| Folder | Commenter | Contact Email | Contact Address | Comment | Tally | | | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Retain PWC Ban | Repeal PWC Ban | Other | |
| 1 | Friends of Kachemak Bay State Park | mako haggerty <mako@xyz.net> | 95 Sterling Highway, Suite 2, Homer, Alaska 99603 | Dear Mr.Green<br>Friends of Kachemak Bay State Park opposes the lifting of the Personal Water Craft (PWC) ban in Kachemak Bay.<br>We have heard arguments for and against PWCs for the last 20 years and there has been no new information that has changed our view that PWCs disturb wildlife and upset the general Park experience.<br>We understand that you have received many letters and emails in strong opposition to the lifting of the ban. There is little more that we can add.<br>Please register our voices in the "NO" column.<br><br>Respectfully,<br>Mako Haggerty, chair<br><br>Friends of Kachemak Bay State Park is a local non-profit whose mission includes educating Park visitors and supporting Park volunteers. Our current membership stands at 107. | 1 | | | organization |
| 1 | Audubon Alaska | Culliney, Susan <Susan.Culliney@audubon.org> | Audubon Alaska 431 W. 7th Ave. Anchorage, AK 99501 | See message: Audubon Alaska comments on proposed repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC1 | 1 | | | organization |
| 1 | Center for Alaskan Coastal Studies | Elizabeth Trowbridge <swertia82@gmail.com>, beth@akcoastalstudies.org | 708 Smokey Bay Way, Homer, Alaska 99603 | January 21, 2020<br>To: Commissioner Doug Vincent-Lang, Alaska Department of Fish and Game<br>Cc: Rick Green, Alaska Department of Fish and Game<br>On behalf of the Center for Alaskan Coastal Studies (CACS), I am writing in opposition to any change to 5 AAC 95.310, with regards to the prohibition of the use of personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas (CHA). We strongly oppose any change that would allow personal watercraft use and management in this critically important habitat for marine life.<br>CACS is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting marine and coastal education and stewardship of Kachemak Bay through place-based ecology education. We were formed in 1982 because of the recognition of our unique and special environment and the need to educate about and stewards this amazing habitat. Our mission is to foster responsible interactions with our natural surroundings and to generate knowledge about the coastal and marine ecosystems of Kachemak Bay through science-based environmental education and stewardship. We believe the conservation of our coastal marine habitat allows people to enjoy a sustainable lifestyle based on a healthy ocean.<br>CACS educational and citizen science programs are designed to provide highly effective experiential education opportunities and model environmental stewardship. They are designed to engage people of all ages and use appropriate methods of delivery aimed at increasing our understanding about the necessity and means to sustain the health and productivity of local environments. Many of our programs provide the opportunity to participate directly in stewardship activities. We host over 1,000 elementary aged students for a 2 night, 3 day Alaska Coastal Ecology program at our Peterson Bay Field Station each year, and have been doing this since 1982. The noise and disruption of habitat that the use of PWCs in this area (and other areas of Kachemak Bay) would be detrimental to the quality of the educational outdoor experience for these students. Many activities involve making a personal connection to the environment as well as time out exploring the tidepools. During the summer we host college groups, youth for residential camps and visitors to Homer and Kachemak Bay. These participants are seeking special outdoor experiences. Having PWC use irt the bay would reduce the number of birds and marine life that could be seen, and would add unnecessary noise to an area that is known for peacefulness and quietness.<br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PW C's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review bv ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts | 1 | | | organization |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Kris Holderied | Kris Holderied <kholderied@gmail.com> | | I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed change by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) to 5 AAC 95.310, dealing with the prohibition of the use of personal watercraft in the Fox River and Kachemak Bay state-designated Critical Habitat Areas. As a resident of Homer, AK in the Kachemak Bay region, I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposal by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) to repeal the regulation because use of personal water craft is incompatible with the purpose of these critical habitat areas to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife.<br><br>I have had the opportunity in the past year to review updates to the state management plans for the Fox River and Kachemak Bay CHAs (ADFG) and the Kachemak Bay State Park, including policies on use of personal water craft. While the proposed CHA management plan does not have a policy for personal water craft use (since personal water craft use was prohibited in the critical habitat areas under 5 AAC 95.310), the issue received a lot of attention because of the importance of personal water craft use and impacts to multiple public users. Based on concerns for the potential of PWC traffic to decrease populations of fish, wildlife and birds, I agree with the recommendation to maintain regulations under 5 AAC 95.310 and continue to prohibit use of PWCs in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>My primary concern is that personal water craft traffic is more likely to routinely and repeatedly occur in nearshore and shallow waters than other small boat traffic, because of the shallow draft and nature of personal water craft use. The Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas have extensive nearshore areas which support high concentrations of marine mammals, fish, seabirds, shorebirds and waterfowl. This creates the potential for increased, adverse impacts on multiple marine species within the critical habitat areas from personal water craft traffic, particularly if water craft are operated for extended periods of time in one area.<br><br>I also recognize that the ability to evaluate potential impacts from personal water craft use is limited by the lack of information on how these water craft may be used in the critical habitat areas, since their use has been limited in the bay since 2001 under 5 AAC 95.310. A survey of personal water craft users and industry to gain information on potential uses within Kachemak Bay is one way that ADFG could obtain information needed to evaluate trade-offs between public recreation access with personal water craft and adverse impacts to fish, wildlife and bird populations that the critical habitat areas were designated to protect. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Laurie Daniel | Laurie Daniel <lauriedanieltnc@hotmail.com> | PO Box 3713<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Dear Commissioner Vincent-Lang, January 21, 2020<br><br>I submit these comments in opposition to the Dunleavy administration interest to repeal the ban on personal watercraft (PWC aka jet skis) in Kachemak Bay. As you well know, ADF&G established the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas (CHA) in 1974 (AS 16.20.590) and 1972 (AS 16.20.580), respectively. The purpose of these CHAs is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose". To that end, and after extensive public involvement, in 2001 the state enacted and has since then repeatedly upheld (2011, 2016-17) the ban on PWC in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHAs.<br><br>The science (observations, studies and published literature) clearly indicate that the use of PWCs in these waters is inappropriate and risks damaging the protected coastal habitat and therefore their use is not compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHAs. This includes a 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and the opinion of ADF&G's staff experts. Further, in 2017, ADF&G concluded in a written memo: "In summary, based on our review of information available since the PWC prohibition was adopted in 2001, we feel there is no new information that would warrant rescinding the prohibition, and in fact the newer information highlights most of the concerns identified when the prohibition was adopted." (emphasis added).<br><br>The clearly evident special interest in this action by Gov Dunleavy flies in the face of governing public resources through the accepted and expected public process we rely on to manage our state. There appears no documentation of consultation with the biologists and management staff who are in the best position to evaluate the impact of, and disturbance from, PWCs on the habitats, fish and wildlife that occur within the CHAs and for whom these protected areas were established.<br><br>The unique natural and ecological values of Kachemak Bay draws many thousands of tourists, as well as other Alaskans, to visit the area, which significantly drives the local economy. Alaskans have strongly and publicly supported the ban, both when it was established and again when it's been under review. It is simply bad governance, and very apathetic, to single-handedly try to reverse decades of work that protects commonly-held natural resources for the benefit of all to instead benefit a small special interest group that would damage those resources in practicing their recreational activity. That group, the Personal | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Parker Martyn | Parker Martyn <parker.martyn@gmail.com> | Bear Cove Property Owner<br>1102 Richard Berry Dr.<br>Fairbanks, AK 99709 | As a property owner in the Kachemak Bay area I am distressed that the State of Alaska is considering opening the bay to use of jet skis. I would like to be put on record that this is not something I favor, and I am very opposed to it. Jet skis are very noisy and disruptive, and because they travel at fast speeds I believe they could increase disturbance and harm to sea life, such as fish, otters, whales, and water fowl, all of which are already being disrupted by routine water craft such as skiffs, fishing boats, water taxis, and other marine vessels. Please do not allow jet ski use in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lois and Marc Simenson | Lois Simenson <simenson64@gmail.com> | Peterson Bay, Alaska | We are property owners in Peterson Bay, next to the Coastal Studies Field Station. We've lived on this beach property for the past 25 years.<br><br>We are opposed to lifting the ban on jetskis in a Critical Estuarine Habitat that is supposed to protect the marine ecosystem and marine life in the Bay.<br><br>Jetskis would have an adverse, negative impact on sea otters, which are already in decline, as well as the humpback whales that migrate each year to feed in the Bay. Jetskis make it easier to harass wildlife with their loud maneuverability and seabirds around Gull Rock would be negatively affected.<br><br>The people who want this ban lifted are those who will profit from the sale and rental of jetskis. There are enough water bodies in Alaska permitting jetskis. Please don't sacrifice this fragile, ecologically sensitive area, so vital to so many.<br><br>Marine life numbers have been in decline for the past 20 years in the Bay. We've witnessed this population decline. Jetskis will accelerate this decline. The noise will annoy those of us who live near the water, especially during the night in summer.<br><br>Please do not lift the ban on jetskis. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Harry W. James | welshman@acsalaska.net | | I find it hard to believe that there is a proposal to remove this ban on Katchemak Bay. Right off the top is the negative impact on a visitors experience that an encounter with a jet ski brings. I have spent all my life in and around the water (except when on deployment) and I have lots of personal experience with this, none of it positive. Katchemak Bay is a unique and wonderful place both visually and ecologically. Jet skis are not a fit with either of those. If there were vast restrictions to Jet Ski use in the state there might be an argument here but apparently K Bay is the only closed area in the state. I can see no argument that would justify removing the ban.<br><br>For those on the cc to this message, I am a registered Republican and I vote every election.<br><br>I am unalterably opposed to the removal of the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Tabb | asrllc@ak.net | | I Repeal of PWC Ban in Kachemak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Captain Tabb Thoms | akplow@gmail.com | 6100 Cordova Street Anchorage, AK 99518 | I am a life long Alaskan, Master ship Captain with generations of my families living here since homesteading in Homer years before Alaska statehood.<br>This is to support the repeal on the ban of PWCs or motor vessels in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>1. Current Personal Water Crafts (PWC) are certified as “Motor Vessels” by the USA and State of Alaska and are actually cleaner and quieter than a majority of the vessels that currently operate in the bay.<br>2. To assist in economic vitality, individuals who purchase PWCs may have higher disposable incomes than many of the regional operators.<br>3. Statistics on PWC owners indicate that they are better educated, more environmentally and ecologically aware, as well as more respectful of the marine wilderness than many boat owners including those who operate legally in Kachemak Bay.<br>4. It is discriminatory to enforce a law where USA abiding citizen cannot enter the port of Homer on their legal registered “Motor Vessel” if they are sitting on it instead of in it!<br>5. The Homer spit sunk during the 64 earthquake and US Federal funds were utilized to rebuild our way back from that day.<br>a. There is NO sign at the top of Homer hill that states NO “Motor Cycles” allowed to enter Homer if “sitting” on their motor vehicle. (if so, Federal funds would be cut off)<br>b. However this current law is stopping “Motor Vessels” from entering or leaving on its Federally funded water ways that are needed to enter or depart Homer harbor<br>6. A few ignorant individuals who held authority to promote their personal and hidden objectives without scientific research is what should be banned<br>7. Homer “Where the Land ends and the Sea begins” unless of coarse your sitting on your Motor Vessel?<br>8. This repeal should not be confused with allowing illegals to enter the port of Homer, but rather allow those that actually live here access to where the Sea begins.<br>9. The current law is not taking into account the navigable waters of the Bay<br>10. If there is concerns of Illegal activity or harm that will be allowed then these areas of activity or harm should be addressed individually, instead of stopping ALL activity. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Jeanne Roche | Jr_Roche@horizonsatellite.com <jr_roche@horizonsatellite.com> | 4930 Elmers Way Homer, AK 99603 | I am very strongly opposed to the attempted repealing the Jet ski ban in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas (CHAs). There are good scientific reasons why jet skis (also known as personal watercraft, PWC) have been banned from the CHAs. Obviously, these areas are called "critical habitats" because they need special protection. And, all continuing scientific evidence clearly indicate that jet ski "recreation" is not appropriate activity in the CHAs. The CHAs are not an amusement park! Please try to understand it is about protecting the wildlife, fisheries, and other life forms in the CHAs.<br><br>Just because one single user group - the Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska - happened to have turned the Governor, obviously without his understanding of CHAs, definitely does not mean the ban that has been voted on twice - should simply be repealed on a whim. There is the public process to consider. And, perhaps, you do not realize that the state places recreational restrictions on many of its lands and waters to prevent harm. The PWCs have 99% of Alaska waters to go do their wave-jumping incurring incredibly loud motor noise. There is absolutely no good reason why they "need" to recreate in the other 1% which happens to be CHAs. To try and portray them as a discriminated group is pure fallacy. To allow PWCs in the CHAs would be the road to destruction which would be stupid, stupid, among other things.<br><br>The Governor's decision to repeal this ban is so very wrong and unfounded. He demonstrates no idea of public process, scientific evidence nor his role as protector of our State. Gosh, I need to check our Constitution. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Ronnie Rosenbaum | Ronnie Rosenbaum <ronnierosenbaum@gmail.com> | 1055 Cottonwood Cir, Golden, CO 80401 | As someone who has had the opportunity to visit your wonderful state and to kayak on Kachemak Bay, I urge you to continue the jet ski ban. When I was on the the bay last summer, I was so taken with the pristine beauty that would be altered if jet skis were allowed. As I believe is the case with other tourists, we would no longer visit and venture out on tlovely Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Thank you for your consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Amy Bright | amy bright <a.bright@msn.com> | | I am a frequent visitor to Homer, AK, and I love the great outdoors. One of the draws for me to Homer is the pristine wilderness experience it affords me, which I fear will be irreparably compromised by the lifting of the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Just as drones (fun for the drone user) ruins the quietude for all the other nature seekers within sight and earshot, so does a jet ski. In fact, I call jet skis "water drones".<br><br>Please don't allow them to ruin the the pristine wilderness experience for me or the other thousands of visitors who bring millions of dollars to the local economy, forcing us to go elsewhere for quietude. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Ole Andersson | ole andersson <dogpero@hotmail.com> | 4400 Tundra Rose Road Homer, Alaska. 99603 | Hi Rick- Allowing Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay is going to cost someone some money. Either Fish and Game or the city of Homer.<br><br>As for Homer; Liability caused by accidents will cost the city of Homer (us the taxpayers) when out of town people come here in the summer and in their ignorance of cold water and local knowledge injure someone or someones property or need to be rescued. Even Alaskans may be a cause of some of these problems.<br>The city would need to come up with best practices guidelines and educate Users to help avoid unsafe situations. Are we prepared to pay for this extra manpower. No<br><br>As for Fish and Game; By all rights, Users should be educated and enforcement of use in Critical Habitat areas should be monitored. Is Fish and Game going to hire extra staff to do this? Considering the current budget situation do you think Fish and Game will hire extra staff? I think you know the answer to this, No.<br><br>I propose we maintain the status quo with the laws as written. Let's not create more problems before solving others.<br><br>Please, No to Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Kachemak Bay Conservation Society | Kachemak Bay Conservation Society <kbayconservation@gmail.com> | 3734 Ben Walters Ln Homer AK 99603 | See message: Kachemak Bay Conservation Society Comments on PWC in CHA.msg in PWC1 | 1 | | | organization | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gabriel Travis | Gabriel Travis <gabetravis.ak@gmail.com> | Healy, AK | Hello Mr. Green,<br>I was disturbed to read a recent article by Rick Sinnott which implied that amount of public opinion opposed is not relevant your decision to open Kachemak Bay to jet-skis. Yet there is no scientific basis that says jet-skis would be helpful to the K-Bay ecosystem, and there is plenty of science to say it could harm wildlife populations and fisheries. Most Alaskans are opposed; indeed, 90% of Alaska's waterways are already open to jetski use. There are tons of ways to recreate in Kachemak Bay, and allowing one of the loudest, fastest, most polluting, and most obnoxious water craft is not necessary in order to provide fair access.<br>I am disappointed that lobbying interests get higher priority than the Alaskan public. I am going on record as completely opposed to this move. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Beau Mills | Beau Mills <beau.mills@gmail.com> | Beau Mills<br>PO Box 6453<br>Halibut Cove,AK 99603 | - Jet skis should not be permitted in Kachemak Bay or in the Fox River Critical Habitat.<br>- This restriction would not unduly restrict recreational use by jet skiing as the majority of Alaska's waters are in fact open to jet ski usage.<br>- ADF & G's own staff has opposed allowing jet ski usage in the above mention area in question because of THIS CRITICAL AREA THAT IS A PARAMOUNT AND PRIMARY ENVIRONMENT AND BREEDING AREA FOR MARINE AND TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE AND FAUNA.<br>-As is true with permitting on land usage that not all land is suitable nor should be allowed owing to various critical factors, nor is all water/marine environment suitable for all usage.<br>- The best use for all allowances on terrestrial and marine environments are the same everywhere - and Kachemak Bay and the Fox River area are not compatible with nor suitable for the proposed current efforts to allow jet skiing.<br>-Protect this area - as are other areas also protected because NOT ALL AREAS ARE SUITABLE FOR ALL USES!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Miriam (Shoemaker) Bracken | Miriam Shoemaker <miriamshoemaker@gmail.com> | | Please continue to ban jet ski's on the Kachemak Bay- This is such a special place in the world that even the slightest disturbance could make the largest negative impact. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Doug Van Patten | Doug Van Patten <dvpalaska@gmail.com> | PO Box 1348<br>Homer, AK | Over the past 41 years I have been an avid boater on Kachemak Bay. There have been many changes to the environment in that short time frame. Some of the changes have been caused by alteration of water temperature and chemistry. Other changes can be directly or indirectly attributed to manmade factors such as overfishing. The scientific community has certainly contributed a wealth of information to document the potential adverse effects of Jetskis and personal watercraft on wildlife and the sensitive critical habitat of K-Bay. I will not elaborate further.<br>Given the dominant use of Jetskis; primarily as fast, fun, loud toys on the water, I am adamantly opposed to their use on Kachemak Bay. Safety and compatibility of other user groups should be addressed. Anyone who has utilized the Homer harbor knows that the entrance can be very congested, especially on weekends in the summer. Given their propensity for speed and maneuverability, it is very likely they will ignore, or be oblivious to the Rules of Road and common courtesy. A potentially hazardous situation will worsen if Jetskis are permitted. The end of the Homer Spit is particularly vulnerable. While it is true that many boats speed by coming and going to other destinations there can be sailboats, a flotilla of slow-moving boats trolling, kayakers, and paddle boarders close to shore. Jetskis will compete for this space if they are intent on "entertaining" others. Visitors frequently enjoy seeing sea otter and harbor seals with the occasion sightings of porpoise and orcas. Their enjoyment will be sacrificed by the disrespectful use of obnoxious Jetskis. This scenario will likely be repeated in other near shore areas including; Halibut Cove, Tutka Bay, and Seldovia.<br>Jetski users have developed a reputation as being oblivious to their surroundings and the disruption of the peace and enjoyment of others. As an example; imagine having an evening dinner on a restaurant deck adjacent to the Chena River in Fairbanks. The diners are enjoying the peaceful river flowing by, perhaps a canoe or two float by. Enter a Jetski. The tranquility and peace of many are shattered by one individual's ego and a machine, who has decided to "entertain" the captive audience. I have witnessed this more than once on the Chena and on other rivers, lakes, and beaches. The vast majority of Alaska's waterways are open to Jetskis. Please uphold the regulations that prohibit Jetskis in K-Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Kerri Erwin | Kerri Erwin <kerrierwin@gmail.com> | | Please consider what is being asked for if we were to bring jetskis to Kachemak Bay. It is not merely another recreational option for tourists/locals. It is an activity that will disrupt an area that tourists and locals alike visit in order to enjoy the marine habitats as they currently are.<br><br>Jetskis pose threats to birds, marine mammals and humans. While I enjoy riding them in appropriate areas, Kachemak Bay is not that area. I am one voice joining the others in asking you to help keep it that way. Please do not allow a recreational item that is incompatible with our current economy and that will pose a new threat to our current natural resources. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Suzanne Singer | suzanne singer <suzannesinger907@gmail.com> | Homer resident | The idea of allowing jet skis in Kachamak bay is a terrible one! They have plenty of other places to burn fuel and enjoy their own noise.<br><br>The destruction to habitat is not worth it!<br><br>Please, every road does not need to be a freeway | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | George Matz | George Matz <geomatz41@gmail.com> | Fritz Creek, AK | See message: Personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habtiat Areas.msg in PWC1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Paul Twardock | Paul Twardock <paultapu@gci.net> | | I oppose opening areas currently closed to personnel watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The potential disruption to wildlife and other people are not worth the benefits to a few. There is plenty of access already in the bay, and almost all other waters in AK are open to personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Angela Doroff | Angela Doroff <amdoroff@gmail.com> | | As a long-time resident of Alaska, I'm asking you to keep Jetskis out of Kachemak Bay and honor the conservation protections afforded that region. There are many places in this vast state that do allow jetskis. They don't need to be in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Sue Mauger | Sue Mauger <s_mauger@yahoo.com> | PO Box 1368<br>Homer, Ak 99603 | Please accept my comments below about the "Notice of Proposed Changes on the Use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas". I am a full-time Alaskan resident and have lived in the Kachemak Bay area for 20 years.<br>I strongly oppose the proposed change to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br>My reasons are many but the one I urge you to consider is the utter disrespect you are showing to your colleagues at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. These Alaskan professionals, who have worked for the best interest of the state for decades, have concluded:<br>"In summary, based on our review of information available since the PWC prohibition was adopted in 2001, we feel there is no new information that would warrant rescinding the prohibition, and in fact the newer information highlights most of the concerns identified when the prohibition was adopted. A draft of this memo was circulated to affected staff in all department divisions (DWC, HAB, CF, SF) and this recommendation was widely supported."<br>These conclusions provide you with a face-saving excuse to back away from this ill-conceived and potentially dangerous regulatory change to 5 AAC 95.310.