peaceful time of the year. Aside from myself and my neighborhood, I would strongly urge you to question whether this is a good move for our community as a whole. Granting things such as this heliport in our residential neighborhood will create hostile feelings towards our seasonal visitors. This I gaurentee. There are other places already in use as heli-ports that are not in the middle of neighborhoods. Why not use those? Would you permit this activity to happen in town? It is already louder there, perhaps no one would notice? I would guess not.

Thank you for your time and patience dealing with such a heated issue.
Lauren McPhun

From: [Nicholas Szatkowski](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#); [David Sosa](#); [jessica meadow](#)
Subject: Noise Report comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 4:56:42 PM
Attachments: [Szatkowski Noise Report Comments_26Jun2015.pdf](#)

Hello Haines Borough Administration-

I have included my comments as an attachment in the preferred pdf format. However, I have also copied the same comments into the text of this email below.

Thanks for reading them!

The only really meaningful things established by the report are that our neighborhood is normally extremely quiet, and that the helicopters are really loud. The report authors included lots of graphs and text that recalculate and refigure this basic information in ways that hide the basic facts.

Report's methodology invalid

The only metrics in the report which are relevant to our situation in planning Heliport sites in the Haines Borough are "single event metrics" because they are the only representation of the real volume of helicopters experienced in the neighborhood. Single event metrics (Lmax, and SEL) simply report actual recorded sound volume. Very simple, easy to understand, and provide accurate reflections of actual noise events. This is the only measurement of sound that is appropriate for comparing noise impacts of specific loud events in the context of a quieter background noise environment. The SEL graphs are mostly detailed in Appendix A. Sound Exposure Levels during the test period range from a (loud) low at the furthest test site of 69.5 dBA to a (painfully loud) high of 120.9 dBA at the nearest. (SELs combine the recorded Lmax with the duration of the sound event into a single metric, to offer a single number representing total noise impact of an event).

By contrast, "cumulative" (i.e., averaged) metrics become very convoluted. They involve sometimes complicated formulae which average the sound of a single event with other, unrelated sounds or background sound. Therefore, metrics such as LEQ (hourly averages) and DNL (daily averages) give a distorted view of actual noise events. For example, during one hour with background sound of 35 dBA, a helicopter might refuel, for 5-10 minutes, causing sound of 83 dBA. The LEQ would average these out, using a complicated formula, and end up with a number around 50-60 dBA. But the sound of the helicopter is not 55 dBA, it's actually 83 dBA. The metric called DNL is even further off-base in our particular situation, as it averages the helicopter sounds (which of course still occur at the same volume) with the quiet background sound level of the entire day and night, over 24 hours. This is why the report can say that at the adjacent property, the DNL was the very moderate sounding 51 dBA, even though the Lmax of the helicopter was consistently recorded at 82-87 dBA (SELs. This comparatively low number is not the result of the quietness of the helicopter, but rather the result of the quiet background noise level. In other words, the quieter the ambient noise of the neighborhood, the lower the DNL, even though the helicopter noise is just as loud as it is in a loud location. The DNL metric is therefore especially inappropriate for determining the impact of loud sounds within quiet environments, because quieter locations will have lower DNLs, falsely masking the true volume of the loud sound events. A 2011 FAA technical report contained the following caution, "**DNL has another major practical limitation. It doesn't work particularly well as a predictor of aircraft noise impacts.**"

http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/research/science_integrated_modeling/noise_impacts/media/6-14-2011_FinalReport_MetricsMestre_etal_061411_part1.pdf

Using DNL as its justification, the noise report is attempting to assert that if you take a very quiet place and add a very loud noise for a relatively short period of time, you get a moderately quiet place, when actually, what you get is a very quiet place with a very loud thing in it.

No matter how quiet it was when you got up and had breakfast, when the loud helicopter sound occurs, you experience it at its volume at that moment. In fact, the quieter the background is, the MORE disruptive loud sounds are, because they are so out of place, and they shatter the peace that otherwise prevails.