<br>I do not support the proposed change and ask that you retain the ban on personal watercraft within Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Nidia Dunayevich | Nubia CipresHargrove <seaandhsugar@gmail.com> | 41561 Stellars Jay Drive<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to ask you to keep the PWC ban in effect in Kachemak Bay Critical Care Habitat Area. I am strongly opposed to lifting the ban of PWC in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I do not see how lifting the ban will add the safe and well being of the community at large. Please feel free to contact for further concerns or questions.<br><br>Best regards,<br><br>Nidia Dunayevich | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Nubia Cipres | Nubia Cipres-Hargrove <nubiacipreshargrove@outlook.com> | 41561 Stellars Jay Drive<br>Homer ,AK 99603 | I am writing to strongly oppose allowing any PWC in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I am against opening these water to the PWC for any reason. At this time I cannot find any reason to allow this to occur that would create a positive impact on these waters. The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is best without any PWC allowed. The area has been kept without the PWC for more time and I do not see any reason that this would add to the safe and well being of the community. There are plenty of other areas for the PWC clubs to enjoy use in much larger areas than the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Please feel free to contact me if you need further information.<br><br>Best Regards,<br><br>Nubia Cipres | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Karen Murphy | KarenPat Murphy <murf2bike@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK 99507 | I am writing in response to the proposed regulation change to lump motorized personal watercraft (PWC) in with other vessel operations in critical habitat areas within Kachemak Bay. I believe that ADF&G will be making a mistake if you accept this proposal. There is legal precedence that has established that the fast, erratic, movement of these PWC is more disruptive to wildlife and often creates conflict between other non-motorized users who can also access the shallower areas in the bay. There is also evidence that there are more fatalities associated with PWC than other vessels which means that the State will have bigger expenses associated with rescue operations in the area. Most importantly, the designation of Critical Habitat in Kachemak Bay means that impacts in this area is much more likely to create a population level effect to the sea otters, whales and sea birds that depend on the quiet portions of the bay for raising their young and survival.<br><br>If you do go through with this regulation change, please establish a formal monitoring plan and research on wildlife impacts with some bays being "controls" (no PWC) and others open to impact. Create a short time frame during which the decision would be revisited with clear criteria for making a final decision that is based on scientific findings on the impacts to the wildlife in the critical habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Tabb Thoms | akplow@gmail.com | President/Owner AK Services 907 884-8222cell/text akplow@gmail.com | This is to support the repeal on the ban of PWCs in Kachemak Bay for the purpose of accessing the Alaska marine highway and travelling to and from Homer to Seldovia, Kodiak, Seward and beyond.<br><br>Personal Water Crafts are certified "Motor Vessels" and are actually cleaner and quieter than a majority of the vessels that currently operate in the bay. Individuals who purchase PWCs may have higher disposable incomes than many of the regional operators. In every instance of numerous overnight trips via PWC, including riding from Anchorage to Seattle, our group of PWC riders have boosted the local economy by purchasing thousands of gallons of gas, have always overnighted in a hotel or lodges, have eaten every meal in local restaurants and purchased necessary supplies from local retailers. During our travels while we may have initially been met with skepticism from Homer residents, in the end the small boost that we provided to local businesses seemed to override any misplaced prejudice or unwarranted fear.<br><br>It is also possible that PWC owners are better educated, more environmentally and ecologically aware, as well as more respectful of the marine wilderness than many boat owners who operate legally in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | T Thoms | 907@ak.net | 907 344-7263 | I Repeal of PWC Ban in Kachemak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Lori DeWitt | lori@loridewitt.com | | Please keep the state of Alaska a place where everyone can enjoy it, its not right to ban anyone from having access to explore the beautiful state.<br><br>REPEAL THE BAN OF JET SKIS | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Wayne Hall | Wayne Hall <shadow@matnet.com> | Anchorage | This is to support maintaining the long-standing ban on the use of jet skis (or "personal water craft") in Kachemak Bay. It is essential to protect the designated Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. There are areas that deserve an additional layers of protection and these are among them. If the claims of "equal access" by the Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska, apparently the sole special interest group promoting repeal, then you should also allow them "equal access" to the Kenai and Russian Rivers during salmon season and to allow any other type of craft or engine size there as well. You know that will not happen. The reasons for those restrictions are the same - the protection of habitat and public resources – and they are just as relevant and applicable to the Critical Habitats in Kachemak Bay. If there is some new reason why Kachemak Bay protections are not, consideration of any change should be subject to a more complete and professional public review and debate than is the case now. A request to the Governor by one special-interest user, with a decision to be made by a political appointee with no biological background or education, and with no public hearings, is a sham and not worthy of Alaskans.<br><br>Leave the prohibition in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Graham Jones, Jeff Thomas, Carl Dixon Within the Wild Adventure Company | Within The Wild Adventure Co. <info@withinthewild.com> | PO Box 91419 Anchorage, Alaska 99509 | This letter represents the Within the Wild Adventure Company comments on ADF&G's proposed repeal of 5 AAC 95.310 that prohibits the use of personal watercraft (aka jet skis) in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. We are strongly opposed to the change that would allow personal watercraft usage and management in this internationally important area for shorebirds, marine wildlife, and a unique maritime ecosystem found nowhere else in the world.<br><br>Within the Wild Adventure Company was formed in 1982 and includes two wilderness lodges (one of them, Tutka Bay Lodge, located within Kachemak Bay) as well as a cafe located on the Homer Spit. Our company mission statement says that we wish to provide our guests with the opportunity to experience the powerful sense of time spent in the natural world, to experience new and enriching adventures that become lifetime memories, and to bring individuals and families closer together in a creative and positive environment. More information on who we are can be found at www.withinthewild.com.<br><br>The Alaska Legislature created the Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area in 1972 and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area in 1974 "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." (Alaska Department of Fish and Game 1993). The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is documented as an international critical migratory stopover area for at least a hundred thousand shorebirds using the Pacific Americas Flyway. The site is especially important for Western Sandpipers, Dunlin, Red-necked Phalaropes and Surfbirds that feed and roost on the wide diversity of shoreline habitats. The sheer numbers of birds prompted ADF&G to nominate the area as a Site of International Importance under the Western Hemispheric Shorebird Reserve Network in 1994 (https://whsrn.org/whsm sites/kachem ak-bay/). Alaska Audubon has designated the marine waters of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area as an Important Bird Area (https://www.audubon.org/important-bird-areas/kachemak-bay#). Lastly, the Fox River Flats and the Kachemak Bay critical habitat areas are one of 28 internationally important shorebird sites across the entire Pacific Americas Flyway-from Tierra del Fuego to western Alaska (Senner et al. 2016). Collectively, these designations demonstrate the international conservation community's support for protection and conservation of the most important site for migrating shorebirds in the Pacific Flyway.<br><br>Jet skis, and other personal watercraft, are designed for recreation and are particularly problematic for wildlife. They are highly maneuverable, very fast, and as a result are very different than skiffs | 3 | | | business/individual | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Esther Smith | Esther Smith <smith.l.esther@gmail.com> | 128 W. 14th Ave. #3 Anchorage, AK 99501 | I am writing to strongly urge you to keep Jetskis out of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br><br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and personal watercrafts (PWC's) are not compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br><br>Please act on behalf of the strong majority of Alaskans who want to protect our birds, marine animals, and humans alike, and oppose Jetskis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mary Cocklan-Vendl | cocklame@yahoo.com | 17209 Ashland Dr. Anchorage, AK 99516 | I strongly oppose repeal of 5 AAC 95.310, which prohibits use of Personal Watercraft (PWC) within the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area (CHA).<br>I have been an Alaska resident since 1981. My husband and I owned property, building a beautiful second home in Homer near the head of Kachemak Bay, for 20 years from 1994 to 2014. We continue to visit Homer regularly and bring visiting family and guests to Homer to enjoy it's vast and tranquil beauty.<br>I am very familiar with Kachemak Bay and its uses and sensitivities. My objections are outlined below:<br>Use of PWCs is incompatible with the values the Critical Habitat Area was established to protect.<br>A major part of the Homer area economy depends on the many tourists and local outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy world class fishing, kayaking, and sightseeing in the spectacularly peaceful and quiet natural surroundings of Kachemak Bay. Kachemak Bay is one of the only, if not the only, place in Alaskan coastal waters where seabirds and marine mammals - including whales, otters, and seals that thrill visitors from all over the world - are protected from PWC activity.<br>PWC's are distinctly different from the type of watercraft now using the CHA. They have rapid acceleration, tight turning radius, and are able to accelerate through shallow water and near shorelines. Their use would introduce a new sound signature to the marine environment. These factors would result in increased disturbance to shorebirds, waterfowl, and marine mammals. Kachemak Bay hosts large congregations of birds and mammals. It also hosts a number of commercial and recreational boat users. None of these existing uses is capable of the maneuvers made possible by an irresponsible PWC user. Mr. Green likened using a 16-foot skiff to a PWC. This is absurd. While a PWC can behave like a skiff, a skiff doesn't have the capabilities of the PWC – fast acceleration, rapid turns, etc.<br>There is Existing Access<br>Improving access is a stated rationale for allowing PWCs in a CHA, but it is a flawed rationale.<br>There is ample existing access. There are numerous launch sites and access points to the waters of the CHA. Removing the ban would merely allow an additional mode of access – and a mode which is clearly incompatible with the values protected by a CHA designation. Indeed, introducing this new form of transportation could create significant conflicts with existing valid uses. Potential conflicts could include interference with recreational fishing (trolling and jigging), commercial fishing (set nets and seines), and kayakers (noise, wake, disruption). PWC users could unlawfully access Kachemak Bay State Park lands and waters as well as disrupt users of the park.<br>The Decision Making Process | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Robert Archibald | Robert Archibald <robert.e.archibald@gmail.com> | PO Box 2460 Homer, AK. 99603 | See message: Comments, PWC Ban Repeal in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River CHA..msg in PWC2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Nancy Hilstrand | Nancy Hillstrand <halibuts@gmail.com> | Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc. Box 674 Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: Comments to OPPOSE rescinding PWC ban.msg in PWC2 | 1 | | | business/individual | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Nancy Hilstrand | Nancy Hillstrand <halibuts@gmail.com> | Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc. Box 674 Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: Common Murre die off from starvation.msg in PWC2 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Gail Heineman | Gail Heineman <gail_heineman@yahoo.com> | 2732 W 67th Ave Anchorage AK 99502 | I urge ADF&G to not repeal the ban on jet skis/personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area (KBCHA). ADF&G scientists have documented the reasons for the ban. A majority of Alaskans supported the ban through the public process in 2001, 2011 and 2016.<br>Letting jetskis in the KBCHA makes as much sense as a dentist pulling teeth from a hoverboard. It is needless and reckless. It did not turn out well for Dr. Seth Lockhard, he was convicted in court. Does the Dunleavy administration really want to look that foolish? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Steven Wayne | steven wayne <americasfinehomes@gmail.com> | 4359 Jill Place South Seattle WA. 98108 | this is an abominable idea! They are noxious, and dangerous to wildlife.<br>Please visit a tropical island soon! Find a beach that hasn't banned<br>jet ski's and listen to the din!<br>You wouldn't want these in your backyard! Neither do the residents of<br>Homer and Kachemak Bay!<br><br>NO jet ski's in Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Lisa Scheerer | Lisa Scheerer <Lisa.Scheerer@umalaska.com> | Unique Machine LLC<br>QMS Program Manager<br>8875 King Street<br>Anchorage, Alaska 99515 | HOMER - Support the Repeal Casting my vote for this. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Cook Inletkeeper | Bob Shavelson <bob@inletkeeper.org> | Cook Inletkeeper<br>3734 Ben Walters Lane<br>Homer, AK 99603 | see message: Inletkeeper Jetski Comments.msg in PWC2 | 1 | | | organization | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Rick and Dorla Harness, Seaside Adventure | Seaside Adventure <seasideadventure@earthlink.net> | PO Box 3066<br>Homer AK 99603 | see message: Jet Ski ban.msg in PWC2 | 2 | | | business | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Richard Harness | Richard Harness <raharness@gmail.com> | | As a resident, property owner and business owner of Kachemak Bay, I oppose the repeal of the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay and Fox River flats!<br>By now you have heard from many of the stakeholders and current users of Kachemak Bay during the short comment period. We know countless residents, business owners, agencies, stake holder, biologists as well as people from outside of Alaska and literally worldwide who are adamantly opposed to the ban. We are willing to fight to support the ADF&G mission and goals statement, which have helped to put the ban in place to begin with!<br><br>My concerns in a nutshell are:<br>•Kachemak Bay communities have built their livelihood and lifestyle around the quiet sports and uses of Kachemak Bay, including fishing, kayaking, hiking, etc. Homer's brand is Kachemak Bay as a natural, quiet habitat that attracts thousands of visitors, so tourism, as well as service businesses are dependent on this long established branding. The governor says Alaska is open for business, and the Kachemak Bay area has many successful businesses that would be hurt by jet ski activity. These PWCs are not like boats!<br>•The multiple designations as Critical Habitat, NEERS site, WHSRN site, and State Park and Wilderness confirm the extraordinary bio-diversity and nature significance of Kachemak Bay. This is not just a body of water to run around on, but a rare habitat that must be protected, as you should well know in your role as associates of ADF&G.<br>•Boats have existed alongside the other current users in harmony for a long time. The essence of PWC's is speed and noise in shallow waters, as you can see in countless ads and reports on the internet and in real life. The first jet skis were developed by a well-known motorcycle racer, and that modus operandum will always be the primary way of using those thrill craft. I am not making assumptions! I was here and exposed to PWCs before the ban, and have been endangered by PWCs on more than one occasion! A few PWCs would ruin the nature experience of hundreds of other users.<br>•You have voiced your opinion that a very small special interest group can get their way against countless other stakeholders who would be harmed by the repeal of the ban. It is unbelievable that official state representatives would go against the vast majority, and well established previous biological research to give way to a small group of special interest!<br><br>We hope when you weigh all the reasons to continue to support the Ban on PWC you will do the right thing and keep the ban | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | M.F. Barker | Frankie Barker <fbarker@mtaonline.net> | Chickaloon, Alaska | I'm writing you in opposition to changing the regulations to allow personal watercraft use (jet skis) in critical habitat areas in Kachemak Bay. There are studies by federal and state agencies and a wealth of scientific literature indicating that allowing jet skis will have a negative impacts on the species for which the critical habitat areas were created.<br><br>Personal watercraft are allowed over 99% of Alaska waters. There are plenty of places for them to go.<br><br>I have kayaked many times through these areas and have observed marine mammals, waterfowl and other bird species that are not found in other parts of the bay or in other waters. This is a special area and the critical habitat designation is warranted and should be preserved by keeping the prohibition on personal watercraft in place.<br><br>M.F. Barker<br><br>Chickaloon, Alaska<br><br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br>Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Colleen Fisk | Colleen Fisk <colleenrfisk@gmail.com> | Anchorage | I am writing to submit a comment on the proposed rule change that would allow jetskis on Kachemak Bay. As a lifelong Alaskan, I vehemently oppose this potential change. The science clearly shows Jetskis and personal water crafts are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Kathryn Mulder | Kathryn Mulder <kmmulder@alaska.edu> | | Jet Skis and and personal watercraft (PWC) are not like skiffs or boats. PWC are a danger to the sensitive ecosystem of Kachemak Bay, which deserves further protection. The Kachemak Bay and Fox River flats Critical Habitat Area has a law put in place to protect and preserve habitat areas under Alaska Statutes 16.20.500.<br>As a resident of the Kachemak Bay area I find there is no need to allow PWCs in Kachemak Bay when the area is critical, and 99% of Alaskan waters are open for people who want to ride them to do so.<br>I also feel that it is not only dangerous to the habitat, birds, wildlife, but also, human safety is in jeopardy. It's a chaotic harbour area when just boats alone are taking off in many directions, now toss in some people trying to jump all those waves.<br>I am against the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and I hope you take the concerns of our citizens seriously in your decision. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | joan ie <alaskanmermaid@hotmail.com> | | NO to Jetskis in Kachemak Bay! Please do not disturb the peace and tranquility of Kachemak Bay by allowing Jetskis. They are noisy and dangerous. I have taken trips where they are allowed and had to leave because of the noise and disturbance of the area. No one wants to hear them roaring around. They add NO VALUE to the richness of our environment and do everything to disturb it. I don't want to see Otters, Seals and Sea Birds harmed or killed by these ridiculous and powerful things. Plenty of other places for people to use them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Bruce Vadla | Bruce Vadla <bvadla@alaska.net> | 399 W Riverview Ave<br>Soldotna, AK 99669 | I'm a lifelong Alaskan who has enjoyed trips to Kachemak Bay throughout my 62 years of living in South Central AK.<br>Please do not allow a return of jet skis to the Bay. There are many places where jet ski operators can "play" on their toys.<br>Critical Habitat areas should not be among them!<br>Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Emmy Lou Pearl Olsen-Drye | Emmy Olsen <olsenemmy@gmail.com> | 35979 Old Sterling Hwy, Anchor Point, AK 99556 | I am a born and raised Homerite, and I really don't want to see the jet ski ban lifted. Kachemak bay is a beautiful and peaceful ecosystem, and there are already plenty of ways for people to recreate here. Personal motorized watercraft will only serve to further disturb wildlife and adversely affect existing economic, recreative, and subsistence activities.<br><br>Please do not lift the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Rob Olsen-Drye | Rob Olsen-Drye <popsairservice@gmail.com> | | I am against lifting the ban on the jet skis in the bay. There is plenty of other ways to enjoy the wilderness! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Marsha Holbrook | Marsha Holbrook <marsha_holbrook@hotmail.com> | | As a property owner in the area for over 30 years, I am strongly opposed to the proposed allowance of PWC usage in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. With public polls showing a strong opposition to their use, it doesn't make any sense that it is being considered. I trust that the governor will make a wise decision with regards to this and withdraw the proposal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Gail Denton | Gail Denton <co.gail.denton@gmail.com> | | Keep Jet Skis out of critical Kachemak Bay habitat.<br><br>I can take my tourist dollars anywhere. I prefer a safe Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Eric Siebels | Eric Siebels <esiebels@gci.net> | | I am writing to notify you that I support the repeal of the ban on Personal Watercraft use in Kachemak Bay. I firmly believe that Personal Watercraft can be used safely and responsibly within the Bay, and other areas. Please work to repeal the unfair ban on PWC use in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Sandra Early | Tom and Sandy Early <minerscourt@yahoo.com> | | I am writing to add my voice to the many that are speaking out against repealing the jet ski ban currently in effect in Kachemak Bay. This issue has been studied at length (recently by the National Park Service as well as ADF&G) and it has been determined that jet ski usage in the Bay, a designated Critical Habitat area, would be detrimental to wildlife, particularly seabirds and marine mammals. Nothing has changed since these studies-in fact, tourism has increased, kayaks and paddle board usage is up, and more people are fishing and trolling in shallow waters. The annual Shorebird Festival brings thousands of birds and hundreds of birders.<br>Seabirds, otters and seals are able to coexist with slower moving and non-motorized small craft in the near offshore waters. Jet skis are designed to travel very fast, make sharp and frequent turns, and enter fragile shallow areas. They are not compatible with the purpose of this critical habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Dave Szynskie | Dave Szynskie <dave.szynskie@g.kpbsd.org> | | I appreciate your time in reviewing our comments. I would like to urge you to keep Kachemak Bay peaceful. The opportunity to experience this serene pocket of Alaska is what makes Homer special. If you have experienced the Homer Harbor during the summer months please imagine the increase congestion the addition of Jet Ski/Personal Watercraft would cause. From what I understand, there is already access for those who wish to Jet Ski in the area through Anchor Point, Whittier, and Seward. Please let Homer be "The place to escape the Noise" Thank you for your work and consideration, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Gus Gustafson | Gus Gustafson <gus@withinthewild.com> | | Absolutely and vehemently opposed to the proposed lifting of the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. Please listen to the will people. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Lindsay Clark | Lindsay Clark <limaclark@gmail.com> | 1303 W. 23rd Ave Anchorage, AK | Jet skis have absolutely NO PLACE in Kachemak Bay. The beauty, tranquility, and supreme specialness of the place is beyond anything I know. Halibut Cove, in particular is a haven I know well and visit often. The quiet, slow nature of the area would be unquestionably compromised by the introduction of the small motorized insects called jet skis. Like a terrible swarm of mosquitoes. Kayaking is an incredible way to engage with Kachemak Bay - I encourage those wishing to buzz about recklessly to hop in a kayak instead. Or go home.<br><br>NO NO NO to jet skis in Kachemak Bay. One more time? NO! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mark Van Arsdale | Mark Van Arsdale <vanarsdale.mark@gmail.com> | | My family and I have spent time camping in Katchemak Bay every year for the last decade. We always value the quiet serenity that it's small fjords and bays have to offer. Personal watercraft will change that. Please keep up the ban on personal watercraft in Katchemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mike and Diane Frank | Diane Frank <mdfrank@gci.net> | | See message: Personal Watercraft Regulatory Proposal.msg in PWC2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ben Harness | Ben Harness <harnessbros@gmail.com> | | Addressing the repeal of the current ban of PWC's - "personal watercraft" better known as Jet Skis is a serious issue. The public has had a ban on PWC's in the Kachemak bay critical habitat area for many reasons. The safety of the public and wild life in the critical habitat area is in jeopardy if the ban is repealed.<br><br>It discusses me that the voice of the public's ban has been muted by an administration that is willing to dismiss the community's decision to limit the use of PWC's in this area. This process has been ripe with the stench of bias corrupt current government policy. It is a disgraceful process when the repeal process has been lead by two individuals Mr. Lang and Mr. Green who have publicly stated that they place "little weight on the importance of public input" The irony is that the public has already spoken and acted. This ban has been in place for years for many reasons, and now the decision of the public is being disregarded by a few biased individuals with special interests.<br><br>I was dumb founded when I heard on the radio proponents of the repeal state that there was as a user group that had their access limited to the critical habitat area in Kachemak bay. On the contrary the public's decision to ban PWC's in the area has not limited any ones access to the area. The public's ban has limited a disruptive activity in this critical habitat because it is not conducive to the environment in that area.<br><br>The repeal of this ban goes against the vary mission statement "To protect, maintain, and improve the fish, game, and aquatic plant resources of the state, and manage their use and development in the best interest of the economy and the well-being of the people of the state, consistent with the sustained yield principle".<br><br>It is common for a society to place rules on activities in areas for the protection of its citizens and the environment. A few examples come to mind. Smoking in public buildings, driving ATV's in city limits, Speed limits on public roads (school zones), motorized vehicles on hiking paths, disruptive behavior in libraries, limiting the horse power of boats allowed on the Kenai river etc.