Additionally, even if DNL were to be used, it could only have any possible meaning if the number of helicopter landings during the test period were exactly the same as they would be in a real situation. SEABA landed at the site 9 times during the entire week of the noise test. And according to SEABA's own biweekly operations/skier day report, only the 4 landings on March 9th were actually transporting skiers to the mountains, reflecting actual conditions of a real heliski operations base. In regular operations that number could easily be 90 landings or even more (2 helis per day, all day, times 7 days). So the average sound (DNL) would be enormously higher. But of course we don't have that actual number. Therefore the Noise Study's data set isn't reflective of the very thing it was supposed to measure. Again, **all averaged metrics (LEQs and DNLs) in the report are invalid, because they aren't based on conditions equivalent to real operations at the site, but rather on a minimized sample of helicopter traffic.**

Also, the study's recording of actual sound measurements was skewed for the following reasons:

-all of SEABA's flights using the 26-mile helipad skimmed the treetops on approach and departure, without even attempting to reach the elevations (minimum 1500' AGL in all cases, and 2640' AGL above valley floors) required under their existing Borough permit. Their failure to abide by this requirement was reported to the Borough multiple times, and the administration labeled the reports as "unsubstantiated allegations" even though the GPS data showed the citizen reports to be accurate. Flying in this manner very significantly changed that sound signature of the helicopters during the noise test period, so that only the Corona property (adjacent to SEABA) experienced sound levels that would occur if the helicopters flew in accordance with the requirements of the tour permit.

This means that only the data recorded at that location ("home by helipad") has relatively accurate readings. (We don't know if the noise recording equipment was located inside or outside the Corona cabin, which would make an obvious difference in recorded noise levels. If the decibel recorder was actually inside the cabin, then even those data are invalidly decreased, because property rights apply at owners' property lines, not just inside our homes or cabins). **This is yet another reason the results of the study do not reflect the actuality of lawful, regular operations of a commercial heliport at the site.**

-The FAA uses a very specific metric for measuring helicopter sounds, called Effective Perceived Noise Level (EPNL). The study didn't use this metric approved and used by the FAA. The report authors not only failed to explain why, but they also failed to even mention knowledge of EPNLs.

-the entire study used ONLY the "A-weighted" decibel scale, rather than recording the actual volumes as raw data. The A-weighted system is a curve that subtracts more and more from actual recorded dB as frequency decreases. From very low frequencies, as much as 50dB would be subtracted from the actual dB level that truly occurred (see page 9 of the report). This weighting scale was created to attempt to emphasize sounds in the mid-frequency range that are more clearly heard by most people. But it distorts the actual record of the true volume of sound pressure. The report states that "most community noise analyses are based upon the A-weighted decibel scale". However, it is not appropriate for measuring low-frequency sound emitters, such as helicopters. A thorough, professional account of A-weighting scales would acknowledge that, in fact, there has been much questioning and criticism of A-weighting for measuring sources of low-frequency sounds such as those emitted by helicopters. The contract required Mead and Hunt to provide raw-data for helicopter noise measurements. They failed to meet this term of their contract, and only included the A-weighted numbers.

Conclusions Invalid and Unprofessional

The report falsely claims that the only standard available for comparison is the FAA's promotion of 65 dBA as a threshold for areas surrounding urban airports. This contention is wildly inaccurate, and undermines the credibility of the report

Even in urban Anchorage, noise regulations do not allow noise levels above 60 dB from crossing property lines in residential areas. (Because of the logarithmic nature of the decibel scale, 70 dB is 10 times higher than 60 dB. **80 dB is 100 times the sound pressure as 60 dB**). **Allowing a heliport at this site would be imposing noise onto neighboring properties that is 100's of times louder than would be allowed in urban Anchorage.**

*The WHO recommends the following guidelines, recognizing the following related health concerns:

For outdoor living areas, a 55 dB noise level will result in "serious annoyance". 50 dB will result in "moderate annoyance," daytime and evening.