<br><br>As a child growing up on an island in Kachemak bay, I have experienced dangerous encounters with PWC's prior to the ban. Now I'm a father of two girls that we a raising on the same island. There is no doubt that there will be more risks to our family | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Mako's Water Taxi | mako haggerty <mako@xyz.net> | | Re: Protecting the Natural Values of Kachemak Bay and the Jobs & Revenues They Support<br>Dear Commissioner:<br>We are local Alaskan businesses who provide services on the Lower Kenai Peninsula and around Kachemak Bay. We are writing for two reasons.<br>First, we're very concerned with the abbreviated timeline the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADFG) has put forward to consider changes to the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. A thirty-day public comment period – falling in the middle of the December holiday season – makes it extremely difficult for us and our customers to weigh-in on this important matter. Furthermore, the addition of fifteen days provided little additional opportunity to engage other businesses and our clients who care deeply about this issue. Accordingly, we request that you extend the public comment period to at least ninety days, and hold a public hearing in Homer, so local businesses and residents have ample opportunity to voice their opinions.<br>Second, we oppose any rollbacks to the current rule regarding personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Tourists and visitors come to Kachemak Bay to enjoy its natural values and to experience "the real Alaska." Jetskis and other thrillcraft will erode that experience, threatening the jobs and revenues these visitor dollars drive into the local economy on the Lower Kenai Peninsula. Contrary to some beliefs, the inherent design and intended uses of personal watercraft make them very different than traditional boats and skiffs. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to personal watercraft, and it only makes sense to leave some areas protected, so Alaskans and tourists alike can enjoy the unique solitude and tranquility of Kachemak Bay.<br>Thank you for your attention to this important matter, and we look forward to your response. Signed,<br>▯ | 34 | | | businesses and individuals | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Cherie Remmer | Cherie Remmer <cherieremmer@gmail.com> | | Please count my vote/opinion as a resounding NO in regard to the issue of allowing jet ski's on Kachemak Bay!! The Bay is perfectly accessible in any number of ways to anyone who wants to be there! It's just that, as in all areas of life, there are certain times and places for everything. And PWD's are not one of those things that should be in that exquisite, and special area, for the multitude of reasons outlined long ago, which still hold true today! People can't always have everything they want, anytime they want it! What a spoiled brat mentality! Do we allow fireworks when there are drought conditions and fire danger is high? NO! Do we allow people to hunt anything they want anywhere and at any time? NO! Do we allow people to catch and keep King salmon when the run seems in jeopardy? NO! You don't hear rational, thinking people whining that their rights are being violated in those cases! This is no different. Sometimes NO is a good and necessary thing. I believe that to be true about our jewel, Kachemak Bay, and all its ecological and wildlife treasure! PLEASE DO NOT OPEN THE AREA TO PWD's !!<br>Thank you for your attention. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Jeffrey Troy Lee | Jeff Lee <skiridge@gmail.com> | Box 44<br>Seldovia, Alaska<br>99603 | Jet skis do not belong in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area there are many other places in Alaska where this type of motorized recreation may be appropriate but not here. If Jet skis want to access the Gulf of Alaska they can put in at Anchor Point. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Kenton Taylor | Kenton <kptaylor@gci.net> | | > I am writing this email to you to be included in the public record of the Department of Fish and Game's consideration of repealing the regulation prohibiting Jet Skis (PWCs) in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br>><br>> AS 16.05.010 (Power and Duties of the Commissioner) states "(2) manage, protect, maintain, improve and extend fish, game and aquatic plant resources of the state in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the state;"<br>><br>> AS 16.20.690 states "The Purpose of AS 16.20.500-16.20.690 (critical habitat and special area statutes establishing them) is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose".<br>><br>> The issue of whether or not jet skis should be permitted in Kachemak Bay was very thoroughly and publicly vetted by the Department of Fish and Game (with no restrictions on public interactions with ADF&G staff to collect information on the issue I might add) between 2000 and 2001. The Alaskan public was overwhelmingly opposed to allowing jet skis to proliferate in Kachemak Bay, and a regulation was passed to prohibit their use in this Statutorily designated critical habitat area. The public recognized the value of the resources in Kachemak Bay and the adverse impact jet skis posed not only to the many species of fish, birds, marine mammals that utilize this area, but to the economic industries such as commercial and sport fishing, tourism as well.<br>><br>> The Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska (a small group in primarily based in the Anchorage area) has asked every governor since 2002 to overturn this ban. Every governor since until the current administration has turned them down, and for good reason. It is not hard to envision the inevitable jet ski collisions with sea otters or humpback whales, their harassment of nesting seabirds on Gull Island and other rookeries, or their adverse impact on the many sea kayaking businesses and the adverse impact they would have on their clients' experience. Repealing the current prohibition on jet ski use in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area would be counter to the statutory direction of "managing its resources in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the state, and would certainly not help "protect and preserve habitat areas... the state has found especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife".<br>> | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Oceana Wills | Oceana Wills <oceanawills@gmail.com> | 59735 Sanford Drive Homer, AK 99603 | I am emailing in opposition of the proposal to lift the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. My concern is primarily for the potential impact on wildlife. Already there are many stressors on marine mammals and birds (sonar testing, climate change). With more motorized vessels on the bay able to drive more shallowly than most boats and skiffs, the potential for harm increases.<br><br>My second concern is how jet skis might impact the experience of enjoying Kachemak Bay. I could see jet skis becoming an attractive tourism opportunity and becoming very popular. There are always skiffs and boats on the water but the intention of transportation is different than the ways in which jet skis might be used. This could potentially conflict with the kayak and stand up paddle boarding that many businesses offer.<br><br>As a lifelong Homer resident, I appreciate the opportunity to voice my concerns. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Marilyn Houser | Marilyn <lostinspace@matnet.com> | 2411 Ingra Street Anchorage, AK 99508 | I am writing to add my voice to the many of Alaskans who oppose the plan to allow jet skis (known by some as personal watercraft) to zoom around in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. As identified by Alaska Department of Fish and Game biologists as recently as 2017, these waters provide vital habitat for birds, marine organisms, wildlife and fish. Traditional user groups will also be impacted. Jet skis are thrill machines that can rapidly change speed and direction; that is the way they are driven and the reason for their appeal. They have no place in a critical habitat area and repealing the prohibition flies in the face of biology and common sense.<br><br>As a 42 year resident of the state, I find myself shaking my head at this plan. I am hopeful the administration will realize its folly. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Samantha Campbell | Samantha Campbell <samanthagwendy@gmail.com> | | Just writing a quick emails to request you to repeal the ban of personal watercrafts in Kachemak Bay. PWC are more environmentally friendly than most boats and all Alaskans deserve equal access to all of our waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Shari Daugherty | Shari Daugherty <shari.l.daugherty@gmail.com> | | The noise, the lack of control, the potential for wildlife disruption or worse... allowing jet skis and similar water craft in Kachemak Bay, should not even be under consideration and I, one of many want this issue to be dismissed as not compatible with our bay. Please do Not lift the ban. It was wise when instituted previously and is just as necessary now. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Andrea Bailey | Andrea Bailey <adsargent15@gmail.com> | | Support the repeal. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Alex L Koplin | bubba@horizonsatellite.com | | I was hoping you could send me an email giving some numbers of how the people voted regarding jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>As a side note, I'm not sure why people's comments weigh so heavily on the issue of allowing jet skis in the Bay, instead of using scientific data that helps us better understand the impact of PWCs in the Bay. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Thomascarl Miller | Thomascarl Miller <millerthomascarl@gmail.com> | | (no subject) Yes | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Mike Goodwin | Rezabeck/Goodwin <rezgood@gci.net> | | I'm a 38 year Alaskan resident, professional recreation specialist, graduate of Michigan State University in Outdoor Recreation Management, and 25 veteran Alaska State Park Ranger. I oppose the Alaska State government in it's proposal to change a long standing regulation that prohibits the use of personal watercraft on the waters of Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats within Critical Habitat Areas. Allowing this proposal to move forward is an unnecessary expenditure of Alaska State natural and human resources. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska State Troopers and U.S. Coast Gard must not have enough to do.<br><br>I'm not opposed to the safe recreational pursuit of enjoying personal watercraft. In fact, I rode one extensively as an Alaska State Park Ranger. This personal watercraft was loaned to the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation for the purpose of providing public safety and the enforcement of State boating laws and regulations on Big Lake North and South in south-central Alaska. When the Alaska State Troopers had "the Big Lake Post" I worked extensively with them to help provide a safe boating environment on Big Lake. I made arrests, enforced boating safety laws and wrote citations to numerous personal watercraft operators. I also observed how this watercraft was generally used by this recreational user group. Personal watercraft are the moto-cross equipment for the water world. They are not designed to go slow. I observed operators running their jet skis in shallow waters that provided nesting and feeding habitat for waterfowl, herons and swans. I also observed jet skis operated illegally within designated public swimming beaches.<br><br>The personal water craft is not an ocean going vessel, although some have made amazing journeys over long distances. The "waterbike" used for this purpose is for a few of the exceptional advocates pursuing this type of adventure. The ocean waters in K-Bay can produce challenging and dangerous conditions for large vessels and are not well suited to this type of watercraft.<br><br>On flat water days on K-Bay and its lagoons the noise from personal watercraft can carry long distances. Personal watercraft can be noisy and visible over long distances as the "rooster tail" spray is projected above the waterline. The property owners and recreationists I know within K-Bay don't spend time there to witness this kind of disturbance.<br><br>I respectfully request the State Governor, the Fish and Game Department Director and their staff drop this proposal and focus on issues that affect what is important to the majority of Alaskans. If this issue is that important it should be put on a ballot | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Ruth Wood | Ruth Wood <tothedogs@mtaonline.net> | Talkeetna, Alaska | See message: Comments on Proposal to repeal 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Abel P. Tolpin | Abel <othieisabel@gmail.com> | 516 High Street Ridgeway Kappa #101 Bellingham, WA 98225 | I just today became aware of the possible reversal of the ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas and was moved to weigh in.<br><br>Greater than 99% of Alaskan waters are open to jetski use and Kachemak Bay is accessible by many other forms of watercraft currently. At 60 mph , it is reported that a jet ski's sound level can exceed 115 dBA. According to the information from the National Pollution Clearing house, PWCs have unique operational characteristics (e.g., continually leaving and re-entering the water, recurrent changes in speed hence noise level and pitch, repetitive smacking of the personal watercraft hulls on water, tendency to circle in one spot recurrently) that make their noise more annoying than that of other boats.<br><br>This unique biome region of Alaska is immensely rich in wildlife, natural resources and beauty. It is critical habitat for the animals that live within and migrate through it. The impact on wildlife by the high pitched droning and the high speed projectile hulls on the water would likely be serious.<br><br>For the people living and recreating in Kachemak Bay, the unique beauty and solitude is it's draw. Having personally camped near the water where jet skis are legal, I can attest that the high pitched drone wakes you, keeps you awake , and there is no escaping it outdoors. I believe this diminished experience could impact the outdoor tourism that is so important to this region's economy.<br><br>I strongly oppose lifting the current ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | American Watercraft Association, Chris Manthos | Chris Manthos <cmanthos@awahq.org> | | See message: Kachemak Bay comment.msg | | 1 | | organization | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Susanne Wilson | Susanne Wilson <laurenbutterfly62@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 136, Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to express my opposition to the possible lifting of the jet ski ban on Kachemak Bay. Kachemak Bay has long been defined as a Special Habitat area and it should continue to be protected. Since those who ride thrill craft can ride anywhere else in Alaska, it doesn't seem unreasonable to continue the ban on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Dena Bennett | Dena Bennett <akfyrfli27@gmail.com> | Eagle River, Alaska | As a lifelong Alaskan, born in the territory of Alaska, I have lived through many changes in the great state of ours. I am very much opposed to allowing jet skis on Kachemak Bay. The argument can be made that, well, there is a lot of boat traffic which potentially affects waterfowl and marine wildlife. My argument is boat traffic is normally slower, holds a steady course and does not as a rule, make abrupt course changes. This allows sufficient time for sea birds and marine life like otters to move out of the way.<br><br>I have watched jet skis in lakes. With speeds up to 60 mph, abrupt maneuvers, loud engines and often unskilled and/or unthinking riders, I believe there is increased danger and harm to the marine environment. They will not be able to move fast enough to evade injury or death. Given the radical changes in ocean temperatures, loss of habitat, and increasing stress on the wildlife that surrounds us and makes this state what it is, I do not feel that additional stress is called for.<br><br>I ride ATV's and am well aware to stay within the areas they are permitted. Non-permitted areas are closed for a reason. I have no wish to further degrade the landscape with indiscriminate use of my machine. This same argument can be applied to water usage as well. Please, please, I beg of you, do not lift the ban on jet skis on Kachemak Bay for the small percentage of people who use them. The ban was originally placed for a reason. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Becky Faunce | Becky Faunce <beckyfaunce907@gmail.com> | 2417 Leary Bay Circle Anchorage 99515 | Thank you for preserving your rules prohibiting jet skis from Kachemak Bay. Not every space needs to be open to those uses. Some spaces need to be preserved as areas for wildlife. Thanks for continuing your protection of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Hal Shepherd | Hal Shepherd <opbdhal@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 15332 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | See message: No Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Peter Ryan | Peter Ryan <pryan18082@aol.com> | | NO!<br><br>Do. Not allow . Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay-you know why.<br><br>•The inherent design and intended use of jetskis makes them incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, which is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br>•Boats and skiffs typically travel from point A to point B. Jetskis and other personal watercraft, on the other hand, are "thrillcraft" which can reach speeds over 60 mph. Furthermore, their jet drive propulsion systems allow them to travel in very shallow water, and prevents operators from steering once the throttle is released.<br>•Governor Dunleavy's actions now ignore our democratic process, and favor special interests who have access to the Governor's office most Alaskans do not. In 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The State revisited the issue in 2011 and 2016, and again, Alaskans spoke-out to maintain the ban. So, this is just bad government.<br>•Staff biologists and managers at the ADFG support the jetski ban in Kachemak Bay. They have reviewed all the scientific literature on the matter and they conclude the ban is appropriate and justified.<br>•The State is currently undergoing revisions to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, and any changes to jetski policy or rules should occur within the context of the management plan revisions.<br>•There are some uses that simply don't belong together. We cannot shoot guns in City limits, or drive snow machines or ATV's. We cannot use fireworks in the Kenai Peninsula Borough. That's because some activities are simply too unsafe or a nuisance to other users. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PWC's, and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is one area that should be left alone. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Tammy Thoms | Tammy Thoms <ak4thoms@gmail.com> | | We support opening to water craft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Josh Wisniewski | Josh Wisniewski <merganseranthro@gmail.com> | PO Box 20 Seldovia, Alaska 99663 | See message: Opposition to the repeal of the ban on PWC usage in the Kachemak BayFox River Flats CHAs.msg | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Holly Brennan | Holly Brennan <hollyfromhomer@gmail.com> | 1968 Uminski Cir Homer AK 99603 Homer AK 99603 | I am writing to urge ADF&G to keep in place the current ban on jet skis and other "personal watercraft" in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>As a lifelong Alaskan (born and raised in Homer, choosing to live here now), I appreciate that Kachemak Bay is protected.This year we're celebrating the 50th anniversary of Alaska's first state park, and here we are having to write letters, AGAIN, to say that we like the park's surrounding waters just the way they are.<br><br>Visitors and locals alike often use the word UNIQUE to describe this area. 99% of Alaskan waters are available for jet skiers. No one living or visiting here wants Kachemak Bay to be like everywhere else in Alaska. Crazy enough, no one living here asked for the ban to be lifted. It has been only two years since this ban was last challenged, with ADF&G concluding, again, that the ban was fully supported by science. Nothing has changed since and there is no legitimate reason for us to be considering a lift of this ban.<br><br>Please listen to Alaskans, not special interests. Keep the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area ban on personal watercraft in place. Like last time. And the time before that. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Peggy Lewerenz | Rodger And Peggy <rnp@gci.net> | | So was Rydel your stage name.<br><br>No. PWCs should not be allowed in Kachemak Bay. That would really help,the ecosystem. What is wrong with you. Oh, yeah, Dumbo Dumbleavy appointed such an experienced person to be on any commission or board in Fish and Game. So are your credentials that you hunt and fish. Kind of like the gal who likes cows in Palins admin. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Joe Wittkop | Joe Wittkop <mxzjoew@hotmail.com> | | Repealing the ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area should not be considered. The current regulations should be upheld or strengthened. It is unconscionable to justify any possible disturbance of a critical habitat area that could have a negative effect on the fish and game the area was created to protect. The public already has reasonable access to the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Personal watercraft users also already have reasonable access to other areas to recreate on jet skis. No justifiable need exists to allow personal watercraft into the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area at the risk of disturbance of a "critical area". It seems a limited number of people want to recreate there on jet skis but the activity should not be allowed just because a few people want to do it. Natural resources are the true heart and soul of Alaska and we are complacently fortunate to have much of the natural environment intact here. We should not take this for granted. We should not put the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area at risk of damage just to satisfy the unnecessary desire of a limited few people (who already have reasonable access to the area) to use personal watercraft there. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Jessica Miller | Jessica Miller <luvnsinak@yahoo.com> | | I support the repeal .... | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Sharon Wilson | Sharon Wilson <sk9wilson@gmail.com> | 60273 Bear Creek Drive Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to you to protest the proposed repeal of 5 AAC95.310, which prohibits the use of personal watercraft (aka jet skis) in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas (CHA) and Fox River Flats.<br><br>The current regulation was written with extensive public input, and is incredibly important to preserving the valuable habitat of our unique Kachemak Bay environment. The beauty and peacefulness of Kachemak Bay is the primary reason my husband and I retired to Homer 11 years ago. We love boating on Kachemak Bay and enjoy the tranquil beauty of the Bay from the windows and deck of our home. We own a 24-foot boat and use the Bay frequently to gather fish and other seafood for our sustenance. We also appreciate the development of the oyster farms, which would be adversely affected by extensive use of jet skis. We know the clean water and quiet of the oyster farm areas must be protected from the joy-riding activities of jet skiers.<br><br>Kachemak Bay waters are used extensively by commercial fishermen as well as by those who gather food for their families. The Critical Habitat Area is also used by scientists gathering information on our ocean waters and seaside habitats. Each spring, national and international birders arrive in Homer for the annual Shorebird Festival. This event brings financial benefits our local businesses, while building solid support for our incredible migratory birdlife populations throughout the year. And, ultimately, the Bay Critical Habitat Areas and Fox River Flats provide safe habitat for populations of whales, Orcas, fish, otters, seals, waterfowl, birds and wildlife throughout the area.<br><br>I strongly encourage the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to follow the existing regulations, created from previous reviews of this issue, and DO NOT change 5 AAC 95.310. Stick to your Guiding Principles and provide for the protection of wildlife and bird populations! In our times of budget austerity, the State of Alaska and local communities should not spend money to change regulations to control the jet skis, build a dock to launch the jet skis, and create an enforcement presence to protect our waters and beaches.<br><br>Do not allow jet skis to pollute our waters… Please! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Bernard Poplar | Bernard Poplar <smpoplar@gmail.com> | | Support the repeal | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Susan Rogers | Susanrogers98@gmail.com | 8641 Sultana Drive Anchorage, AK 99516 | I oppose lifting of the present ban on use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay waters in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, as proposed by Governor Dunleavy.<br>It appears that Governor Dunleavy responded to a special interest request to effect this change to present regulation and unilaterally put the regulation forward without consulting the management plans for the areas that have prohibited use of jet skis in these two area since 2000. Not only am I opposed to jet ski use in these two areas, but I do not support the manner in which the regulation change came about. There is a process of regarding the work of biologists and ecologists most familiar with the area and past assessments of their use, then using that as the scientific basis for changing a regulation. To put out the regulation change over the holidays, so that few would notice it and respond, and with a short turn around for a comment period (that was extended), and to disregard the work of scientists who maintain that the ban would still be best for the habitat is to denigrate the work of professionals, Alaska Department of Fish and Game staff and the general public. Comments in past instances have been addressed to the Commissioner or a Public Information Officer, not to a political appointee as in this case, Rick Green. In that Mr. Green is a member of the Personal Watercraft group requesting the change in regulation, in all likelihood he is not an impartial individual who should receive any comments from the public or management staff.<br>The ban in place since 2000 should remain in force. Jet skis are not like any other watercraft: they have variable speeds and irregularly swoop close to shore. The noise and motion does disturb both birds and fish that rely on stable conditions for nesting and foraging. The jet ski noise is enough to scare off fish that are prey to some birds or larger fish. This upset of the food chain in the local ecosystem will also have a deleterious effect on recreational fishing and wildlife viewing—activities that are enjoyed by many local folks and tourists. That many people will have a diminished experience in Kachemak Bay so that a few can pursue a transitory pleasure is not a balanced perspective in my view.<br>We have laws or regulations that ban other vehicles from certain places also. For example, all-terrain vehicles are not allowed on the roads. It is okay to ban jet skis from an area where they will injure wildlife and the environment. On Great Pond in Belgrade Lakes, Maine, jet skis have been banned from areas where loons are nesting. Prior to the ban, the loon population was declining, due to harassment by jet ski drivers. Since the ban about 15 years ago, the population has rebounded.