For indoor dwellings, for speech intelligibility, noise levels should not exceed 35 dB.

For sleep disturbance, 30 dB background; 45 dB is expected to wake, or otherwise disturb, a sleeping person.

In outdoor parklands and conservation areas, "existing quiet outdoor areas should be preserved and the ratio of intruding noise to natural background sound should be kept low."

..."For indoor environments, reverberation time is also an important factor. If the noise includes a large proportion of low frequency components, still lower guideline values should be applied."

The Haines Noise Report neighborhood ambient noise measurements show an extremely quiet background noise level, between 16 and 29 decibels. That's quieter than any category they have in their charts. Quieter than "Wilderness Residential," at 35 decibels, vastly quieter than 51 dB "Wooded Residential," which they attempt to characterize this neighborhood as being, and dramatically quieter than the 65 dBA level that is being proposed as a standard for our neighborhood. The report authors suggest that a drastic elevation in neighborhood decibel levels is appropriate, without any supporting evidence whatsoever for why this is acceptable on a social or municipal planning level. The Federal Noise Control Act of 1972 recognizes detrimental impacts of increasing neighborhood noise, and says that an increase of 20 dB "*will result in widespread, vigorous public opposition.*"

Even with the dampening effects of A-weighting, the maximum noise levels measured during the study period ranged from 77.4 to 104.3 dBA at the four sites. All of these noise levels are above reference ranges for residential noise standards, standards preserving healthy hearing, and national and international standards protecting public health. (See Anchorage municipal codes, EPA Noise Control Act of 1972, and World Health Organization Guidelines for Community Noise.)

The Haines Noise Report concludes with a DNL metric, (mis)calculated by *averaging the excessively loud helicopter noise events with the extremely low ambient noise levels*. The study failed to use EPNLs, and the report fails even to acknowledge existence of this metric, the FAA's preferred and best metric for measuring helicopter sounds. The report's authors admit that they failed to use the FAA's Integrated Noise Modeling, which was another requirement of the contract they signed and were paid for. This model is the method used and approved by the FAA by which to arrive at a DNL. Nonetheless, having failed to use the modeling system approved by the FAA, Mead and Hunt make assertions about the expected noise levels in the neighborhood, at surrounding properties. However, they are using a sample time period during which SEABA was flying unlawfully, hiding their "cone of sound" from the noise monitoring stations. They are also using a preposterously small number of flight events to arrive at their DNL.

The Haines Borough was warned not to waste our public funds to pay an outside consultant for something that does not return meaningful value to the public. Measurements of ambient background versus helicopter sound levels could have been obtained for a small fraction of the price paid to Mead and Hunt. Most of the expense went to their analysis and production of a "cooked-book" report which appears to be using obfuscatory jargon and graphs to make it look like a very loud sound is somehow, impossibly, rather quiet. I wonder who in our Borough might have suggested that angle to Mead and Hunt.

sincerely,
Nicholas Szatkowski
26-mile
Chilkat Valley, Alaska

From: [Nancy Berland](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Noise study comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 9:09:09 AM
Attachments: [NBHeliNoiseComments.doc](#)
[Effects of Airport Noise on Housing Value.doc](#)

Julie, please accept these comments.

Thanks.

Nancy

In looking over the Noise Study and looking at the cited FAR Part 150, it's apparent that the contractor used a methodology designed for different circumstances. Basically the Noise Study concluded that the DNL measured at 4 Haines sites met the FAR Part 150 acceptable noise "standard" for residential areas near airports, with a DNL less than 65 dBA.

That FAR Part 150 applies to **existing airports** is extremely clear: it "is the primary Federal regulation guiding and controlling planning for aviation noise compatibility **on and around airports.**" (Emphasis added.) The 26 Mile site is not an airport. Airports have more than 9 noise events over a 7-day period. All the fancy colored charts, graphs and tables generated by these 9 noise events and presented in the Haines study have no context, and are absolutely meaningless.

DNL is the average sound pressure level in A-weighted decibels for an average day of the year. According to FAR Part 150, this methodology works for assessing airport noise because it takes into account the effects of intensity, duration, frequency, and time of occurrence of aviation noise events, as measured against the background noise of the area. This average is used to determine compatibility at existing airports operating 365 days per year, and often 24 hours a day. Obviously there are many aviation noise events to be averaged at airports, and this is a way of ascertaining how much additional noise is created by the airport. However, the DNL for the Haines study includes only 9 noise events, that lasted a maximum total of 38 minutes (at the non-helipad sites) over a 7 day period. The impact of these 9 events becomes totally diluted in the calculated DNL by the low background noise levels at these sites for the rest of the 144 hours of the study. In other words, the DNL calculated for these sites consists of 99.66% background noise and .44% helicopter noise. What the charts and graphs really show is that this is a quiet, rural residential neighborhood that will be greatly impacted by allowing a heliport there.

Of more significance is the information (Figure 2-2) that an increase of 10 dB is humanly perceived as being twice as loud, an increase of 20 dB is perceived as 4 times as loud, an increase of 30 dB is perceived as 8 times as loud, an increase of 40 dB is perceived as 16 times as loud and an increase of 50 dB is perceived as 32 times as loud, and so on. Table 4-1 shows ambient noise levels are between 17 and 30 dBA 90% of the time, with noise events ranging from 77 to 94 dBA at non-heliport sites. This means a person at one of these three measured sites would hear an increase from 47 to 77 dB from normal background noise, per event. Using the information presented, this means a resident would experience noise events that were between 16 and 128 times as loud as normal. To say the least, this would be disruptive in the extreme. This certainly could be considered a "taking" of a person's right to the quiet enjoyment of their property. (Attached please find information regarding how property values decline near airports.) In this regard there is ample literature available (from the US Forest Service and even NASA) concerning the "annoyance" component of helicopter generated noise, and ample information regarding health impacts such as increased stress levels. Unfortunately, none of this information made it into the Noise Study.

FAR Part 150 explains the purpose of a Noise Exposure Map, which requires identifying present and future noise patterns. This is obviously important for airport planning. While 9 events does not create a pattern, the concept that there may be significantly more than 9 events per each 7 day period in the future is neither considered nor analyzed in the Haines report.

It must be said that DNL methodology used in this report could be used to justify citing a heliport just about anywhere in the Borough, perhaps even next door to where you live. Municipalities confine aviation noise to one or two airports for a reason. The three existing heliports are already excessive considering the amount of helicopter use.

The Haines Noise Study is further deficient in that it does not state if the events measured occurred underneath flight paths, which would affect the amount of noise recorded at each site. Also Nicholas mentioned in the CVN that the flight logs (not available on the Borough web site) indicated the helicopters were flying at 200 feet AGL. If this is indeed the case, 14 CFR Part 135 was violated, as it requires a 300 foot minimum AGL.

The Haines Borough has wasted an incredible amount of time, energy, and money on this issue. The Planning Commission decision to deny a permit should be upheld.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Nancy Berland

AVIATION NOISE LAW

Airport Noise and Residential Property Value

Effects of Airport Noise on Housing Value

In 1994 the consulting firm of Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc. prepared a report titled *The Effect of Airport Noise on Housing Values: A Summary Report for the Federal Aviation Administration*. The report describes a methodology for evaluating the impact of noise on housing values. The methodology essentially compares market prices in similar neighborhoods that differ only in the level of airport-related noise. In pilot studies using this method, Booz-Allen found that the effect of noise on prices was highest in moderately priced and expensive neighborhoods. In two paired moderately priced neighborhoods north of Los Angeles International Airport, the study found "an average 18.6 percent higher property value in the quiet neighborhood, or 1.33 percent per dB of additional quiet." (See Bibliography: Impacts of Noise on Property Value.)