<br>I sincerely hope that this proposed regulation will not be enacted. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Ed Berg | Ed Berg <edwardberg100@gmail.com> | | As someone who has lived on Kachemak Bay since 1982. I am writing to oppose the introduction of jet skis into the Bay. Some 99% of alaskan coastal waters are open to jet skis: there is plenty of room for this activity.<br><br>I am sure that the jet ski threats to wildlife have been well addressed in other letters, and I certainly second those concerns.<br><br>I am also concerned about jet ski noise. The noise level in Homer is very high in the summer with whining float planes on Beluga Lake, Ravn flights, helicopters and abundant fixed-wing activity. We really don't need to add jet ski noise to the present cacophony.<br><br>I am also concerned about jet ski crashes with submerged boulders at higher tides. There are numerous large (as much as 15 ft) glacial boulders scattered along the mud flats on the north shore of the Bay. These can be seen (but not very well) on the 1996 Google Earth imagery. At high tide there appears to be a lot of navigable water right up to shore, which would draw in fast moving jet skis like a magnet. Local skiff operators know well to avoid these waters and have nautical charts if they need to go close to shore. It's hard to imagine the driver of a high speed jet ski surviving a crash with one of these submerged boulders. Let's not give them the opportunity to make such mistakes. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Mike Cooney | mike cooney <mdcooney9@gmail.com> | | Please retain current regulations denying JetSki use in Kachemak Bay. Thank You. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Anchorage Audubon Society, Vivian Mendenhall | forwarded from Gov.'s office and Vivian Mendenhall <fasgadair@gmail.com> | PO Box 101161, Anchorage, Alaska 99510 | See message: FYI Personal Watercraft Use in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.msg | 1 | | | organization | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Todd Gustafson | todd gustafson <toddgustafson@yahoo.com> | Box 15294 Fritz Creek Ak | As a local resident and loving user of Kachemak bay, I am vehemently opposed to The so-called personal watercraft and the carnival/amusement park character that they bring to the aquatic environment where they are allowed. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Robbi M Mixon | Robbi M Mixon <robbimmixon@gmail.com> | | A strong majority of Alaskans supported a jetski ban in 2001, and again in 2011 and 2016. It feels like the Governor's office is ignoring the fact the state has spent considerable time and money over the past 3 years revising the management plan for the Kachemak Bay CHA, which would be the appropriate place to make changes to jetski use. It also feels like the Governor is ignoring the opinions of his expert staff at the ADFG, who believe the ban should remain in place. That's because the Governor is listening a small group of special interests with access to the Governor's office – and not the thousands of Alaskans who have spoken out to retain the natural values of Kachemak Bay.<br>•The inherent design and intended use of jetskis makes them incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, which is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br>•Boats and skiffs typically travel from point A to point B. Jetskis and other personal watercraft, on the other hand, are "thrillcraft" which can reach speeds over 60 mph. Furthermore, their jet drive propulsion systems allow them to travel in very shallow water, and prevents operators from steering once the throttle is released.<br>•Governor Dunleavy's actions now ignore our democratic process, and favor special interests who have access to the Governor's office most Alaskans do not. In 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The State revisited the issue in 2011 and 2016, and again, Alaskans spoke-out to maintain the ban. So, this is just bad government.<br>•Staff biologists and managers at the ADFG support the jetski ban in Kachemak Bay. They have reviewed all the scientific literature on the matter and they conclude the ban is appropriate and justified.<br>•The State is currently undergoing revisions to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, and any changes to jetski policy or rules should occur within the context of the management plan revisions.<br>•There are some uses that simply don't belong together. We cannot shoot guns in City limits, or drive snow machines or ATV's. We cannot use fireworks in the Kenai Peninsula Borough. That's because some activities are simply too unsafe or a nuisance to other users. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PWC's, and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is one area that should be left alone.<br>I really appreciate your time. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Cathy Parkman | Cathy Parkman <catparkman@gmail.com> | 857 Tyler Street<br>Port Townsend , WA<br>98368 | I just today became aware of the possible reversal of the ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas and was moved to weigh in.<br><br>Greater than 99% of Alaskan waters are open to jetski use and Kachemak Bay is accessible by many other forms of watercraft currently. At 60 mph , it is reported that a jet ski's sound level can exceed 115 dBA. According to the information from the National Pollution Clearing house, PWCs have unique operational characteristics (e.g., continually leaving and re-entering the water, recurrent changes in speed hence noise level and pitch, repetitive smacking of the personal watercraft hulls on water, tendency to circle in one spot recurrently) that make their noise more annoying than that of other boats.<br><br>This unique biome region of Alaska is immensely rich in wildlife, natural resources and beauty. It is critical habitat for the animals that live within and migrate through it. The impact on wildlife by the high pitched droning and the high speed projectile hulls on the water would likely be serious.<br><br>For the people living and recreating in Kachemak Bay, the unique beauty and solitude is it's draw. Having personally camped near the water where jet skis are legal, I can attest that the high pitched drone wakes you, keeps you awake , and there is no escaping it outdoors. I believe this diminished experience could impact the outdoor tourism that is so important to this region's economy.<br><br>I strongly oppose lifting the current ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Jimmy Jackson | Jimmy Jackson <jimmyrhett@gmail.com> | | I am a Katchemak Bay land/cabin owner and I oppose repeal of ADF&G's ban on the use of jet skis in the Critical Habitat Areas of Katchemak Bay. The resolution of the Homer City Council addressing this issue accurately describes the reasons that the ban should be maintained. I agree with those reasons. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Leilani ONeill | Leilani ONeill <leilanione.is@gmail.com> | Port Orford, OR | Hello and thank you for allowing us to express concern for the Critical Habitat Area of Katchemak Bay and for considering the voices of the many as well as the research confirming damage and harm to a unique and valuable area.<br>Opening this Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay for jetski use is a dangerous idea. It is a danger to others who use the area to recreate. Accidents happen and a simple accidental collide with a high powered jetski could easily result in a fatal accident. Please protect your citizens and young families who come to your town to enjoy the special and unique beauty of Kachemak Bay.<br>Kachemak Bay would not have the unique and unparalleled beauty of pristine wildlife that it does today if those before us had allowed the use of jetskis in the Critical Habbitat Area of Katchemak Bay.<br>Please, I urge you, keep the Critical Habitat Area of Katchemak Bay jetski free. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | William Dougherty | William Dougherty <pdougherty@gci.net> | 8520 Spendlove Dr. Anchorage, AK 99516 | I am a very long-time Alaska resident. For years I owned waterfront property on Kachemak Bay, though I do not now. I am adamantly opposed to jet-skis in Kachemak Bay for reasons that ought to be obvious to anyone familiar with Kaychemak Bay and jet-skis. Nonetheless, I will enumerate a few of them:<br><br>1. This issue has been addressed previously. Alaskans have spoken up repeatedly to keep jet-skis out of the bay. It is exceedingly frustrating to an average citizen to have to keep addressing this issue over and over. Does that only stop when the will of the majority of people is finally ignored and jet-skis are allowed?<br><br>2. Jetskis in Kachemak Bay will be used in the most obnoxious way possible. K-Bay is not a tropical resort where the weather is routinely benign, everyone is in vacation mode and engaging in similar activities, and people are only there for a short time. Jet-skiers in Kachemak Bay will tend to cluster and buzz around close to land. Everything they do will bet close to land, in the intertidal zone, in the most valuable wildlife habitat. I guarantee you that jet-skis will be buzzing in circles a short distance off the spit, until late at night. They will be disruptive to all animal life in the vicinity, thereby destroying activities like bird watching and observing animals like seals and otters. To a significant degree, the natural values of Kachemak Bay are at stake in this decision.<br><br>3. Jetskis are intended to be ridden for some people's idea of "fun." They are not modes of transportation. They are designed for adolescent thrills like jumping waves, making tight turns and spins, racing, running in shallow water and congregating in small areas. They are extremely noisy. They are almost uniquely equipped to threaten birds, marine mammals and irritate humans trying to enjoy any other activity in their vicinity.<br><br>4. The purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added). The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Jim Tolpin | Jim Tolpin <jim.tolpin@gmail.com> | 857 Tyler St Port Townsend, WA 98368 | While I don't own property along the Bay, I do visit there often as a tourist. If Jet ski's were allowed to operate there like they do in 99% of the rest of Alaska's waters, I would be extremely disappointed and would, in the future, likely stick closer to home (i.e. the San Juan Islands of WA state where these loud and polluting personal watercraft are banned to the relief of the majority of residents and visitors.)<br><br>Please maintain the ban of jetskis in Kachemak bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Ron Alban | Ron Alban <ron@albancpas.com> | 3150 C Street, Ste. 250 Anchorage, AK 99503 | I am writing to express my strong objection to the lifting of the ban on the use of "personal watercraft" as defined by the US Coast Guard and jet skis in the area under consideration. While it may be understandable that other personal watercraft may be operated responsibly and safely in the areas under consideration, jet skis are another matter. The vast majority of Alaskans oppose risking the safety and viability of our wildlife and their habitat in this irresponsible repeal effort. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Karen Rudd | Karen Ruud <keruudak@gmail.com> | | I take this opportunity to express my hope that Kachemak Bay remains free of jet skis. As it is designated a Critical Habitat Area it has been evaluated for its richness and diversity of marine life. Being able to maneuver at high speeds and closer to shore enables jet skis to access areas outside of usual boat traffic, disrupting quiet areas for the diverse life that inhabits the K Bay.<br>I am a property owner in Kachemak Bay . For several decades the impact of increased use has become increasingly evident on the waters of K Bay. Changes in numbers of allowed watercraft , including skiffs, water taxis and kayaks , demonstrate increased density and increased risk of safety infractions. Boat wakes consistently wash ashore with marked impact on tidal zones, vital zones for preserving the uniqueness of this Critical Habitat. Birds - murrelet, guillemots, various ducks- and marine mammals- sea and land otters, seals- would be at greater risk of a direct collision with jet skis since they are the near-shore residents.<br>Please acknowledge the voices of us opposing the jet ski ban being lifted. Kachemak Bay deserves to remain jet ski free. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Cari Sayre | Cari Sayre <caridave@mtaonline.net> | P.O. Box 711 Talkeetna, AK 99676 | I am adamantly opposed to the idea of allowing jet skis (PWCs) in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. The law is clear: the purpose of creating those special areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statute 16.20.500.<br><br>Rules such as this should not be changed on a political whim. The current status, in effect for 45 years, is due to many scientific studies which show that jet skis (PWCs) are incompatible with the special area's purpose.<br><br>There are many, many bodies of water in Alaska where jet ski riders can go to play — in reality, those areas constitute over 99% of Alaskan waters. In my opinion, the folks who ride those noisy watercraft don't really care what their surroundings are, or what kind of creatures are being impacted. They are simply thrill-seekers who are looking for a bit of an adrenaline rush.<br><br>My judgements come from years of summer visits to my family's cabin in northern Michigan, which is on a narrow channel between the mainland and an island. We have lost nearly our entire beach front to wake from PWCs — the big boats respectfully avoid the area because they know they can't get through. But the jet skiers want to go everywhere. So they do. They go where the fish used to be plentiful. They go where the common loons used to nest. They go where there used to be quiet spaces. We cannot let these "used to" scenarios happen in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>I have spent time in the Homer area off and on since 1973. Skiing up the Fox River in 2001 for an ascent of Truuli Peak was a highlight for my family, and a dry-run for a Denali expedition. We saw mountain goats, and tracks of bear, fox and swans on that late-April snow along the partially melted-out river.<br><br>Kachemak Bay is a treasured destination for people around the world, and it deserves the State's utmost consideration. Marine mammals, fish and birds already face increasing threats from ocean acidification, trash, temperature increases, climate change. Please, please do not add another threat to their lives. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Erin McKittrick | McKittrick, Erin <emckittrick@HomerElectric.com> | Seldovia | I live on Kachemak Bay, travel on Kachemak bay to get to and from my home (Seldovia), and recreate on Kachemak Bay. I would like to see the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay remain. If it is lifted, the state must provide money and personnel to enforce safety rules, and the boundary between waters where jet skis are allowed, and the state park waters (where they will still be prohibited). The park's single ranger cannot possibly enforce that.<br><br>While skiffs also have motors, the majority of skiffs in the bay are operated by their owners (who have experience driving them), for transportation or fishing (a low-speed activity where situational awareness is required). Jet skis may be rented by people who've never driven them before, and the fun of a jet ski is to move through terrain at high speed. This will create an unnecessary hazard for everyone else that uses the bay, from wildlife to kayakers, to fishermen and water taxi operators. At minimum, the state should study the impacts of jet skis vs. skiffs on wildlife, since I've seen no good data on relative impacts.<br><br>Kachemak Bay is a well-used and well-loved beautiful area. The current ban has not hurt local businesses and tourism, and water taxi operators and guides have seen a dramatic increase in traffic over the years. Changing the rules is unnecessary, and unwanted by most of the bay's current users. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Teena Garay | Pete and Teena Garay <peteandteena@gmail.com> | Homer Ak | Kachemak Bay is not Big Lake or like other sports area, we have critical habitat area and rely on them being protected. I like jet skis and have ridden them for fun but please not in Kachemak Bay. There's a reason it's been protected in the past, please keep it protected in the future. The animals and marine life are stressed out enough due to the environment change they don't need jet skies adding to it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Tom Parkman | Thomas Parkman <Thomas.Parkman@clearwaterpaper.com> | Peterson Bay, Alaska | I am not normally a believer in burdensome government regulations, but in the case of the Personal Watercraft Ban in Kachemak Bay I believe it has served us well, I vote to keep the current ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Catherine Sterling | C Sterling <aurorashibas@gmail.com> | PO Box 210643 Anchorage, AK 99521 | I support equal access on Alaska's waters. Please support the repeal of the Kachemak Bay PWC ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Peter Mjos | Gmail<br><2torsk@gmail.com> | Halibut Cove<br>Lagoon | I am a longtime Kachemak Bay property owner. Our property sits at the entrance to Halibut Cove Lagoon.<br>From there we have witnessed several egregious incidents with jet skis, waterfowl, sea otter and kayaks.<br>We have witnessed groups, and individuals, roaring around the entrance point into flocks of goldeneye, harlequin, guillemots, and gulls and deliberately maneuvering to startle and flagrantly harrass and scatter . This is outlaw behavior. Moreover, they seem to favor high speed cavorting over the “Flats”’<br>wide and broad tidelands, occasionally even leaving trenches in the tidelands.<br>The same behaviors have been perpetrated on and against sea otter, some with pups.<br>Since the ban these behaviors have been rare, although there have been some cowboys.<br>There have also been some incidents whereby an anchored megayacht will, without knowledge of the ban, launch overpowered and screaming jet skis. They , however, generally cease when reminded of the ban.<br>Leave no doubt, jetskis are more than simply a very unpleasant nuisance. They are an environmental hazard and threat. There is neither excuse nor reason to readmit them to the waters of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Alison Eskelin | Ali Eskelin<br><alison_eskelin@yahoo<br>.com> | | Please maintain the personal watercraft prohibition in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. These critical habitat areas have garnered additional protections since 2001 and to quote ADFG, "there is no new information that would warrant rescinding the prohibition (on PWC) and in fact the newer information highlights most of the concerns identified when the prohibition was adopted."<br><br>I am a user of Kachemak Bay and PWC use in the area would detract from my experience in the bay and would harm the tourism industry in Homer and the surrounding areas. A repeal of this ban has great potential to impact the habitat, wildlife and traditional user groups and such impacts cannot be easily mitigated. ADFG determined, with extensive public comment I might add, that PWC recreation, by nature of the speed, noise, and abrupt manuevers could be detrimental to the wildlife that use these criticals areas.<br><br>Please maintain the PWC prohibition in these critical habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Steve Wayne | steven wayne<br><americasfinehomes@<br>gmail.com> | 4359 Jill Place<br>South<br>Seattle WA.<br>98108 | this is an abominable idea! They are noxious, and dangerous to wildlife.<br>Please visit a tropical island soon! Find a beach that hasn't banned<br>jet ski's and listen to the din!<br>You wouldn't want these in your backyard! Neither do the residents of<br>Homer and Kachemak Bay!<br><br>NO jet ski's in Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | William Day | Billy Day<br><dayadventure@gmail.<br>com> | 65195 Nearly<br>Level Rd.<br>Homer, AK<br>99603 | subject line: No Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay<br>-- Need I say more? This is the most preposterous idea since they sent the draggers up the Bay in the late 70s. No thrill craft in the Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Lisa Oakley | Lisa Oakley<br><lisaoak@gmail.com> | 2510 Foraker Dr<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99517 | I’m writing to you to express my opinion that personal watercraft like jet skis do no belong in Kachemak Bay. It’s not just my opinion, but is written into Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 that the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to “protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose.” Jet skis are incompatible with the core purpose of the critical habitat status. As you probably already know scientific studies document this. Don’t let politics destroy one of Alaska’s gems.<br><br>Let Kachemak Bay retain its natural wealth to support the economic health of the Kenai Peninsula. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Deborah Oudiz | Debbie<br><doudiz@yahoo.com> | PO Box 15232<br>Fritz Creek, AK<br>99603 | Do not allow jet ski use on Kachemak Bay. I live in Homer and I’m concerned about the critical habitat of the bay and the disruption of our environment that jet skis would produce. There have been many article submitted to you on the degradation of critical areas by jet skis. Do not approve the use of jet skis that will ultimately degrade this area for many people and many species. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Kim McNett | Kim McNett <kmmcnett@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | I am writing to discourage you from changing the restriction of PWC in Kachemak Bay. Designated as a Critical Wildlife Habitat Area, Kachemak Bay is a unique place because we have chosen to offer special protections that favor wildlife and their habitat, with human activities that have a minimal impact on the ecosystems here. Jet skis pose a threat to the CWHA due to 1) Distribution to resting, feeding, and nesting wildlife 2) Lack of regulatory enforcement of violations 3) Degradation of the nature aesthetic that is a major selling point for already established local businesses and private users.<br><br>1) I have been a sea kayak and nature guide in Kachemak Bay for 10 years. I facilitate locals and visitors with immersive personal experiences in nature. In the process, I have learned a lot about human instinct, and in general, people's lack of awareness for wildlife behavior. As a guide, I witness the instinctive urge to approach wildlife in a disruptive manner. Most people do not know the distances needed to avoid causing an otter to dive, a bird to fly off, or a seal to slip off a rock, and they rarely self-ascribe their own boundaries. Most people aren't even aware that if they cause those behaviors, they are taking energy from the animal that it could otherwise use in survival, and their activity is degrading the appeal of the habitat to the animals.<br><br>People come to Kachemak Bay to see the abundant wildlife, they want to get close. Before starting a tour, I let people know that we will be viewing wildlife while trying to not disturb them, I need to be vigilant as a guide to prevent distributive behavior, even from a slow, human-powered kayak. From a skiff or a larger boat, I see hundreds of visitors approach Gull Island every day. Some know to go around the masses of floating murres. Others drive right through them, causing hundreds to dive and escape the oncoming threat. When visitors get to the island, they usually motor down and quietly watch, or slowly circle the island, appreciating the sounds of the birds. They take fuel-effieent and conservative routes near the island, then motor off to their other destinations.<br><br>Imagine the difference in behavior of a jet-skier. A jet-ski is not usually a vehicle used for utility or transportation, like a skiff or a larger motor boat. It is also not a quiet or slow activity like a kayak or a paddle board. Their appeal is in the activity of driving them rambunctiously. The appeal of a jet ski is to be able to go fast, jump wake, and spin circles, to easily go over here, now over there, now back over here again as a way to get a thrill. While it's not in my taste, I am not opposed to it on principle, but it is painfully obvious that these behaviors would disrupt wildlife in Kachemak Bay. Otters resting around the mouth of the | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Tom and Jane Meacham | Thomas E. Meacham <tmeacham@gci.net> | 9500 Prospect Drive Anchorage, Alaska 99507 | My wife and I are 53-year residents of Alaska. We are adamantly opposed to any change in existing regulations that would permit the use of personal watercraft (commonly known as "jet-skis") in areas of Kachemak Bay that are designated as Critical Habitat and are presently close to such uses.<br><br>The existing designation as Critical Habitat means that human activities that are known to be particularly disruptive to wildlife, particularly recreational activities that can be conducted in vast ares of the state that are not designated as Critical Habitat, have been properly excluded, and should continue to be.<br><br>The argument of "equal recreational access," when balanced against the purposes of Critical Habitat designation, simply carries no weight. Just as motorcycles are not allowed on bicycle and pedestrian trails, or snow machines on ski trails, outdoor recreation itself is not being prohibited, only the user's choice of an inappropriate vehicle for the particular location.<br><br>We urge that the existing closure of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area to the recreational use of personal watercraft be continued, and not be repealed.<br><br>Please include these comments among those submitted to you regarding the proposed regulation change. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Miranda Weiss | Miranda Weiss <mirandaweiss@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 1498, Homer, AK 99603 | I'm writing to urge you to maintain the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I have lived in Homer for 20 years, and am raising my two daughters here. The current effort to overturn the long-held ban on PWCs is an overreach of Governor Dunleavy's administration. No change should be made to this law.<br><br>Research shows that PWCs are different than boats and have a unique impact on waterways and coastlines. This is why PWCs have been banned from countless waterbodies across the country, and many states have restricted their use to certain areas.<br><br>Furthermore, an overturn of the ban would put an impossible burden on the scant personnel at Kachemak Bay State Park, where, in park waters, PWCs would continue to be prohibited. Park staff can barely keep area trails maintained. There simply wouldn't be the resources to enforce Park rules related to PWCs. There's a zero fiscal note on the proposed rule change, but this ignores a real and expensive burden to Kachemak Bay State Park.<br><br>My family and I are recreational boaters on Kachemak Bay. We like to fish, hike, camp, and play in and around the Bay. Like many people who live here and visit, we value the aspects of the Bay that led the area to be designated a Critical Habitat Area—including intact wildlife habitat and undisturbed coastline. PWCs pose a threat to these values.<br><br>Please maintain the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Do not hesitate to contact me about this letter if you have any questions. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Barbara Carlson | B Carlson <carlson.bc@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | Thank you for extending the comment period so that those who missed the deadline could address the call to weigh in. I oppose the changing of the Alaska Administrative Code to repeal the prohibition of the use of personal watercraft, or Jet Skis, in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. The shallow, near-shore waters on the south side fo the bay are especially important to vulnerable wildlife species that the critical habitat areas were set up to protect. This would likely be a place Jet Skis would want to go, which would jeopardize the well-being and survival of said wildlife species. Again, I opposed the changing of the AAC to repeal the prohibition of the use of personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in and for your consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Michael Hawfield | Michael Hawfield <mike.hawfield45@gmail.com> | | As a 20 + year resident of Homer, I strongly oppose allowing such high-powered motor craft as jet-skis to operate recreationally in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat. The long-standing prohibition of these watercraft must be maintained. These machines are detrimental to the wildlife of the Bay area, above all, but they also impede on the thriving "quiet sports and recreation" that is deeply valued (and valuable) throughout the Bay.<br>Please do not allow jet skis to operate in Kachemak Bay.<br>Thank you for listening, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Friends of Alaska National Wildlife Refuges | David Raskin <davidc.raskin@me.com> | | See message: Personal watercraft ban.msg in PWC4 | 1 | | | organization | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Marilyn Kirkham | Meme Kirkham <mkirkham65@gmail.com> | P. O Box 2111 Homer, Alaska 99603 | My last 40 years has been spent boating in, hiking around and viewing the magnificent Kachemak Bay. On a daily basis it has been part of my lifestyle and quality of life.<br><br>We owe the quality of our precious Bay to nature, topography and the natural phenomenon of currents and tides that enter to cleanse and refresh the pure sea water Bay. We also owe the current state of this incredibly unique habitat to the the law that recognized this - Alaska Statues 16.20.500 - that protects and preserves this area - the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitats. By restricting all other uses "not compatible with the primary purpose of the law to protect and preserve habitat areas crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife" we have the hope of this area going forward as a rich resource to sustain itself and future generations of Alaskans and visitors.<br><br>Let us keep going forward with this history of management and not be deterred - we have too much to loose by not sticking to the foresight of this plan and the Alaska law that provides us with this incredible opportunity to take care of this amazingly rich world class habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Vicki Gerken | Vicki Gerken <alaskavickiirwa49@gmail.com> | 3820 E 84th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99507 | See message: PLEASE, Repeal the Ban of Personal Watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC4 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Bill Watkins | Bill Watkins <watkinsnp@hotmail.com> | Anchorage & Denali Park, Alaska | See message: Proposed Repeal of Ban of PWC (jet skis) into Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Richard L. Gustafson | Richard Gustafson <rlgust71ak@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 4144, 1039 Barnett Place Homer, Alaska 99603 | I am **opposed** to the proposed repeal of the ban on jet skis or personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat. There is no new science to show that repealing the ban is prudent. As a resident and user of Kachemak Bay I feel they would cause more problems and and stress to fish and wild life in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat. Additionally, I am concerned about the safety and negative economic impacts of allowing jet skis it the bay and potential conflicts with established users. I agree with Homer City Council 's resolution 20-007(S), urging the State of Alaska to retain the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat. **The proposed repeal is bad public policy!!** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Andy Josephson | Andrew Josephson <andrewjosephson2003@yahoo.com> | 4859 Pavalof Street A/A 99507 | I strongly oppose the proposed rule-making that would allow for PWCs in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I have every belief that these PWCs would interfere with birds and fauna that live in Kachemak Bay. As a consequence, it would secondarily impact a thriving tourism economy that visits Kachemak Bay.<br><br>AS 16.20.500, the enacting law for Kachemak Bay, reads that the area's purpose is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br><br>I have no idea how the PWC rulemaking would be consistent with this statute. I think it would invite, yet again, additional litigation against the State of Alaska.<br><br>The science clearly shows that Jetskis and PWS's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>I surely worry about the morale at ADF&G if its experts and scientists are disregarded in place of a perceived political agenda.<br><br>Given that 99% of Alaska is open to JetSkis, it's ok--really, it's ok--to continue to disallow the PWCs in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Willy Dunne | Willy Dunne <wdunne907@gmail.com> | 40508 Waterman Rd. Homer, AK 99603 | I oppose the repeal of 5 AAC 95.310. These regulations were enacted after a thorough deliberative process that included an extensive public comment process.<br><br>The process being used now to repeal these regulations is flawed due to limited time for public comment, what appears to be deliberate timing of the process around major holidays, and the lack of formal public hearing.<br><br>In two local Kachemak Bay area public meetings, the public overwhelmingly opposed repeal of the regs. After hearing from the public, the Kachemak Bay State Parks Citizens Advisory Board voted unanimously to submit a resolution opposing the repeal. The Homer City Council also passed a similar resolution after an open, public process. The City Council also requested an extension of public comment period to 90 Days which your agency did not grant.<br><br>A process to review the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas Management Plans is ongoing and potential recommendations for changes will be released at a future date. No regulation changes should be made until that process is completed.<br><br>The AK Department of Fish and Game has revisited these regulations several times since enacted and has always acted to retain them. The 2017 ADFG memo spells out the reasoning for retaining the regulations and cites multiple scientific publications supporting the regulations. When I asked you for studies supporting the repeal, you replied the proposal was based on the opinions of staff. You later clarified that it was based on the opinion of staff who are aware of the studies and literature, yet you provided no documentation.<br><br>These regulations must not be repealed, especially without adequate public process and without revised management plans in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Chris Scudder | chris scudder <scudderchris@hotmail.com> | | Please review all the ban on PWC. I live on the Kenai peninsula and would love to be able to go fishing off my Jet ski in the waters in my backyard in my backyard. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Kelsey Hardy-Place | Kelsey <hardyplace@gmail.com> | | My name is Kelsey Hardy-Place and I am a Homer resident. In the summers I earn my living working for True North Kayak Adventures as a guide. I spend nearly seven days a week on the waters of Kachemak Bay. I do not approve of any changes made to the current restrictions of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay waters.<br>I know you have many statements to read but please consider these points:<br><br>• TOURISM is a huge portion of Homer's economy. I have an in depth interaction with many of these tourists. Wildlife and the feel of wilderness are the main draws for most travelers. Yes I know much of Kachemak Bay, especially the area most tourists visit is not truly wilderness compared to other parts of Alaska. But for many visitors it's a huge change from their daily worlds and the quiet beauty of our waters is highly valuable to them.<br><br>• The CRITICAL HABITAT AREA is there for a reason. We've already determined that the area is valuable and fragile enough to need protection, the research is there.<br>Yes, PWC technology has improved<br>Yes, many skiffs are worse in terms of pollution<br>BUT that does not change the fact that more PWC means more of a negative impact.<br><br>In my opinion, the comparison to small outboard motors doesn't not mean we should allow more jet skis, but rather we should look towards improving our skiffs.<br><br>• Realistically, the area opening to PWC if the repeal goes through is unclear and difficult to determine. The borderlines of the state park are very unclear and unintuitive. Regulation would be difficult and improbable.<br><br>Please try to look beyond the political ties of this issue and truly consider what is the best option for Kachemak Bay, the incredibly valuable resource that we are all so lucky to have and responsible to care for. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Scott Bartlett | Scott Bartlett <scottgbartlett@gmail.com> | Fritz Creek, Alaska | I am writing to state my opposition to the effort to open Kachemak Bay waters to jetskis and personal watercraft. As a designated Critical Habitat Area, Kachemak Bay is worth more than a thrill ride which could have lasting negative impacts. The unique biology and ecosystem of Kachemak Bay have already been recognized as a critical habitat and a estuarine research reserve. It is crucial to preserve the natural state of the Bay. We know this ecosystem is delicate and that high speed craft operating in shallow waters can easily damage the benthic environment that support all of the bay. The existing ban on PWC is not just about the "here and now", it is preserving this ecosystem for the future. I am writing on behalf of a family of 5. I want my children, and their children, to be able to enjoy and learn from the natural splendor of Kachemak Bay. Let's not throw that away for a thrill ride. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Doug Reid | Douglas Reid <reiddouglasa@gmail.com> | | I do not support the repeal of the PWC ban. Kachemak Bay has a unique combination of wildlife species that are vulnerable to disturbance and easy accessibility, which is why it was designated as critical habitat. Alaska has a long precedence of limiting activities in certain ares to protect impotant resources. The benefit from tourism to the Kachemak Bay area, due to the presence of marine mammal amd bird species, is an important part of the economy. Local businesses have invested time and money in advertising based on the presence of these species and undisturbed habitat. To endanger that investment in favor of a user group that would be unlikely to generate the same level of economic benefit is counter productive. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | clyde vicary | clyde <vicary@alaska.net> | | Please respect the integrity of one of the few special areas that are exempt from jet skis and do not let them back into Kachemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Lois Dianne Spence-Chorman | Dianne Spence-Chorman <diannespence@gmail.com> | 39960 Highview Court<br>Homer, Alaska 99603 | As a 40-year resident of Kachemak Bay, I would like to go on record as supporting our majority preference for a ban on the use of personal watercraft on the bay. I witnessed the destruction of habitat, wildlife, and peace of mind for family campers as PWCs ruined a riverside campsite in Florida near where my parents used to reside. A serene area for fishing and family activities turned into a raucous playpen for an select group of overstimulated man-boys playing with their power toys.<br><br>Those of us who live here welcome everyone who wants to enjoy the beauty of our bay. We merely ask to be allowed to protect our resource. Based upon your interview with our local radio station, I doubt you are listening. Nevertheless, we must try to be heard. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | no name | 9168026163@mms.att.net | | See message: Untitled.msg in PWC4 (attached image file of document) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Susan Van de Riet & Dan Brassil | Susie Van de Riet <svdr1@sbcglobal.net> | St. Louis, MO | I'm am emailing to express my concern about the possibility for the jet ski ban to be lifted in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. My husband and I made the journey for a vacation in Alaska from our home in the midwest a couple of years back. One of the highlights of our trip included the beautiful, quiet solitude while kayaking in Kachemak Bay Habitat and seeing abundant wildlife/plant life. We are concerned that if this ban is lifted, not only would there be noise pollution taking away from this experience, but there would be damaging impacts on the wildlife & ecosystems. For example, we saw so many sea otters (among other animals). I suspect that sea otters would not "hang out" feeding at the surface with their young if they are at risk of being hit by a loud, speedy jet ski. This will also likely cause damage to the underwater ecosystems and aquatic plants that seem harder and harder to find in the wild as time goes on. These habitats need to be protected. Please keep the jet skis out! | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Mary | Yoshiko Hill <alicenwonderland22@sbcglobal.net> | | I am reaching out to express my firm belief that jet skis should not be allowed in Kachemak Bay. As Kachemak is the only marine habit left in Alaska to not allow jet skis, repealing the ban risks disruption to the local ecosystem and livelihoods of Homer residents and could lead to the deterioration of the unique environmental features that attracts many non-locals to the area.<br><br>The repeal could have long-lasting and irreversible negative effects on the Kachemak Bay and homer overall. I firmly believe that the risk-to-reward ratio does not support the repeal and strongly urge you to reconsider. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Joel Cooper | Joel Cooper <cooperjoela@gmail.com> | PO Box 3585 Homer, AK 99603 | I have lived in Homer for 28 years and have recreated, fished, and as an environmental scientist, have studied fish and wildlife populations in Kachemak Bay. Please do not repeal 5 AAC 95.310 which prohibits personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>The purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500.<br><br>Jetskis and personal watercraft (PWC) are not like skiffs and boats. With overpowered 200-300 horsepower engines, Jetskis are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water and congregate in small areas. As a result, they pose unique threats to birds, marine mammals and humans alike. They do not belong in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>I also disagree with this process. This is not how the state statue intended to revise Critical Habitat Area Management Plans. This process is wrong. Why are you trying to change an Alaska Statute this way? This is not the Alaskan way! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Lynda Raymond | Lani Raymond <lanibirder@gmail.com> | 41640 Gladys Ct Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Comments on 5ACC 95.301.msg in PWC5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | George Gehlert | George Gehlert <gehlertgeorge@gmail.com> | | See message: Fwd: Intent to lift the ban on Jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC5 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Sarah Goldstein | Sarah Goldstein <sarah.goldstein1535@gmail.com> | | Please keep jet skis banned in Kachemak Bay! The habitats living there are more important than people being able to ride jet skis. Jet skis are allowed in plenty of places already. The damage they would cause to the wildlife would be irreversible and a huge mistake!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Giuseppe Ricciardi | antonio ricciardi <tncricciardi@gmail.com> | | Our Household supports the ban!<br>No to jet skis! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Jennifer Stow | Jennifer Stow <n2alaska@hotmail.com> | | Please keep the ban in place. There is plenty of other places in the area to ride. Kachemak Bay is a unique and wonderful place to go and the noise and disruption of these machines would absolutely ruin the Bay. Not to mention the wildlife and habitat that could potentially be destroyed, it's just not worth the risk. 99% of Alaska's waters are open to PWC, let's just keep this little corner protected.<br>Thank you for taking the time to read each and every comment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Linda Sorrick | Linda Sorrick <stork_58@yahoo.com> | | Mr. Green, I am opposed to jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Years ago friends and I were kayaking on a lake in Nikiski when half a dozen jet skiiers started racing around the lake. One of them came very close to one of my friends and leaning sideways on his jet ski made a curving sweep next to her that sent up a spray but which if he had leaned over any more might've taken her out. When both parties landed ashore we confronted the group of jet skiiers. They were drunken kids, late teens or early twenties. The experience put us off kayaking on lakes where jet skis are allowed. They are dangerous instruments in the wrong hands. I would urge you to keep the ban on jet skis. Thank you for your consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Jennifer Jordon | Jennifer Jordon <jordonjennifer0@gmail.com> | | Writing in regard to the pending jet ski ban in Homer. Certainly would love to keep this area protected and tranquil, the amazing experience out on the water would be not only effected by jet skis but would also pollute the waters<br><br>Hope this sanctuary stays clean and pure for generations to come. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Lela Ryterski | Lela Ryterski <lelaryterski@gmail.com> | | I believe the safety and preservation of the sensitive habitat in Kachemak Bay should be protected and valued and cared for to the best of our ability.<br><br>Keep jetskis out. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Ron Wallace | Ron <ron@equinemanagement.com> | | Please keep the ban on jet skis in Kamchemak Bay!<br><br>When we visit your wonderful state this area is one of our favorites. Jet skis would destroy the pease and tranquility of such a special area | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Andreas and Katrin | Andreas Fischer <fischer-muelheim@gmx.de> | Germany | we hope you are fine and send you warm greetings from germany!<br>A lot of times we speak about our kajaktour with you at Kachemak Bay. It was one of our most wonderful experiences!<br>Watching the animals of the sea, the birds,otters and bolteagles from the Kajak in this quiet and peaceful environment was something very special!<br>Unfortunately we hear now about plans for jetskiing in this area.<br>That's terrible!<br>We hope that this plans will not become true.<br>For the nature, for the animals and last not least for the people, who come every year in this wonderful area to find a quiet and peaceful place to relax!<br><br>All the best for you and for Katchemak Bay! | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Chuck Ash | Chuck Ash <wildflyak@gmail.com> | 11300 Polar Dr<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99516 | I am writing to weigh in against the proposal to allow PWC (jet skis) in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area.<br>This use has been publicly polled and overwhelming opposed by the public. It has been reviewed periodically and the ban upheld by the ADF&G several times the establishment of the KBCH area. The use of PWC's in that area is incompatible with the stated purposes of the Kachemak Critical Habitat Area.<br>On a personal level, I know this area well as I have been a property owner in Kachemak Bay (Sadie Cove) for nearly 40 years and I can state that the use of PWC there is in direct opposition to all of the reasons I had for deciding to buy the property in the first place.<br>I am further at a loss to understand the governor's reason in proposing what is obviously counter to the established will of the people and the stated rule of law. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Michael R. Wirschem | Mike Wirschem <mikewirschem@gmail.com> | | I ask that the restriction on PWCs in Kachemak Bay remain in force. K-bay is a particularly pristine natural habitat for marine mammals, birds, fish and other game that should remain protected from the noise, exhaust, speed and turbulence PWCs disrupt nature with. K-bay is not Big Lake, Campbell Lake, Lake Louise or a place for motorized craft riders to rally. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Paula J.S. Martin, Ph.D. | Paula Martin <pjsmartin@gmail.com> | 1231 Melody Rose Lane<br>Box 271<br>Homer, AK<br>99603 | First, thank you for your time and energy on this issue. I do not envy your position.<br>Second, I am an Alaskan living in Homer and Homer is where I plan to spend my retirement years.<br>Third, I believe the Critical Habitat designation for Kachemak Bay has been a strong positive to protect our natural resources and to protect the economy of the Homer region. Therefore I believe the restriction of personal watercrafts (i.e. jet skis) should remain. My reasons are as follows:<br>a. Economic. There are large numbers of tourist visitors that come to Homer to see birds and marine mammals (e.g., the Annual Sea Bird Festival). These would be lessened, as the noise from the jet skis will scare away more animals and disturb the natural experience the visitors come for. In addition, there are a number of small business that rent kayaks. Kayak rentals and jet skis do not mix well.<br>b. Ecological. The noise and speed of jet skis are unlike any other water craft. The whales and otters and sea birds are not adapted to those noises. Maintaining a lower noise environment is a rational, intelligent conservation choice.<br>c. Regulatory. As the purpose of a Critical Habitat designation is to "enhance wildlife" and "to minimize the degradation and loss of habitat values," jet skis do not fit those goals, particularly as jet skis have not had a place in the habitat for decades. In addition, as jet skis are not a watercraft that individuals will use for fishing, jet skis will not open up the resource for more users.<br>For these reasons, and because jet skis are fundamentally just an entertainment/recreational vessel, not a practical fishing vessel nor a practical transport vessel, please do not change the existing policy. Do not allow jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Dave Erikson | David Erikson <derikson@alaska.net> | P.O. Box 15204<br>Fritz Creek, AK<br>99603 | See message: Kachemak Jet Ski Ban.msg in PWC5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Catherine Kottra | Cathy Wick <cathy.wick@me.com> | Anchorage Little Tutka Bay | I am writing to urge you to reconsider repealing the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat areas.<br><br>The state agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, in charge of these areas has TWICE indicated that these are sensitive areas in need of protection stating in their management plan that it is to " protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetration of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." The last revision of the plan was in 2017 and there has not been a review since. Kachemak Bay is a sensitive environment for fish, marine organisms, marine mammals and bird life. And the great majority of Alaskans has always agreed and supported this position.<br><br>The term Personal Watercraft is merely a euphemism for a vehicle which, unlike traditional boats, is designed and advertised for high speed riding, circling and wave jumping. These vehicles are noisy and travel at high speeds close to shore disrupting the shoreline and intertidal zone, which contain an abundance of smaller marine organisms, terrorizing marine mammals and waterfowl. Along with the noise pollution they will be a safety hazard for kayakers and fisherman in the Bay. They will also impact the local residents, both permanent and seasonal, who have chosen to live in the bays and coves and tourists who wish to see wildlife in a natural setting. All will now have to tolerate the noise pollution, safety concerns and degradation of the marine environment that jet skis entail.<br><br>For years Ms. Potts and the jet ski lobby have been agitating to rescind the ban on jet skis in the Bay. Suddenly it appears to be a "done deal." What has changed? Have the biologists with Fish and Game changed their stance? Has there been an outcry from a majority of Alaskans asking for this change? Or only a small persistent lobby who have gained the ear of the governor citing fairness and equal access. 99% of Alaskan waterways are already open to jet skis. And there is ample precedent for areas being closed to certain uses due to impacts on animal population negating the fairness and equal access arguments.<br><br>Do not overturn what has been an essential element in a well thought out plan for the Kachemak Bay Critical Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Kammi matson | Kammi Matson <ikammi@gmail.com> | | I'm sure you've been inundated with emails about this issue. And honestly, your mind is probably already made up. I can't imagine I can come up with a more compelling argument than the one you already believe to be true. So, I'll just say, as a lifelong Alaskan, and a water sport enthusiast - I've paddledboarded most of the waterways on the Kenai Peninsula - inland and on the Bay a I believe that jets skis have no place in Kachemak Bay. They are a danger to the people using them as well as our environment. Please vote against them and uphold the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Terri Possehl | Terri Possehl <terri.possehl@gmail.com> | | For all the reasons you have probably heard from numerous others, including dangers to wildlife, dangers to environment, noise/nuisance to humans, among others, I am opposed to removing the ban that would allow Jetskis in Kachemak bay.<br><br>I have been a frequent tourist in Homer, Seldovia, and the coves in the Bay, appreciating the natural beauty. I have been diagnosed with PTSD and the calming effect of this area would be destroyed with the addition of JetSki's and other thrillseeking watercraft.<br><br>Our vast state has many diverse areas. Not everything from the southeast will be part of the experience in the interior. The wild life in Prudhoe bay is different than the wildlife in Bethel and different from the wildlife in Sitka. The activities for residents and tourists are different as well. There are other places in Alaska where people can ride these types of watercraft. Any benefit for removing this ban and allowing these types of watercraft in Katchemak Bay, would be overwhelmingly outweighed by the negative impact that would happen as a result.<br><br>I ask you, respectfully, please do not remove this ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Katrina Graf | Katrina Jensen <katrinaajensen@gmail.com> | | Please keep the jet skis out of Kachemak Bay! The otters can't vote so they need you to do the right thing and help them! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Steffen-Malik Høegh | S-M Hoegh <psykolog@me.com> | Denmark | Please remain true to your good name "Green" and keep protecting the Kachemak Bay from Jet Skis.<br><br>As a frequent guest in Alaska - and if you want naturalist keep coming back do maintain the ban on Jet Skis in the most prestine natue of AK. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Lindsay Martin | Lindsay Martin <cellbiologyhelp@gmail.com> | Homer (40175 Alpenglow Circle | My name is Lindsay Martin. I live in Homer (40175 Alpenglow Circle). I am writing to urge you to not allow personal water crafts in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I believe PWCs and other boating vessels are very different. The safety risk, sound, speed, and habitat disruption are much higher with PWCs than other vessels.