A 1996 study funded by the Legislature of the State of Washington used a somewhat similar methodology and found that the proposed expansion of Seattle-Tacoma Airport would cost five nearby cities \$500 million in property values and \$22 million in real-estate tax revenue. The study of single-family homes -- all in "very good" condition, with three or more bedrooms and two or more baths, and excluding the most expensive and inexpensive units to provide more representative comparisons -- found that "a housing unit in the immediate vicinity of the airport would sell for 10.1 percent more -- if it were located elsewhere."

The Washington study also concluded: "all other things remaining equal, the value of a house and lot increases by about 3.4% for every quarter of a mile the house is farther away from being directly underneath the flight track of departing/approaching jet aircraft." (Details can be found in Sections 9.01 - 9.07 of the study.)

In 1997 Randall Bell, MAI, Certified General Real Estate Appraiser, licensed real estate broker, and instructor for the Appraisal Institute, provided the results of his own professional analysis to the Orange County Board of Supervisors. Comparing sales of 190 comparable properties over six months in communities near Los Angeles International Airport, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario Airport, Bell found a diminution in value due to airport proximity averaging 27.4 percent. (See the full report.) Bell has also developed a list of over 200 conditions that impact real estate values -- airport proximity is categorized as a "detrimental condition."

Disclosure of Airport Noise to Buyers

California law requires sellers to reveal noise and other nuisance factors in a Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement prior to sale, permitting prospective buyers to look elsewhere or to lower their offers.

As of January 1, 2004, residential property owners in California are required, under certain circumstances, to disclose to prospective buyers that the property is in the "vicinity" of an airport (Assembly Bill 2776, 2002). (See AB 2776.)

Avigation Easements

Airports can acquire avigation easements in the airspace over neighboring properties in order to (1) prevent construction of buildings and towers, planting of trees, installation of lighting, or any other development that might interfere with aircraft takeoff and landing, or (2) protect against liability for any nuisance caused by airplanes using the airport, i.e., the impact of noise, fumes, and vibration on the "use and enjoyment" of properties under the flight paths to and from the airport. The former is a type of "hazard easement" while the latter is a type of "nuisance easement" but in practice both are called avigation easements. The two types are not typically combined in one legal document, although they may be.

Airports rarely take the trouble to acquire nuisance avigation easements by initiating condemnation proceedings. The nuisance easements are sometimes imposed on new developments near an airport, but only if the airport owner (a city or county) also has jurisdiction over the land surrounding the airport. An airport may also require a nuisance avigation easement as a condition for installing insulation against noise in homes and schools. When sued for nuisance by neighboring landowners, airports assert that they have a prescriptive avigation easement over the plaintiff's land and therefore are not liable for any nuisance due to aircraft noise, fumes, or vibration. In theory a prescriptive avigation easement is acquired by simply flying over the property for a number of years (the number set by state law to perfect a claim for adverse possession). However, only California courts have come close to recognizing avigation easements acquired by prescription (see link below to discussion of prescriptive avigation easements).

If the provisions of the easement are written broadly, the easement could preclude the property owner from successfully suing the airport for maintaining a nuisance (such as noise, air pollution, or airport lighting). For example, the easement might contain language that grants the airport the right to create noise, dust, vibration, fumes, etc. from aircraft presently using the airport as well as any future aircraft at the airport. If at the time the easement was granted the airport was used only by small, propeller-driven planes, but now a variety of helicopters fly in and out of the airport, the property owner would have difficulty arguing that the airport had exceeded its rights under the easement.

Avigation easements are recorded in the county recorder's office and show up in a title search. Like most easements, they are binding on any future owners of the property. See the following:

California Public Utilities Code section 21652 (statutory authority for avigation easements)

Sample avigation easements: California sample, FAA model

Prescriptive Avigation Easements

"Avigation Easements, and Lawsuits for Inverse Condemnation and for Nuisance" by
Ronald D. Steinbach, Attorney at Law (California)

[Revised Nov. 13, 2004]

From: [Sally Boisvert](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#); [David Sosa](#)
Subject: Our comments on the recently published Noise Measurement Study
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2015 10:20:40 PM
Attachments: [Noise Study Comments Rafe and Sally.docx](#)

Hello Julie and David,

I hope you are well.

Please find attached the comments that Rafe and I wish to submit in regards to the recent Noise Measurement Study.

Julie, could you confirm receipt when you get our comments tomorrow? Thank you!

-Sally and Rafe

Sally Boisvert & Raphael McGuire
P.O. Box 578
Haines, AK 99827
(907) 767-5515

June 25, 2015

Hullo,

We are writing to share our opinion on the recently published helicopter noise report. It appears to us the most relevant part of the study was the measurement of how loud it was during the moments a helicopter was passing, which was extremely loud. The report indicated that averaged over an entire day, it wasn't that loud, at least not compared to a neighborhood near a commercial jetport. This is entirely irrelevant. How disruptive something is should be measured while it is occurring, not over an arbitrary extended time frame.

We have both worked around helicopters and it is distinctly obvious that they are incredibly loud and disruptive. This study measured the noise of a small number of flights and compared it to an average lower 48 neighborhood, whereas the reality is a very quiet and peaceful remote rural neighborhood being overrun by a much higher daily number of flights. Furthermore, the noise of a helicopter depends partly on how it is operated. Since the company operating the flights during this study has a strong interest in the outcome, they presumably flew to minimize noise, low to the trees and gently on the throttle. Normal operations could be substantially louder.

Helicopters are loud, too loud for a wooded residential neighborhood. The people who live near the proposed heliport say they think it is too loud. There are already several operating heliports nearby. This heliport in the 26 mile neighborhood should not be permitted. Nor should heli-ports be permitted in the nearby Moose Valley where we, and many other families reside.

We believe it would be in everyone's (i.e. the Haines Borough, the helicopter skiing industry, and local taxpayers) best interest to strategically locate heliports away from residents' homes; in so doing, the Haines Borough could continue to promote the successful helicopter-skiing industry, while the people of Haines who work in other local industries can continue to enjoy the places we reside year-round, and continue to be welcoming to winter ski tourists. Visitors often remark on how friendly and welcoming our small town is. Let's keep it that way by locating heli-ports away from the homes of the locals, who will then feel more inclined to continue to make heli-ski tourists feel welcome and invited.

Respectfully,

Rafe McGuire &

Sally Boisvert

P.O. Box 578

Haines, AK 99827

From: [Sally McGuire](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: Fwd: Helicopter noise assessment comments
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 7:13:45 AM

Hi Julie, could you please post this with the other helicopter noise report comments? thanks, Sally

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sally McGuire** <chilkootmcguire@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 26, 2015 at 7:11 AM
Subject: Helicopter noise assessment comments
To: Sally McGuire <chilkootmcguire@gmail.com>

I have read the helicopter noise assessment. I must say I was surprised by the poor quality of the work- I would have expected better research from a college freshman (and especially considering what we paid for it). It also reads like it was written by an apologist for the wind industry.

To site something as noisy and disruptive as a heliport in a residential neighborhood is an example of exceptionally poor planning, bound to create serious problems. The point of any kind of zoning is to ensure neighborhood homogeneity and consequently peaceful coexistence. Those citizens of Haines who support heliskiing must have noticed by now that the people who have to live with it don't get used to it and they don't stop being angry about it. Those problems won't go away until the heliskiing industry is required to operate away from people's homes. Haines has endured many years of disruption and disintegration of community from this. Allowing SEABA to site their heliport in a small, formerly quiet, rural community will ensure that the problem continues.