<br><br>I recently spent time at the head of the bay, biking along Kachemak Selo (up in the critical habitat area by the Sheep and Fox river). I regularly enjoy recreating in and around Kachemak Bay. The area is beautiful, and many people enjoy it. I'm all for people getting out in nature, and being on the water. However I believe PWCs are not appropriate, as they will disrupt the wildlife and habitat in a way that other motorized boats do not. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Thomas Pease | thomaspease@alaskan.net | Anchorage | See message: Oppose Jet Skis in Kbay.msg | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Maureen A. Johnson | Maureen Johnson <ohana.alaska@mac.com> | Kasitsna Bay | I hope I'm not late in writing, but I wanted to get my opinion in regarding any change to the current regulations to allow use of "personal water-crafts" aka: jet-skis, on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>We own waterfront land on Kasitsna Bay, and my husband's family has owned land on the Spit as well as Bishop's Beach for over 50 years. The area is already open to all responsible users.<br><br>I believe we all need to care for the eco system and marine life that Kachemak Bay brings us. Jet skis have know problems: they cause high amounts of pollution, their fuel contaminates water and can collapse the aquatic life in the Bay, they can be reckless and accidentally hurt marine creatures, small crafts lead to small broken parts lost in the ocean which are dangerous for fish, and do I even need to mention the horrors of noise pollution?!?<br><br>So I do oppose any change in the regulations to allow an unnecessary and dangerous threat to Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Thank you for allowing our input! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Megan O'Neill | Megan O'Neill <moneill5450@gmail.com> | 3476 Main St Homer, AK 99603 | I live in Homer, Alaska and have been a resident of the State of Alaska for 39 years. I am opposed to jet skis and personal watercrafts (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats are critical habitat areas especially for birds, wildlife and fish. Jet skis and PWC have huge engines and are intended to be driven fast, make tight turns and run in shallow areas. As a result they are far more dangerous to birds, marine mammals, fish and humans than skiffs or boats. There are many areas available in Alaska for jet skis and PWC, but destroying a critical habitat area is unacceptable.<br><br>The City Of Homer is opposed and ADFG has failed to perform any analysis on the impact of jet skis and PWC on our town or the environmental impact on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Jeanne Parker | Jeanne Parker <jeannemena@gmail.com> | Kachemak Bay | I strongly oppose repealing the ban on Personal Watercrafts in Kachemak Bay! When they were first banned that action was thoroughly researched and strongly supported. Nothing has changed that would make lifting the ban a good idea, and Kachemak Bay is an environmental gem that needs to be protected!<br>Personal watercraft comprise less than 10 percent of all U.S. vessels, and are involved in 55 percent of all collisions. The American Medical Association reported: "The rate of emergency department-treated injuries related to (personal watercraft) is about 8.5 times higher than the rate of those from motorboats."<br>Jet skis are rudderless. And when the throttle is off, a speeding jet ski is like a car on ice. It can't stop, and the driver has no control.<br>Jet skis are noise is a problem.<br>A typical Jet Ski has an average top speed of 65 miles per hour. There is no possible way that any meaningful marine mammal protection enforcement could patrol the entire Kachemak Bay and protect our marine mammals from this new, high-speed user group.<br>Kachemak is the wrong place for jet skis nand the current ban needs to stay intact. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Scott Meyer | Scott Meyer <fiddlemeyer@gmail.com> | 40210 Alpenglow Circle Homer, AK 99603 | I urge you to reject the proposal to open Kachemak Bay to personal watercraft. The question of allowing personal watercraft there has been considered repeatedly and rejected, even by ADF&G, based on studies showing impacts on wildlife. To me, the issue isn't whether personal watercraft themselves cause impacts, but more the way they are operated. They are made for play, rather than for utility, and therefore don't typically travel in a straight line like most boats. Their unpredictable trajectories are more likely to cause stress or collisions with wildlife. As a boater and frequent user of Kachemak Bay, I don't relish the thought of having to look out for het another fast moving water hazard. Personal watercraft are allowed in nearly all lakes and most salt waters in Southcentral Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Anna Drew | Anna Drew <drewa2@udayton.edu> | | Please continue the jet ski ban in the Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay. Please preserve the wildlife and the peace found in this special place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Terri Possehl | Terri Possehl <terri.possehl@gmail.com> | | I am opposed to removing the ban that would allow jet-skis in Kachemak bay.<br><br>I have been a frequent tourist in Homer, Seldovia, and the coves in the Bay, appreciating the natural beauty and wildlife of the area. I have been diagnosed with PTSD and the calming effect of this area has been instrumental in my coping and healing. I sincerely believe it would be destroyed with the addition of jet ski's and other thrillseeking watercraft.<br><br>Our vast state has many diverse areas. Not everything from the southeast will be part of the experience in the interior. The wild life in Prudhoe bay is different than the wildlife in Bethel and different from the wildlife in Sitka. The activities for residents and tourists are different as well. There are other places in Alaska where people can ride these types of watercraft. Any benefit for removing this ban and allowing these types of watercraft in Kachemak Bay, would be overwhelmingly outweighed by the negative impact that would happen as a result.<br><br>I ask you, respectfully, please do not remove this ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Lynne Seville | scylla@gci.net | | Please accept my comments opposing the repeal of 5 AAC 95.310, which bans personal use watercraft from the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. Based on my experience fishing and boating around southcentral Alaska over the past 30 years, personal use watercraft are not a compatible use in these critical habitat areas.<br><br>I have been and am still a frequent visitor to Kachemak Bay and have also spent a lot of time boating and fishing in Resurrection Bay and out of Whittier in Passage Canal. The waters of Kachemak Bay are home to a variety of marine plants, fish, birds and marine animals that live and shelter in this area. That is why the area was designated as a critical habitat area.<br><br>I have watched as personal watercraft became more and more common in Resurrection Bay and Passage Canal and have witnessed their erratic and wildlife disturbing use. Personal use watercraft are much faster, change direction very quickly, are loud, kick up a big wake and are commonly operated in the shallow near-shore waters in tight patterns. Unlike the boats we share these waters with which are normally just transiting through the area, jets skis are usually recreating in protected near-shore waters. Their use is most often at extreme speeds and unpredictable patterns. I have personally ridden on and driven jet skis and wave runners in other locations and certainly enjoyed their abilities, however, the same abilities that provide a thrilling ride are not compatible with critical wildlife habitat areas. These personal watercraft characteristics (ability to operate in near-shore shallows, noise, speed, wake, and maneuverability) make them far more damaging and disruptive to the wildlife than other motorized watercraft. I also witnessed the addition of fuel supplies strapped to these PWC to allow their riders to go farther. The fuel supplies are vulnerable to coming loose and spilling into the water.<br><br>The legislature passed statute, AS 16.20.500, which directs the Department of Fish and Game to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose. The Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas are, by statute, especially crucial areas. Personal use watercraft were banned many years ago because the Department found that their use was not compatible with the statute's primary purpose of protecting the habitat. There is no new, nor existing data/information that suggests use of personal use watercraft is compatible with protecting critical habitat. My personal observations have been that they are certainly NOT compatible with critical habitat. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | John Strasenburgh | John <jsandrw@matnet.com> | PO Box 766 Talkeetna, AK 99676 | See message: Public comment re proposed lifting pwc ban.msg in PWC5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Mark Carroll | Markdmarkcarroll@outlook.com | Anchorage,Ak. | I support the repeal of the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. The pwc operators should have access restored.<br>I have spent warm summer days on Big Lake and on Alaskan salt water. To think that Kachemak Bay would become a great big Big Lake scene is quite a stretch. I hardly notice them out of Whittier and Seward. The salt water operators I know are long time responsible Alaskans that share a great love and respect for Alaska`s environment.<br>The issue is equal access to Alaska for Alaskans. Both sides on this issue share respect for the Bay. Im hopeful both sides can respect each others use. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Matt Johnson | mattj@alaskan.com | Anchorage, Alaska | As a lifelong Alaskan of sixty years, I strongly oppose any change in current regulations that would allow the use of personal watercraft (jet skis) on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>What problem does the proposed change seek to resolve? The argument that this change will give all users "equal access" to the area has no merit. The area is already open to all responsible users. However, as with many recreational areas in the state, there are rules in place that protect the area from damage. Many have pointed out the current restrictions on engine size on the Kenai River, ban of motorized craft on many lakes and creeks, ban of certain motorized vehicles on State-maintained roads, to name a few examples.<br><br>I join the majority of voices who are opposed to this reckless and unnecessary threat to a treasured public asset. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Lisa Fane | Lisa Fane <lisafane@gmail.com> | | I would like to add my voice to the many other voices who have been speaking in opposition to the use of Jetskis in Katchemak Bay Critical Habitat. It is the pristine beauty and natural state of the area that makes it so special and which would be most threatened by the use of Jetskis. Jetskis have the ability to travel in the most sensitive areas and do irrevocable damage to the wildlife and their habitat. They don't belong in this special area.<br><br>I urge you to keep the Jetski ban in place. People visit Alaska because it is the last, great frontier. When the natural beauty is allowed to be spoiled by loud, damaging watercraft in sensitive areas, Alaska starts to look more like any other place in the lower 48 and that would be a real shame.<br><br>Be on the right side of history and leave a legacy that is worthy of Alaskan and protect the ban now and in the future. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Joe Schultz | Joe Schultz <joe@jslcreativelearning.com> | Golden, CO | I'm writing because I think it's critically important to keep personal watercraft like jet-skis and wave runners out of Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. The wildlife that call this area home deserve to live there unharrassed by these pleasure-only vehicles.<br><br>I visited the area in a sea kayak and saw firsthand how dolphins, whales and sea otters peacefully play and frolic in the waters of Kachemak Bay. I believe it would be a crime against nature to introduce these noisy and dangerous vehicles into this critical habitat. There are plenty of places one can go in this world to speed around on a jet-ski or wave runner. The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area should never be one of them. It would ruin the habitat for the animals that dwell there and for generations of humans who go there to observe these animals in their natural state.<br><br>I urgently implore you to continue to ban jet-skis and wave runners in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Bret Haering | Bret Haering <bfhaering@netscape.net> | Halibut Cove | As a Kachemak Bay Property owner, I want to thank you and the Governor for the opportunity to Comment:<br><br>In the interest of fair play, I think that part of the Critical Habitat Area should be made available to operators of Jetskis/personal watercraft with certain allowances and restrictions:<br>For the sake of added safety, an area open to the use of these crafts should be near shore, and reasonably close to Homer Harbor with a narrow and direct access corridor between the two locations. The area of allowed use should not within 2 miles of any Private Property, Established beach camping site, Popular use beaches, Set-net sites, or oyster/mussel aquaculture farming sites. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Wendy Noomah | Wendy Noomah <wendy.noomah@gmail.com> | Homer | Lifting the ban on jet skis (PWC) is a stupid idea. The consequences will be wasted state money on lawsuits, loss of tourist business, bad blood between Alaskans, confrontations between jet ski users and other people trying to enjoy the Bay(some possibly violent), more people ready to sign the recall Dunleavy petition, not to mention the harassment and death of seabirds, shorebirds and marine mammals. Leave the PWC ban in place! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | ? Noomah | Bill Noomah <noomah@gmail.com> | | Lifting the ban on jet skis (PWC) is a stupid idea. The consequences will be wasted state money on lawsuits, loss of tourist business, bad blood between Alaskans, confrontations between jet ski users and other people trying to enjoy the Bay(some possibly violent), more people ready to sign the recall Dunleavy petition, not to mention the harassment and death of seabirds, shorebirds and marine mammals. Leave the PWC ban in place! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Susan Phillips Cushing | Susan Cushing <cushinghouse@gmail.com> | 1423 Bay Ave Homer, AK 99603 | No way. Count this as a NO vote, comment. We live on Kachemak Bay and by common sense know that disturbances of wetlands, nesting areas, calm kayak coves, whales breaching, and more . . . will occur by recreation watercraft known as jetski.<br><br>One more way, Governor Dunleavy and his appointees are trying to avoid the protection of the environment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Judy Brunkal | Judith Brunkal <judbrunkal@gmail.com> | | We own a cabin and 5 acres in Fritz Creek east of Homer. We love Kachemak Bay and the wildlife that make their home there. Please do not allow jet sea traffic in this beautiful bay. The noise and intrusion of jet skis would definitely be a detriment to our waterfowl sea otters and other living things that depend on Kachemak Bay for their sustenance. Stop this idea before it starts!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Nicholle | Nicholle Romero <nicholleromero@gmail.com> | | Please don't let the jet skis take over our beloved waters and wildlife! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Amy Christiansen | Amy Christiansen <newjustamyc@icloud.com> | | 99% of Alaskan waters are open to jet skis. They have plenty of places to have their fun. Please continue to protect Kachemak Bay waters from jet ski use! This is a pristine beautiful place! Nothing has changed except increased traffic and population in the area!!! Please do everything in your power to protect this place I call home and enjoy!! Jet skis are dangerous. There are too many people and traffic on the bay already!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Kneeland Taylor | Kneeland Taylor <kneelandtaylor@ak.net> | 425 G Street, Suite 610 Anchorage, AK 99501 | See message: JET SKIS IN KACHEMAK BAY.msg in PWC6 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Dennis Poirier | Dennis Poirier <dpoirier907@gmail.com> | Little Tutka Bay | I have property in Little Tutka Bay 10 miles from Homer.<br>I am opposed to opening Kachemak for use of personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Dave Johnston | Cari Sayre <caridave@mtaonline.net> | P.O. Box 711 Talkeetna, AK 99676 | It is totally wrong to despoil a world class visitor destination just to try to attract a few votes from a small number of motor salespeople and their customers. Visitors from around the world come to Alaska, to Homer, to Kachemak Bay to find the undisturbed, pristine places for which Alaska is famous. They come here, in part, to escape the din and smelly cacophony of the world-wide motor culture. Thrill-seeking amusement park jet ski riders do not belong in critical habitat areas. Anyone who cannot understand this simple concept is a wee bit simple, perhaps.<br><br>In addition to demolishing pristine tranquility, jet skis would disturb birds and animals, both land and marine, and fish as well. Kachemak Bay is a critical habitat area for many species, the proverbial Golden Egg, and it is important for the protections it now has to be extended for many years to come.<br><br>I have known and loved Kachemak Bay since April, 1963 when I became friends with Yule Kilcher and his family. In April, 1968, Yule and I, along with Bill Babcock (Tuckerman's dad) began hiking, skiing (Bill was on snowshoes) and birding there, up Fox River and over the Harding Icefield and down Exit Glacier into Seward, making the first ascent of the Kenai Peninsula's highest point, 6612' Truuli Peak. (Vin and Grace Hoeman joined the expedition at the base of that peak, and it was Vin who named Truuli Peak and Exit Glacier.)<br><br>My wife, Cari, our son, Galen, and 3 friends followed our 1968 route to Truuli Peak in April, 2001. In addition, I have spent time boating and exploring and birding around Yukon Island.<br><br>Please ask Clem Tillion if he reckons jet skis would be a good addition to Kachemak Bay. And put a stethoscope to Jay Hammond's casket to hear if he's rolling over at the very idea. Jet skis on Kachemak Bay should set Jay's heart a-thumpin' I'd bet. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Virginia Unseld | Vjunseld <vjunseld@aol.com> | 68 Athena Rid Black Hawk, CO 80422 | One of my most memorable experiences was kayaking in Kachemak Bay near Homer. Please do not allow jet skis in this quiet bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Jim Thurston | James Thurston <jtinhbc@yahoo.com> | Halibut Cove, Alaska | I only recently learned the State has opened a public comment period with the intent to lift the current ban on jetskis on Kachemak Bay. Halibut Cove features protected waters surrounded with breathtaking scenery. Much of the time these waters are glassy calm and reflect that scenery in great detail. The settings are usually accompanied by a peaceful quiet which is is often commented upon by our envious visitors.<br><br>Now picture the impact of jetskis: There will be loud racket and water wakes as some immature adults who get off on these thrill rides run around in their mindless circles leaving empty beer cans and other trash for those of us who live here to pick up. Halibut Cove is a part of our Alaska natural resource and should be managed as such. The impact of jetskis here will result in transforming this pristine environment into the likes of Big Lake on a sunny weekend. Does the State actually think that would be a good thing?<br><br>If the authorities are nevertheless determined to blindly forge ahead and revoke the current restriction, at least they should consider allowing it to remain in selected areas such as Halibut Cove and possibly other settlements where the adverse impact would be significant and promote hard feelings. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Barbara Parker | Barbara Parker <dippercreek1996@gmail.com> | | I am deeply concerned about your proposal to open Critical Habitat in the bay to jet ski users. This ignores biologists past and present, ignores ample public testimony, and threatens the birds, marine life and all that this habitat supports. There is no real justification. The tourism that bolsters our economy depends on a healthy bay. Thrillcraft are exceedingly noisy and intrusive. Please show that you respect Alaska and its people by dropping this proposal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Margi Blanding | Margi B <margib543@gmail.com> | | See message: Keep the personal water craft ban in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC6 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Ezra Gutschow | Ezra <ezragutschow@gmail.com> | Homer, Ak | There are other places to ride jet skis. They will have a negative impact on the majority of tourists. It is not recommended by your own experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Denise Pitzman | Denise Pitzman <dpitzman@gmail.com> | | I am writing you today to give you input on keeping the jetski ban in Kachemak Bay. I believe that usage of natural areas and resources has to be a balance of science and protection of the environment as well as allowing for enjoyment by residents and guests. Keeping the ban on Kachemak Bay has been reviewed a number of times and based on science it has been decided that the best protection is to keep the ban. There are numerous ways for all Alaskan residents and guests to enjoy the many wonders of Kachemak Bay without excluding anyone. There are kayak rentals that are very affordable. Water taxis are easily rented to transport guests anywhere in the Bay. Usage is not diminished by this ban - the bay is accessible to all. Please keep the ban in place so our environment, atmosphere and enjoyment is not diminished. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Alder Snow | Alder Snow <aldertree11@gmail.com> | | Please help keep jet skis banned in our critical Habitat area here in Kachemak Bay. Studies clearly show the damage to fragile wildlife habitat resulting from jet ski use. I appreciate your time and consideration on this matter. Governor Dunleavy is overreaching in his efforts to repeal this ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Rebecca Paul | Rebecca Paul <rkpaul48@gmail.com> | | Please NO jet skis on KACHEMAK BAY. Please. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Janice A Burke | jan burke <janbur1@comcast.net> | 1003 Cottonwood Circle Golden, CO 80401 | I visited Alaska last summer for the first time. I visited multiple areas of the state and the time I spent on and near the Kachemac Bay were by far the most impressive time that I spent. I have talked to many others about the wildlife I saw in the Bay and the unique aspect that the elimination of Jet Ski's provided to create the wonderfully rich natural sea life environment and quiet. The approach of banning this type of activity has a research base which many others have conveyed to you. As I see it people come to Alaska to view nature in its natural state. As over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PVC's it make sense that the tourist industry would be hurt dropping the ban as people can get that type of experience many places in Alaska.<br><br>Please maintain the ban on PVC's in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Cotton Randall | Cotton Randall <cottonrandall@yahoo.com> | Westerville, Ohio | Dear Mr. Green, Rep. Stutes, Rep. Vance, and Senator Stevens, I am writing to you as an out-of-state US citizen who has made multiple trips to Alaska and will certainly make future visits. Please keep the ban on jet skis / personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay critical habitat area. I understand that you are probably looking more for local input from Alaskans on this (as you should), and I'm sure you are receiving their input from both sides of the issue. I think I represent at least one common type of tourist who come to Alaska. During my last trip, we kayaked in Kachemak Bay critical habitat area and spent several days in Homer. It was a truly amazing visit and we just convinced friends to go there this summer. Having personal watercraft, especially jet skis, in the area that we kayaked would've changed our experience so much negatively (not just from the noise but more importantly the wildlife - we saw so much that would negatively impacted by personal watercraft). There should be places where jet skis are allowed and there are many but Kachemak Bay critical habitat area is not one of them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Rachel Gueldner | Rachel Gueldner <rae72@me.com> | Minnesota | We loved our vacation to Alaska and Kachemak bay in 2018. We will definitely be back. We loved the beautiful calm waters in the bay and enjoyed lunch on the beach and kayaking. We also love jet skis. We've jet skied in the ocean off the coast of Costa Rica, and in lakes in Minnesota. Please please don't allow jet skis in Kachemak bay. They are tons of fun, but they are loud and disrupt the wildlife, which is what people come to Alaska to see. Keep Kachemak bay pristine, beautiful and quiet. And let the jet ski party happen in other parts of Alaska | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Hannah Rasker | Hannah Rasker <hrrasker@gmail.com> | | Please do not allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I was a tourist to that area, put money into the economy, supported a local business and would not have enjoyed the beauty of the area with Jet Skis disturbing wildlife habitat. I highly value the preservation of Alaska's wild and quiet places. I would not go back to that area if Jet Skis are present.<br><br>From a valuable tourist, please consider. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Liz Johnson | sportshopalaska@gci.net | Anchorage and Bear Island | I am writing to oppose the pending proposal to allow jet skis into Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I am a current property owner and have spent most of each summer since 1983 at the head of the Bay near Bear Island. Kachemak Bay water is cold, the wind is very unpredictable, and there is a twice daily tidal change that would make using jet skis very dangerous. It would be very difficult to keep track of people who are using jet skis on the bay in case of an emergency. The tidal change and general wave pattern as the water moves up and down the bay makes it a difficult body of water to cross by knowledgable skippers in good boats-- much less the average weekend jet skier who knows little about Bay water or the danger it poses. Using jet skis on a lake makes sense. Allowing use of jet ski in a body of cold, unpredictable water like Kachemak Bay makes no sense.<br><br>I am sure there are others who are writing concerning the serious habitat effects of jet ski noise and air pollution. To me the possibility of loss of life by someone on a jet ski who does something foolish where it will be difficult, if not impossible, to rescue them is very real. Over the years I have both seen and heard ( from listening to the Marine band chatter) boats who have quickly gotten into serious trouble by not respecting the tide, waves, or bad weather which comes up very quickly on the Bay.<br><br>There are plenty of lakes on the Kenai peninsula which make sense for people to use and enjoy jet skiis. Kachemak Bay is not one of them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Mike O'Meara | Michael O'Meara <mikeo@horizonsatellite.com> | Homer/Anchor Point Alaska | I'm opposed to the use of Jetskis (PWC's) in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. In past efforts to open the critical habitat I've offered detailed comments outlining the many reasons Jetskis should remain prohibited. I'm tired of having to repeat myself every few years so will make this short.<br><br>The reason the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas were created was to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Extensive scientific study from many different source has shown Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with this purpose.