The citizens of Haines who live up the highway do so because they value peace and quiet and are willing to pay for it (just driving back and forth to work costs a lot). They are well aware of the hypocrisy of their being forced to live in a helicopter landing zone, while downtown residents are protected from even as much as a crowing rooster.

Incidentally, the way the noise report should have been conducted would have been to send someone around to ask the neighbors what they think. Then you pool and weight responses from people who live close to the facility or under the flightpath. You put those who live a mile away into another pool, and so on. Any averaging that is done, if you want to average, should be only within each pool. Using averages to prove that an extremely loud noise is actually nice and quiet is a fine example of how to lie with statistics.

As far as I can see, the only point of spending forty grand of our money on this "noise assessment" study was to prove that the opinions of the people who live up there don't matter.

Sally McGuire

From: [David Sosa](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Subject: FW: comments for noise study
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:43:32 PM
Attachments: [CommentsforNoiseStudyatBSVproperty 6 26 2015.docx](#)

From: Sunny Sundberg [mailto:sunny@seaba-heli.com]
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:33 PM
To: David Sosa
Subject: comments for noise study

[David see attached.](#)
Thank you

[Scott](#)
Scott Sundberg
GM / Guide
SEABA LLC
www.seaba-heli.com
907 314 0445

To: Dave Sosa
Borough Manager

I would like to say that when asked for public comment on the study it was difficult to decide what to comment on. The study was done through empirical methods, it was meant to be objective and without the subjective content that has made this CUP so difficult to interpret. I think the last paragraph of the study below sums up the considerations of this study:

“As stated above, the three sites outside the helipad ranged from 30-51 DNL. Typical noise measurements at an average “wooded residential” land use is generally around 51 DNL. This means that the measured average noise level at the three sites fairly closely matches, or is quieter than what would be expected in wooded residential or quieter land use types. However, it is important to note that these comparisons do not link to any specific noise standard or regulation, but rather give a generalized comparison between what is typical in similar land uses and the results measured during this Study”.

Also, after reading through it a couple of times, it dawned on me that the noise levels that are near or close to light commercial noise determined by the study only would affect 5% of residences out in the 26 mile area. In effect information stating otherwise was not present.

Context number 1:

This area is zoned generally allowed use, which encompasses about every imaginable use from private residential, to commercial and even heavy industrial. The report says that during this testing and information gathering period that the dnl levels stayed very close to what one might experience in a wooded residential area. This is stated as 30-51 DNL.

In this context the DNL levels could be much higher and still be compatible with all the allowed land uses in this area.

In the chart that they use to compare noise in figure 2-2 they group these same decibel levels, 30-51 as quiet.

Context number 2:

The Lmax time duration of the events is limited to when the heli is going to take off and land. In the appendixes you can look at each event and determined that the average amount of noise generated at the location averaged around 4 minutes and 45 seconds, the LMAX averages total 85 seconds per occurrence. 75% of the remaining noise is 90% lower.

If you had a rock crusher or a sawmill running at this site,(both do not need a permit under current zoning) which at the industrial scale both generate peak noise over 110 decibels, with an average length of time for peak noise could be 6 plus hours a day.

A helicopter landing and taking off 20 times a day would have a LMax duration of 1700 seconds or 30 minutes over the course of the working day. This would account for only 10 percent of the industrial noise generated by a permitted activity like a rock crusher or sawmill.

Comparatively one could conclude that the allowed uses are much more intrusive, probably do create a level of undo noise, and generate a more continuous LMAX and SEL levels. So why is this activity supposedly given so much attention? Why are we even discussing this issue.

Context 3:

In everyday life through the borough, along highways, and in the commercial and residential areas of the borough, sound is generated from 7 in the morning to 11 at night in some circumstances.

Turner Construction operates a CUP gravel pit at the top of 4th street next to residences. Large equipment cut into the hillslopes above the residences, load trucks with gravel, and then proceed down the hill through the residential area to deliver their product to customers.

In terms of noise there are probably similar if not higher noise levels involved with this activity. It also would qualify that unlike the 4th street gravel pit, helicopters noise moves away from all residences over public lands identified near the test site, over lands allocated as resource development and multi purpose recreation. This includes recreation machinery that delivers high levels of noise. This happens both in personal recreation, as well as commercial operations. Noise is part of everyday life in economy and in enjoyment. For true quiet one must retreat to wilderness, and even then a International jet can disturb the solace.

My other thoughts after giving certain scenarios demonstrating realities associated with this topic, I want to mention a few things about the environment of the study.

Haines and specifically 26 mile had a very light snow year. This affected a few crucial aspects that were not in the study.

1. As a result of the low snow levels, SEABA was forced to cancel it snowcat tours which leave from the immediate study area. In 2014 we did 28 cats ski trips. An abundant amount of ambient or background noise was left out of this study because of this. Noise not captured that normally would exist would include snow plow rigs both for state and private roads near the study area, private vehicles using BSV and SEABA roads to get to the activity, the startup and shutdown of the SEABA snow cat which is a diesel tractor that needs to warm up and cool down every time it departs for the excursion.
2. We also have snow mobile tours that leave from this area that were not facilitated because of low vegetation cover as well. We had enough snow to move the machine on the snow, but because of the lack of deep snow our rental business and general activity was down 80%. Most rental occur with deep snows that the riders are targeting.

This noise study identifies that while there is noise, it is no greater than what has been and is accepted throughout communities including ours, noting the example of the 4th street in commercial and more importantly in line with residential areas.

Without a doubt I feel that this study demonstrates that this is a compatible use for this area, giving the current zoning, and the relatively infrequent amount of noise that it will contribute to the area.

Finally the other comment is that noise is apart of any economy, and this zoning within in the borough was specifically left open for private landholders had options to do what they want. Under consolidation this was requested and lobbied for during consolidation by the people who owned property outside of the town site.

When the borough assembly added the requirement to get a CUP from the Planning and Zoning, under title 5, if a person wanted to develop a heliport, it errored by not allowing the

exclusion of Generally allowed uses. This study shows that if the proposed development of a heliport was in a residential or commercially zoned area, then the validity of getting a CUP has merit.

I believe an easy fix for the borough is to remove this condition from ordinance from title 5, and put into title 18 under the appropriate zoning.

Thank you for your time.

Scott Sundberg

From: [Thom Ely](#)
To: [Julie Cozzi](#)
Cc: [David Sosa](#); [Lynn Canal Conservation](#); [Chilkat Valley News](#); [AORC Board](#)
Subject: Helicopter Noise Study - Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 6:55:34 AM

Dear Haines Borough,

The results of the Helicopter Noise Study at the 26 mile residential area came out exactly as predicted. Helicopters make noise at a level that bothers some people and not others.

The fault in the study is that the flight path and elevation of the helicopter was not regulated or monitored. In addition, nine flights is an extremely low sample. The noise monitoring stations were set up, but no official was there to tell the pilot where and at what elevation to fly. This lack of data parameters and scientific analysis renders the study useless.

In addition weather data for the days that the monitors were in place was not collected or factored in. Wind direction and velocity affect the soundscape. The microphones had wind shields on them but this has no relation to how the rotor noise is affected by the wind.

The 70 DNL standard used for comparison in a wooded residential area is also subjective. Most people living in the Chilkat Valley want peace and quiet at home. This local standard may be 25 DNL. That is why there are noise ordinances in residential areas. Dogs barking, heavy equipment working, chainsaws and helicopters are all considered a nuisance and annoyance.

The fact of the matter is that heliports do not belong in residential areas. If approved, as an adjacent property owner I would pursue legal action and monetary compensation from the Haines Borough. All commercial aviation needs to take off and land at at the Haines Airport.

Sincerely,

Thom Ely
POB 1014
Haines, AK 99827