<br><br>There is no shortage of places for people to ride Jetskis. To my knowledge all Alaskan waters outside of Kachemak Bay are open.<br><br>Jetskis are designed to be ridden for thrills and maximum speed.<br>Kachemak Bay brings thousand of tourists from outside and within Alaskan, often because they seek to get away from such activity. Most want to enjoy the beauty, fishing, and less frenetic experience available here. Our local economy thrives on this. We do not wish to give this up so the Governor can pander to the politically powerful Jetski industry.<br><br>Rest assured that if the state attempts to move forward with the foolish plan to open the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas to Jetskis people of the area will appose it in court. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Erik Pullman | Erik Pullman <epullman@kbaytech.com> | 4135 Hohe St Homer, AK 99603 | See message: PWC in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC6 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Amy Morrison | Amy Morrison <amymorrison12@gmail.com> | | Hello I am writing to express my view that Jet Skis should NOT BE permitted in the critical habitat area of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Having spent considerable time in Kachemak Bay and marveled at the beauty of that ecosystem I was horrified to learn that jet skis might soon be allowed in such a naturally diverse and beautifully quiet place. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW JET SKIS IN THIS GORGEOUS PARADISE! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Brian Martin | Brian Martin <bmart06@gmail.com> | | Hi Rick! Hi Dorla! I hope you two are well, safe, healthy and happy. I'm sorry to hear about the jet skis, I hope you guys find success in your endeavor, and a happy season!<br><br>Hello, my name is Brian Martin, and I think the ban on jet skis in the little Kachemak bay is a necessary decision to make, for the sake of preserving the gift of nature in the serenity and sanctity it deserves, especially when such spots like Kachemak are becoming fewer and fewer. Thank you! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Jeni Lidster | Jenifer Lidster <jmlidster@gmail.com> | | > I had the pleasure of spending a summer in Kachemak Bay with Rick and Dorla a couple of years ago. It is such a beautiful and serene area and is the home to an abundance of wildlife animals. While I was there, I had the opportunity to observe countless sea stars, jellyfish, tardigrade, barnicles, algae, eagles, otters, seals, whales, and many more animals that I did not even know existed! It would be a huge disturbance to the wildlife and the bay to allow jet skis in the area. The negative impacts that jet skis cause would be detrimental to the animals and their habitats and would be a major loss to one of the most beautiful places in the states. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Susan Houlihan | Susan Houlihan <4houlihan@gmail.com> | 35895 North Fork Rd. Anchor Point, AK 99556 | I have lived in Alaska since 1995 and I love Alaska for it's wilderness and people. I have lived along Kachemak Bay since 1999. The designation of Critical Habitat in Kachemak Bay guarantees that future generations will also get to enjoy the natural beauty of this magical place. Please do NOT allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay or Fox River Critical Habitat area. It will destroy the peace and quiet far more than boats do and decrease my sense of safety as I kayak and paddleboard in Kachemak Bay. The Critical Habitat designation has the explicit goal to "enhance wildlife" and "to minimize the degradation and loss of habitat values." Personal Watercrafts do not fit within this designation what-so-ever. Kachemak Bay not only supports incredible fisheries and wildlife, it's pristine nature supports many businesses that would be severely and negatively impacted by liberalizing jet skis. Their noise and high speed is a threat to marine mammals and non-motorized users of Kachemak Bay. I am emphatically opposed to allowing Personal Watercrafts in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Dana Lyons | Dana Lyons <dana@cowswithguns.com> | PO Box 2627 Bellingham, WA 98227 | I'm writing to strongly encourage you to continue the ban on jet skis and PWC's in Kechamak Bay. Kechamak Bay is treasured by myself and so many others as one of the last wild pristine places on earth. A bunch of jet skis running around will be bad for wildlife, bad for tourism, bad for the serenity. Jet ski noise will hurt fishing for God's sake. Now THAT is unAlaskan! :-)<br><br>I love Homer, and have spent a lot of time over there years. I come almost every year. Please protect the Kechamak Bay from jet skis. For the environment, and the economy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Rob P. Clay, Director, WHSRN Executive Office | Laura Chamberlin <lchamberlin@manomet.org> | Manomet | See message: Comments on repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | organization | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Matt Smith | M Smith<br><mwsadc@gmail.com> | 59595 East End Road<br>Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Comments OPPOSING repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Kendra Zamzow | Kendra Zamzow<br><kzamzow@gmail.com><br>> | Chickaloon, AK | I am writing to show my support for keeping Kachemak Bay free of jet skis and personal watercraft.<br>The Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat is meant for fish and wildlife viewing, and there are many many waters available for this type of recreation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | **Anastasia J. Kunz** | Anastasia Kunz<br><anastasiakunz@gmail.com> | | I am contacting you to ask that you consider not repealing the ban on jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay. As a biologist, I am keenly aware of the harmful impacts that high-speed personal watercraft can have on valuable wildlife. This wildlife has both intrinsic and economic value, and forfeiting this resource to allow jetskis in this area is irresponsible. While my primary concern is maintaining a pristine habitat that follows the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area legislation, it is important to note that the aesthetic value of the Kachemak Bay will also be negatively affected. In order to preserve this important habitat, please keep the current ban on jetskis in this area. There are other areas where this recreational activity is acceptable, but not in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Kyle Rudzinski | Kyle Rudzinski<br><krudzinski22@gmail.com> | | See message: Fwd: Keep Jet Skis Out of Kachemak Bay!.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Mark Schollenberger | Mark<br><msberger@horizonsatellite.com> | 69195 Karen Circle<br>Anchor Point, AK 99556 | Hello , I'm writing in response to the proposed lifting of the jet ski ban in Kachemack Bay critical habitat area. For the record, I am opposed to lifting the ban.<br><br>Kachemack Bay is a critical habitat area for good reason...to protect marine and terrestrial wildlife from any from of harassment. Jet skis pose both a noise, and physical, threat to marine life near shore, and off shore, given the reckless nature of how these "toys" are used.<br><br>Citizens of Alaska, and tourists, come to Kachemack Bay for solitude. Jet skis zipping back and forth in the Bay would impact that solitude. It's one thing to run a boat from point A to B, and another thing to be recklessly zipping back and forth for the fun of it.<br><br>Jet skis in the bay would create navigational hazards, especially in the mouth of the harbor, one of the busiest and roughest part of the bay. Current boat traffic, wind, waves and tidal currents are a recipe for accidents to happen if jet skis were allowed near the harbor.<br><br>There would be an enforcement conflict if jet skis were allowed in the Bay, and restricted from Kachemack Bay State Park waters, it would create a huge enforcement problem to keep people from entering the Parks waters, where they would impact wildlife, and people, within the shores of the Park.<br><br>Jet skis can enjoy 99% of the State's waterways. They do not belong in Kachemack Bay. I am opposed to allowing jet skis in Kachemack Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Erica Wolfson | erica wolfson<br><ericawolfsong@gmail.com> | Sebastopol, Ca. 95472 | Hello Respected Officials.... I visited Kachemak Bay last summer for one of the most peaceful and beautiful days of my vacation and maybe even life, I urge you to please keep it that way.<br>NO JET SKIS . Please. keep the ban up there's plenty of other places for those noisy polluting things. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Mary Hamilton | Mary H.<br><mlhecf@gmail.com> | | Please keep jet skis out of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Please retain the natural environment of the area. There are plenty other places to jet ski. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Will Runnoe | Will R<br><will83530@gmail.com><br>> | 53430 Mansfield Ave<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I live in Homer and thoroughly enjoy Kachemak Bay and all it has to offer. It is a unique aquatic environment and is blessed with exceptional beauty, not just from and individuals eyesight but from a wide range of diverse environments that can't be seen.<br><br>The Bay is already stressed with boat traffic and I don't see any reason to add to the stress. The boat traffic is mostly for fishing and commercial uses that benefit our economy. Jet skis will provide very little impact upon our economy and will further stress our diverse environment not to mention causing undue marine traffic hazards.<br><br>I've lived in places where jet skis are allowed and it ain't a pretty picture. Most of the jet ski owners are just there for thrills not to mention harassing people who are fishing, kayaking and sailing.<br><br>My family is totally opposed to this proposal and I'm appalled it's even being brought up again. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Nancy Munro | Nancy Munro <nancymunro276@gmail.com> | | I do not support lifting the ban on jetskis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. The reasons for banning jetskis in these critical habitat areas were well articulated many years ago when the ban was enacted, and none of the facts behind those arguments have changed. I do understand that a very small number of people have either a personal interest in running jetskis in the Bay or a financial interest in promoting that activity. I don't think that justifies the proposed policy change, and, frankly, smacks of a commercial interest buying the Governor's support for such a change. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | John Page | John Page <kayakexplorer@gmail.com> | | Please retain the Jet Ski ban | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Bridget M Maryott | Bridget Maryott <discoverhomer@gmail.com> | | I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposal to repeal the current ban on jet skis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Homer, Seldovia and Halibut Cove have built many sustainable businesses that cater to visitors coming to the area for our pristine environment and wildlife. Jet Skis are not conducive to this environment and they are already allowed in 99% of Alaskan waters. Please respect our way of life. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Tobben Spurkland | tobben spurklan <klippfisk@msn.com> | Seldovia | I am opposed to allowing jetskis into Katchemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Claudia Duffield | Claudia Duffield <cdocean@gmail.com> | Alaska | Please do not permit jet-skiing in this precious habitat. Such use would be extremely harmful to the Homer habitat for all wildlife there. There are plenty of other places in Alaska where that use is less harmful. Ak resident since 1978 and a kayaker | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Rick Sinnott | Rick Sinnott <rickjsinnott@gmail.com> | Chugiak, Alaska | See message: Kachemak Bay CHA jet ski ban.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Sarah Bouchard | s-bouchard <s-bouchard@sbcglobal.net> | | I am writing to ask that you do not allow jetskis into Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. We recently visited the area as part of ecotourism travel. The experience was amazing and the presence of jetskis would ruin the experience entirely. We planned to go back, but would not under those circumstances. We also worry about the ecological impact of jet skis on native wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Mark Combs | Mark Combs <mcombs80@yahoo.com> | 4047 156th Ave SE Bellevue, WA 98006 | Last year my family spent a memorable day kayaking in the beautiful Kachemak Bay. The beauty of this place - from the lovely scenery to the abundant wildlife - would be diminished by the addition of jet skis. I do hope you will be able to keep the jet ski ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Beth Manning | Beth <bethinalaska@hotmail.com> | | I visited Homer for the first time a few years ago and fell in love with the wildlife, sea and land, and the pristine nature of the Bay. The best way to preserve this is to keep the jet ski ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Jim Herbert | JIM HERBERT <jherbert8000@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | I am a Homer area resident and wish to express my support for the status quo: not allowing jet ski use in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>It is obvious to me that the state and municipalities can have many reasons to regulate what and how vehicles of many types can be used. For example, using motorized watercraft of limited horsepower on portions of the Kenai River while not allowing motorized boats at all on other portions. Moose hunters can not use motorized vehicles at certain times in certain places.<br><br>On a December 2019 visit to Florida, on the 5 occasions I saw people riding jet skis, they were all turning in tight circles and wake jumping at high speeds. A conversation with a US Coast Guard person in Key West suggested that "hot rodding" behavior by this type of watercraft was a problem for the CG as well as other boaters. I personally have seen some, but not all, jet skiers operate recklessly out of Whittier and Seward. Perhaps a small number give the rest a bad name. Nonetheless, law enforcement by state and federal agencies is scant on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Regardless, I feel certain that the high speeds and at times erratic activities of these water craft are disruptive to birds and sea mammals in ways other vessels are not. At almost all times of year there are various species of birds in the shallow waters near the Homer Spit where I assume many jet ski operators would operate.Many folks just find them annoying the way a dirt bike would be if encountered on a mountain hiking trail.<br><br>I believe there is ample opportunity for jet skis to operate out of Anchor Point, Deep Creek, and other beaches in our immediate area. Whittier, Seward, Anchorage, and many lakes are available as well. It seems fair and appropriate to allow an area designated as a Critical Habitat to prohibit their use.<br><br>Please preserve the status quo and ban jet skis from Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | William W Wood | Bill <curveman@mtaonline.net> | Wasilla, AK 99654 | See message: Kachemak Bay jetski activities.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Gareth Chesley | Gareth Chesley <gareth.chesley@gmail.com> | | See message: Kachemak Bay Jetski Public Comment.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Joel Wheeler | Joel Wheeler <wheelergeneral@gmail.com> | | I am an Alaskan boat owner who has regularly enjoyed the serenity of Kachemak Bay for the last 28 years. It is with respect that I submit my opposition to the proposed changes to the restrictions of personal watercraft use at Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. To lift restrictions that have been in place for years and subject the residents of the area to the unrestricted use of PWC would surely disrupt more than just the wildlife that find sanctuary in these Critical Habitat Areas. The ability for PWC to travel at high speeds in shallow water threaten the peacefulness of the area. When restrictions are lifted, people flock to these places and these critical habitats are not meant for that kind of traffic. I lived on Kachemak Bay in the 90's and remember when Kayak tour groups would trespass onto private property to relieve themselves and leave piles of toilet paper above the tide line in the trees and just off private trails. This will surely happen again. There is also no short supply of places to ride PWC outside of Kachemak Bay. Please do not allow the use of PWC in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. I thank you for your time and look forward to a decision that truly makes the most sense for the area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Bob McCard | bmccard@alaska.net | | I am writing you to keep the ban on Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay, Homer, Alaska.<br>Jet Skis are a detriment to wildlife and habitat. Jet Skis not only can damage habitat, but the sound of the machines can be harmful to wildlife.<br>Please keep the ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Su Niedringhaus | Su <zeemoo@earthlink.net> | Golden, Colorado | One of our favorite parts of a 30 day visit to Alaska a couple of years ago was a kayak trip through the pristine Kachemak Bay. The wildlife and quiet beauty enchanted our family. We've already sent other friends there who've enjoyed it as much as we did. Please don't let jet skis into this beautiful area. There are plenty of places to recreate, not so many places to spend a day so close to nature. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Nona Hall | Nona Hall <tagittagit678@icloud.com> | | We have kayaked in Kachemak Bay several times. What makes it so appealing and why we continue to rave about our experiences is that the bay is quiet, the water is calm, and it allows us to see and feel God's presence in the wildlife and vegetation in this peaceful, beautiful place. Please keep it peaceful for visitors, for the wildlife, and for safety on the water. How sad if this is spoiled by jet skis. We definitely would not return. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Angie Hamill | Angie Hamill <angie.hamill.ak@gmail.com> | | I am completely against allowing Jet Skis to operate in Kachemak Bay. The thought of the possibility is even wrong. Please don't be swayed by special interests in the personal watercraft industry nor swayed by a politician who only has his self preserving interest in mind. Listen to the public, protect Kachemak Bay and the special ecosystem it is. Please, NO JET SKIS. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Felicia Riedel | Felicia Riedel <f_riedel@hotmail.com> | Kenny Lake | While I don't live near Kachemak Bay, I've lived in Kenny Lake a long time and am a homesteader's daughter. In our late 60s, my husband and I have used snow machines & 4-wheelers for fun -but responsibly -and for work, but now we count on them for hauling wood, etc. They are noisy and stinky, Jetskis even more so, but Jetskis are mainly for fun and not work. They should only be in very specific recreational areas, areas that people don't rely on for food or livelihood through tourism like the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat. We have Jetskis on some of our small lakes around here, and they look like a blast. But they are hard on animals and not what people want to experience if they've paid to go to a wild place in Alaska. Tourists can stay in town to smell noxious fumes and hear irritating sounds. Kachemak Bay isn't my home, but I would hope other Alaskans would stick up for me in a similar situation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Kathy Sarns Irwin | Kathy Sarns <kathysarns@gmail.com> | Homer | We moved (ourselves and our business) from Anchorage to Homer in 2008 and bought a home near the ocean- because it is quiet.<br>If Jetskis are allowed to ruin Kachemak Bay we will not stay here in Homer.<br><br>Just like cigarettes, it just takes ONE Jetski to adversely affect everyone and everything around, with noise pollution and disrupting wildlife with it's fast & unpredictable movements.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other users not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500<br><br>if you need a reminder why Jetskis don't belong in Kachemak Bay - here is ADFG's summary of this issue<br>https://inletkeeper.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Memo-DWC-and-Habitat-PWC-Recommendation-May-2017.pdf<br><br>NO no no to Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay, Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Aleta Erickson | Aleta@olympus.net <aleta@olympus.net> | Bear Cove, AK | DO NOT OPEN KACHEMAK BAY TO JET SKIS<br><br>I'm writing you to voice my strong displeasure over discussions to repeal the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I own 16 acres with a small cabin and over 200' of shoreline in Bear Cove where we have no roads or electricity. The undeveloped condition of Bear Cove makes it a paradise for hunters and fishermen, and for those of us who enjoy kayaking on the quiet and protected waters of the cove, and watching wildlife such as migratory waterfowl, sea otters, eagles, orcas, sea lions, and humpback whales that come into the cove to feed and rest. To have these noisy thrillcraft (jet skis) in Bear Cove would be a travesty and would infringe upon the right of the numerous other human and non-human visitors to the area to enjoy the waters in and around Bear Cove.<br><br>To say that keeping jet skis out of Kachemak Bay prevents a user group from enjoying the waters of the bay is beyond silly and defies logic. Nobody it telling these people that they cant buy a boat and come here. Many people do. But the nature of jet skis and their users is that they drive fast, circle about, leap-jump over the many large waves that are created by their high-powered machines, and generally make a nuisance of themselves for everyone in the vicinity. I know because for many years I lived near a lake where jet skis were allowed and they were an obscene nuisance for everyone but themselves, which did not concern them, of course. The loud noise they made echoed around the hills of the lake so there was no way for man or beast to escape the noise, and they don't troll about or linger the way fishermen and hunters do. They stay put ... and go round and round and round.<br><br>Jet ski use is already allowed in most waters of Alaska. Jet ski owners can take their thrillcraft to those other places. Why are we even revisiting this nonsense proposal to defile our beautiful Kachemak Bay when it was decided not to have them here years ago?<br><br>I implore you: do not repeal the ban on jet skis in our lovely Critical Habitat Area. They don't belong here. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Rebecca and William Hutchinson | Becky Hutchinson <becky2@eaglestation.com> | 36970 Hakala Rd Soldotna, AK 99669 | See message: Protect Kachemak Bay from jetskis.msg in PWC7 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Gwen Bennett | Gwen B <muttnpug@gmail.com> | 304 Linwood Ln Kenai, Ak. 99611 | I am writing to request that the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay be kept in place.<br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Judith A James | Judith James <jamesj@eou.edu> | 40951 China Poot St Homer AK | While living in Oregon for a few years in the 1970's and 1980's, I and my family often observed personal watercraft "Jetskis" in action on various water bodies, and can attest to the intrinsic danger to wildlife and birds that these vehicles present.<br>In my experience, there is no way to protect our priceless marine mamal population -- sea otter, seal, sea lions, and others -- and our sea birds such as murres, puffins, gulls, pharalopes, petrals, and so forth -- There is simply no way to protect these valuable birds and animals while allowing jetskis in the Bay.<br>The value of the quiet wilderness and the tourist industry that the wildlife and the wilderness brings to Homer and the other communities around Kachemak Bay.<br><br>As a (nearly) life-long resident of Kachemak Bay, who has been in the tourism industry, agriculture, and wilderness hiking and camping, I beg the governor and Legislature to keep Kachemak Bay free from personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Dave Brann | Molly & Dave Brann <homerbrann@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 1901 Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: Re: Personal Watercraft ban.msg in PWC7 | 1 | | | continuatuion of message chain orginating on Jan 18. - should check for duplicate_Fixed found original email, not double counted. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Scott McEwen | Scott Mcewen <scottmcewen907@gmail.com> | Homer | See messsage: Comment on repealing the current ban of Jetskis operating within the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Sarahlily Stein | Sarahlily Stein <sarahlily@escusting.com> | | I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed repeal of the jetski ban in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Allowing jetskis into this area will be harmful to the wildlife, residents, and small businesses that call this area home. As a Critical Habitat Area, Kachemak Bay CHA is designated by the Alaska Legislature to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." As the scientists at the ADFG have repeatedly concluded, a jetski ban is appropriate and justified. There are many other recreational activities that are welcome in Kachemak Bay CHA, such as sea kayaking.<br><br>I have worked in this area for the past two summers kayak guiding. From this experience, I have seen firsthand how crucial the wildlife is to small businesses in both tourism and fishing. Protecting this area from jetskis means protecting small businesses.<br><br>Just like the fire ban this summer, the jetski ban is intended to protect Alaskans. For Kachemak Bay CHA, protecting our wildlife and small businesses means banning jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Carol Meares | Carol Meares <carolmeares@icloud.com> | 3459 Main St.<br>Unit 2<br>Homer AK<br>99603 | see message: Comments opposing repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Darlene Holmberg | Aniak Light & Power <aniaklnp@arctic.net> | Aniak | Greetings, this is in regards to salmon habitat protection. There are many assaults upon our fish and wildlife habitats that we can't stop or mitigate, climate change being the foremost. There are a few that we can control or eliminate. Please take steps to reduce threats from recreational activities such as thrill craft traffic in areas known to be inhabited by fish, wildlife and birds. People who enjoy pristine and quiet and take pains to get there should not have to be in conflict with those riding for fun with nowhere in particular to go. If I want to go to my fish camp for the weekends to fish or relax, I should only see others with like sentiment, and the thrill seekers can do their thing closer to the town, where there is already lots of water traffic that is expected and not loathed. Most of the kids are doing their watercraft fun in view of the town, which also increases their safety, should they experience a mishap. There is no reason to allow the thrill rider to be in quiet neighborhoods or lakes or far from town, certainly not where fish and birds congregate to feed or rest. Please strengthen protections for vulnerable and critical habitats and occupants (migratory or otherwise), before there's nothing left to protect. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Barbara Harris Owner / VP Marketing, Team CC | Barbara Harris <ads@teamcc.com> | | Emailing: PWC ban20200120.pdf.msg MOVED SCANNED LETTERS TO FOLDER WITH HARD COPIES OF SAME FORM LETTER | | | | not counted here- should be counted with other form letters from TeamCC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Alex L Koplin | bubba@horizonsatellite.com | Homer | I am a resident of Kachemak City. I am opposed to having jet skis in the Bay. Kachemak Bay is considered a critical habitat area and allowing for jet skis in the Bay definitely puts more demand on the habitat of this beautiful area. I'm not sure why you are even thinking about allowing jet skis in the Bay. Has there been a change in the designation of our Bay?<br>When the first otter fatality, first human injury, first mollusk that is gone because you allowed skis to be on the Bay, well that falls on you. The idea that you have to cater to another user group because they want it is not always reasonable because of the costs involved. The relationship between the land and the people is essential for our continued sustainability.<br>There are many places in Alaska you can use jet skis; let's keep our Bay safe and not contribute to every whim people have so they can recreate. Please allow us to use protect our resources, both human, animal, and the environmental treasures we still have. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Ron Somerville | somerville@gci.net | 8126 Keegan St.,<br>Unit A<br>Juneau, Ak<br>99801 | See message: FW: Personal Watercraft in Ketchemak Bay.msg in PWC8 | | | 1 | Forwarded from Doug Vincent-Lang's personal email to DVL and RG ADF&G emails - check for duplicates | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | **Kate Finn** | hundredthmonk21@gmail.com | POBox 3364<br>Homer AK 99603 | See message: Fwd: Continue the BAN on Jet-skis and PWC in Kachemak Bay!.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Kim H Madden | Kim Madden <57khmadden@gmail.com> | | As a Property own on the Bay I oppose Jet Skis being allowed. The Bay is a source of food, income and a water highway. The introduction of Jet Skis would interfere with these needs to the point of being a safety hazard. I for one would not wish to compete with Jet Skis to get back and forth from Homer or my cabin on the other side.<br><br>Please consider these concerns. There are more than enough other places Jet Skis are allowed without adding Kachemak Bay to the list. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Patricia Westbrook | patwestbrook@hotmail.com | 166 W Bunnell Ave, Unit 10 Homer, AK 99603 | I am opposed to permitting Jetskis in Kachemak Bay because of damage to wildlife in the Bay.<br>The law is clear: the purpose of Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Whitney Cushing | whitneylpcushing@hotmail.com | | I am hoping that Alaska Department of Fish and Game can uphold the critical habitat area designation and jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. I grew up in Homer and now live in Maryland both near the Delaware Bay and Potomac River. It seems that the peacefulness of every bay or river I am on can be interrupted within seconds by the loud buzz of jet skis and make it much less appealing to plan a trip to. Homer's main industries are commercial fishing and tourism. Jet ski use conflicts with both of these important sources of livelihood. I believe that visitors come to the area to experience something different. After all there is probably a lake near where people are traveling from that is thousands of dollars cheaper to get to, yet people come up to Kachemak bay for once in a life time trips. Further, many of my friends and I come back every summer to spend time in Homer on and around the water – I believe that making the bay just as any body of water is in the lower 48 is will reduce the impetus for folks to want to return and reduce the long-term vitality of the area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Nicole Szarzi | njszarzi@gmail.com | Homer | See message: Fwd: Uphold personal watercraft ban.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Scott Burbank | Scott Burbank <homerkayaking@gmail.com> | | email subject: Hey Skis email content: N | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Ceal Smith | Ceal Smith <ceal@theriver.com> | Homer, Alaska | I was shocked to learn that lifting the ban on high-powered watercraft was under consideration. Jetskis and personal watercraft (PWC) are not like skiffs and boats. With overpowered 200-300 horsepower engines, Jetskis are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water and congregate in small areas. As a result, they pose unique threats to birds, marine mammals and humans alike.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br><br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | John W. Schoen | The Schoens <schoenak@gci.net> | 13240 Mountain Pl Anchorage, AK 99516 | I urge you not to change the prohibitions on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>I am a wildlife ecologist and have lived in Alaska for more than 40 years. I have owned boats in Juneau, Homer, Seward, and Whittier and have observed jet ski activities in southeast Alaska, Resurrection Bay, and Whittier areas. Jet skis disturb and disrupt birds and marine mammals. I have seen that that impact and the scientific literature also has documented harmful impacts to wildlife from jet skis.<br><br>Please listed to your professional staff and maintain the current regulations in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Mary C Gray | Marcee Gray <marcee@havenhousealaska.org> | | Excuse me, but you have been appointed to a group who is tasked with protecting HABITATS and ECOSYSTEMS for FISH and WILDLIFE.....NOT to open CRITICAL HABITATS to RECREATIONISTS with motors.<br>It is TOO bad that both you and our governor misunderstand all this. it is too bad that you have tried to Hijack this department for a limited group who have plenty of places to drive their speedy machines instead of the Fritz Creek Critical Habitat and the protected waters of Kachemak Bay.<br>You are part of the wrong board and your intentions are wrong minded.<br>We also know that you will be bombarded with comments against this issue, but you have also said that you don't care about how many of us again oppose this activity in a Critical Habitat area. You have pretty much said that you feel for the poor misrepresented Jet skiers who are being kept out of an area that should be open to the public....talk about silly.<br>Keep Jet Skis out of KACHEMAK Bay and FRITZ CREEK CRITICAL HABITAT. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Susan Aramovich Scott Burbank ( St. Augustine's Kayak &Tours) | Scott Burbank <homerkayaking@gmail.com> | | The nagging question keeps coming up WHY why change what has been established in Kachemak Bay, and dismiss the known data, jet skis are thrill craft, and they have their function and place, but not in Kachemak Bay!!! We have been in the Eco tourist business for 37 yrs. My husband and I started our Eco business from scratch, and we have watched the industry grow in leaps and bounds. Be assured with massive growth of modern technology and growing global economies, people want to escape the busyness of their lives and they are even trying to download apps on how to disconnect, so I believe I can fairly attest after 37 yrs in the industry QUIET is the new norm, and I do believe we have an important say on this issue! Let the ban remain!! | 2 | | | business/individual | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Scott Burbank and Susan Aramovich | Scott Burbank <homerkayaking@gmail.com> | | This is Scott Burbank and Susan Aramovich,<br><br>We are recently retired after operating a tourist business in Kachemak Bay for 37 years(St.Augustine's Kayak Tours). We have lived on the bay for 41 years and have a loving attachment to it.<br><br>It has been wonderful to live in a region where the community has honored and recognized the specialness of place.<br><br>We would very much like to see the ban on jet skis maintained now and in the future in recognition of the many economic benefits and otherwise that having one place protected allots to all of us.<br><br>To people who wish to have their access and freedom to practice this activity available to them, I would point out that Alaska has 36,000 miles of coastline and many additional miles of lakes and rivers where they can freely enjoy their activity. We are only asking for a small portion of Alaska waterways and wildlife corridors be protected.<br><br>Thanks for taking into consideration our point of view on this controversial matter. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Katie Dawson | Katie Dawson <rag1smith@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | I am writing to voice my strong opinion that jet skis don't belong to the fragile and unique environment of Kachemak Bay. Because jet skis can travel at a very fast speed, are unpredictable because of their maneuverability, and are very noisy, they will have a very negative impact on the marine creatures that depend on the waters of Kachemak Bay for survival. Pleasure craft that solely exist to provide speed thrills for their riders do not belong in the fishery and tourism industry that exists in Homer and its environs. The salmon, whales, birds and other wildlife don't need the stress of speeding boats charging into shallow areas, screaming and jumping over waves, or driving circles around them. Tourists come to Homer to enjoy a pleasant wildlife viewing experience and seaside culture that doesn't involve small, speeding boats making noise and scaring the wildlife. Allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay is like allowing race cars to go one hundred miles around slow moving cars on a scenic road. Everyone understands why very fast race cars aren't allowed to race on city streets. There is a majority of other places in Alaska jet skis are allowed. Studies by Fish and Game and other government agencies' EIS have come to the conclusion that jet skis will be harmful to the sensitive marine environment of Kachemak Bay. This idea has popped up several times in Homer over the years, and has been strongly rejected by the residents of Homer. Their opinions and wishes should be listened to. Of course this will make the small number of jet skiers who want to operate in Kachemak Bay unhappy; but you know what?—you can't make everyone happy and if you try, no one will be happy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Susan Biggs | Susan Biggs <sbiggs@gci.net> | | It is appalling that one would even consider bringing jet ski traffic into Kachemak Bay (Homer, Alaska). These quiet and pristine waters are the home of many creatures including varieties of whales and dolphins, as well as sea otters, fish, etc. Through careful management, the bay continues to be a quiet and tranquil area, which is why residents and travelers enjoy the beauty of this area, and not the noise and chaos of jet ski traffic. The overwhelming horsepower causes them to be detrimental to the marine life and the peacefulness. It has been scientifically shown that jet skis and personal watercraft are not compatible with the Kachemak and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat report. This is a recreation area with a different focus. Please keep this type of recreation in the proper areas and not where is has already been established as not appropriate. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Richard Dunn | Richard Dunn <capdick@me.com> | 357 lee drive Homer | I strongly object to changing the regulations to allow jet ski's in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Marilyn Sigman | Marilyn Sigman <marilyn.sigman@gmail.com> | 4611 Kachemak Way, Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Jet skis in Kachemak Bay (6).msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Jeff Erickson | Jeff Erickson <JeffHRO@alaska.net> | 60998 East End Rd. Homer, AK 99603 | I would like to express my thoughts to you on a very divisive issue. There are emotions on either side of the Jet Ski issue that tend to cloud the objectivity of our opinions.<br>The opponents of jet skis declare that hard scientific fact demonstrates the potential negative impact of jet skis on wildlife but fail to provide the evidence sufficient to convince me. Many are tempted to simply chock their "science" up to hyperbole at best.<br>Those in favor of lifting the ban declare that jet skis are no worse than any other vessel and it is unfair to limit a single user group. They believe the rumor that a few rich and influential people complained because they were harassed by jet skiers while enjoying the quiet solitude of kayaking in the coves across the bay. In your position you may know more about both the science rumor and the conspiracy rumor. Whatever the case I would urge you to carefully consider real evidence and history on this issue.<br>I think that most Alaskans feel strongly that a particular user group should not be excluded from an area without seriously considered reasonable cause. Likewise Alaskans put a high value on our environment and its resources. It is true that jet skiers can be annoying and that the activity does not mix well with some other activities in the bay. Perhaps we should focus on the behavior of users rather than the machinery they use. It is unfortunate that the abuses of a few have again restricted the privileges of all. It is unfortunate that we like spoiled siblings are putting pressure on your office to decide who you are going to make angry by making a decision that may be of very little consequence outside of politics.<br><br>May God give you wisdom, | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Rosemarie Acker | Charlie Acker <cacker@mcn.org> | | Please keep the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Kim Madden | Kim Madden <57khmadden@gmail.com> | | blank email | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Willie H Condon | (c) Outlook.com <sailwood@hotmail.com> | | I own and operate a small lodge in Sadie Cove,Kachemak bay.<br>I am absolutely opposed to opening the waters to jet skis.<br>The last thing our clients want to experience is the noise of those infernal machines while having their Alaskan wilderness experience. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Jyoti Chadda | Jyoti Chadda <akjchadda@gmail.com> | | Why? Why would we want to allow jetskis in Kachemak Bay when Most of Alaskan waters are open to motorized vehicles of various kinds! Can we not leave one area pristine and noise free??? Jetskis DO NOT need to be in Kachemak Bay an area where people from all over the world come to enjoy and relish the beauty of Alaska and our wonderful wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Eivin Kilcher | Eivin Kilcher <kilcher.e@gmail.com> | | Hello, my name is Eivin Kilcher i am a third generation resident of kachemak bay. I strongly disagree with allowing jetskis in kachemak bay. In my life time i have seen a decline in many species of shellfish from kachemak bay. As well as some natural runs of Salmon in the Fox River Critical Habitat disappear. I believe that allowing jetskis would threaten more salmon, shellfish, marine mammals and human lives. There is no logical reason i see to open kachemak bay to jetskis and personal water craft capable of operating in such shallow water. Please don't be another short sited politician without long term vision of protecting our resources. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Rio Shemet Pitcher | Rio Shemet Pitcher <rio.shemet.pitcher@g.kpbsd.org> | | I am a senior at Homer High School. I have lived in homer my whole life and would not like to see jet skis in the bay They will disturb the peace and the wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Jesikah Cavanaugh | Jesikah Cavanaugh <jesikahcav@gmail.com> | | The Kachemak Bay is a unique and beautiful region of our incredible state. When considering the introduction of jetskis and personal watercraft please keep in mind the following:<br><br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br>Thank you for your consideration, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Joe Page | Joe Page <joepage52@hotmail.com> | | For over 30 years I took student groups from the Mat Su Valley to Homer as part of a program we called Project Ocean. Coordinating with the Pratt Museum, the Alaska Center for Coastal Studies, and the Islands and Oceans Center, our young people learned about the incredible habitat crucial to the fish and wildlife of the bay. Allowing jet skis in the waters of K-Bay would seriously erode the quality of the experience.<br><br>Please keep jet skis out of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Erin Borowski | Erin Borowski <erininak@gci.net> | | I understand from your interview with KBBI that you don't see a substantial difference in personal watercraft vs other small watercraft like skiffs. If this is indeed your understanding, it is clear that you have never watched teenagers playing on jet skis. While a jetski may be used to get from place to place, the main reason all the people I know who own them is for the thrill of the ride. They go fast, they turn sharp, they catch air when jumped over other boat wakes. They aren't used for quiet, reflective time on the water and they can't really be used to transport any gear - they are ridden for the joy ride they offer.<br><br>I have had lots of fun over the years riding jet skis and watching my boys ride them. I also enjoy ocean boating and kayaking. There are lots of places to have fun on a PWC; the idea of allowing their use in the critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay is beyond understanding to me.<br><br>Please consider this comment as a big "No thank you!" to lifting the ban currently in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Robert Standish | Bob's Cabin <bobscabinak@gmail.com> | PO Box 1106 Kenai, AK 99611 | I am opposed to lifting the ban on jet skis (Personal Watercraft) in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>This area was designated as Critical Habitat by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game several years ago. This designation was made by habitat biologists who recognize the uniqueness of an ecosystem area to the flora and fauna that need special protection to ensure survival of the unique area. Jet ski use in the critical habitat area is not compatible with the biological marine organisms and wildlife found in this unique ecosystem.<br><br>Jet skis would disrupt the current biological status of this critical area. Jet skis travel near shore with high speed and rapidly changing directions; thus having a high potential to disrupt the unique biological ecosystem.<br><br>The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area should be protected from jet ski use. The area needs continued monitoring from adverse activities such as jet skis.<br><br>The local human population overwhelmingly oppose the use of jet skis and there are numerous other unprotected areas throughout the State of Alaska where jet skis may be used. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Anne Brooks | MarkaAnne Brooks <brooks.markaanne@gmail.com> | 1704 Rogers Park Court Anchorage, AK 99508 | I an a 45 year alaska resident and I oppose any regulation lessening restrictions on personal watercraft in Kachemak bay and surrounds. I do not believe the use is consistent with wildlife protections. I also have concerns about life safety and emergency response in the area with inexperienced users of which I think there will be many. I think the numbers will rise rapidly due to interests of tour operators further damaging the area. We have many places throughout southcentral that is not off limits. Do not open to this use. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Nicole Szarzi | Nicole Szarzi <njszarzi@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Keep ban on personal watercraft in place.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Marshall Miley | Marshall Miley <mrmileyy@gmail.com> | | I am emailing you to express my concern for the proposed allowance of Jet skis and other recreational motor vehicles in the Kachemak Bay Area. From my understanding and experience with the area, I see it as a very significant wildlife habitat. I have served on the ACC for a summer and have friends and have visited the area several times now. I am sure that we all love the great outdoors being residents, visitors, and former residents of the great state of Alaska. My concern is not only aesthetic, but practical and inclusive of the lifestyle and patterns of our treasured wildlife. I have spent time helping my friends business of ecotourism there and it depends largely on serenity and the undisturbed activities of all wildlife. They not only deserve this inherently as creatures of the animal kingdom but the people and residents of the area deserve their solitude as well. In my opinion, recreational motor vehicles serve no purpose on our precious waters. There is no practical reason why people should be jet skiing and disturbing the silence and serenity of others. Now, if they were using them to transport goods, services, water, food, etc. I could see merit in allowing it. However, since this is clearly not the case with such proposed vehicles, I strongly believe the sea otters, dolphins, and nesting raptors deserve respect and to be treated properly by honoring their own personal space and undisturbed behavior. Please, for the mental well-being of us all and for the sake of preserving the wildness of the final frontier and aesthetic quality of nature that many thousands of people come to this great state for every year, I ask that you oppose this proposition of the allowance of jet skis and other similar recreational vehicles in our precious waters. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Michael B. Rearden | Mike Rearden <mrearden@gci.net> | | See message: Lifting of ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC8 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Dave Atcheson | Dave Atcheson <daveatcheson@hotmail.com> | Sterling, Alaska 99672 | I am writing to express my views on inclusion of Jet skis on Kachemak Bay. The purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife. The science is clear and shows that Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>With over 99% of Alaskan waters open to Jetski use, opening this seems ridiculous. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Karen Shemet | Don Pitcher <pitcher@xyz.net> | | As a longtime resident of Homer, I want to add my voice to the many that strongly oppose allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. I thought Rick Sinnott's piece in the Anchorage Daily News yesterday made very clear and reasonable points for why we need to uphold the status quo here.<br><br>I also don't appreciate "the process" or shall I say, lack of process involved in overturning a rule that has been on the books from the beginning. This is clearly an effort to ram rod a change through that the powers that be are in support of. Let's not pretend that this is a fair and open discussion of options when it appears that a decision on high has already been made. People will not be quiet on this issues, especially when treated disrespectfully.<br><br>The issue of jet skis operating in our bay and home places is a serious no brainer, so let's just leave things as is. The protection that the bay, critters and ecosystem have now is how it should remain, forever, as was intended. We need to do the right thing here and not mess up Kachemak Bay with destructive and noisy jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Bill Wiebe | Bill Wiebe <janeandbill@gmail.com> | | It appears that you are getting some pressure from higher ups to open Kachemak Bay to jet skis. This pressure does not amount to widespread support from an Alaskan jet ski community because there really isn't one. Most of this pressure comes from a few individuals who stand to make money and our Governor may be one of these individuals.<br><br>And its not even that much money. There are so many safer and more interesting places to use a jet ski in Alaska outside of Kachemak Bay. The lakes and rivers near Anchorage would be far more lucrative. The most popular jet ski area I've been to is on the Colorado River below Needles where it is warm and calm. There is lots of jet ski money being spent there and when a machine breaks down it will most likely wash up next to somebody's beach house.<br><br>Kachemak Bay? Its cold, too rough for jet skis on many summer afternoons, featuring 22 foot tides inundating mudflats. Aim a dart at Anchorage on an Alaska map and you would hit a better jet ski location. The helicopter pilots may not agree with me as they would be fully employed rescuing stranded jetskiers off the Fox River Flats. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Craig Cutler | Craig C <2998856@gmail.com> | | Halibut fishing Capitol of the world. Oyster farms. Salmon fisheries. Shorebird festival. Kachemack Bay State Park. Cruise Ship stop. Charter and sight seeing boats. Tourists on the Homer Spit. Money for the State economy! Jet skis here? NO!<br>Just as well put a race track inside your favorite restaurant, library or church and watch your financial supporters disappear. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Patricia Westbrook | Pat Westbrook <patwestbrook@hotmail.com> | | I am opposed to permitting Jetskis in Kachemak Bay because of damage to wildlife in the Bay. I want you to convey this information to Govenor Dunleavy and recommend that he NOT approve use of Jetskis in Kachemak Bay.<br>The law is clear: the purpose of Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Catherine Knott, Ph.D., | Catherine Knott <sansanding@hotmail.com> | | I'm an environmental anthropologist, 59 years old. I have seen the damage and disruption that jet skis do in the Adirondacks, in Arizona, in Washington State, in the Great Lakes in Michigan (where I grew up) and in Eastern Ontario in the Temagami Lake area. They swamp the nests of shorebirds and contaminate the water. They disrupt other wildlife including marine mammals. They are noisy and will drive away some tourists. Many of the tourists who spend the most money in Kachemak Bay are older and would not be riding jetskis. They would be turned off by the noise and pollution and damage to wildlife. They are looking for peace and quiet. Consider who comes to the Annual Shorebird Festival. So, while the governor is thinking this is a money-maker, I 'm here to tell you that according to social science and environmental science, he hasn't got the data to support that assumption, and in fact, the opposite may be true, as well as damaging to the environment.<br>So my vote is no to jet skis. Think about the consequences, both in loss of revenue from tourists who have a lot of money and are looking for peace and quiet in a beautiful area, and ecologically to wildlife and water quality.<br>Instead, why not develop more educational programs that teach tourists other ways to enjoy their time in Alaska while protecting our wildlife and waters? We could actually get more high-dollar tourists by emphasizing the unique qualities of our wild areas, unlike the areas already contaminated by the noise pollution and literal water pollution of the jetskis, as well as the damage to the environment.<br>Here 's to thinking things through!<br>Let's try to educate the governor to do what 's right for Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Marcie Craig | Marcie Craig <marcie99502@yahoo.com> | Anchorage, Alaska | Anyone can see that allowing jet skis will cause irreparable damage (including but not limited to stress, noise, and probable maiming and killing) to the wildlife that lives there. For the Governor to be considering this ill advised idea to garner favor with a few jet ski owners will only cause even more negative reactions towards him which he clearly doesn't need as he is facing a recall movement. Any Alaskan who owns a jet ski knew they couldn't zoom around Kachemak Bay. It is called a Critical Habitat Area for a reason.<br>Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Shoshana Sadow | Shoshana Sadow <shoshanasadow@hotmail.com> | Anchorage & Homer, Alaska + Tucson, Arizona | See message: OPPOSITION OF JET SKIS in KACHEMAK BAY.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Marie Carlton | Marie Carlton <seaburyroad@live.com> | | Hello Mr. Green. The purpose of the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is just that...Critical! It is to " protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife." No water craft or person can be allowed to degrade, reduce, destroy or change ( intentionally or not ) a critical habitat area. Personal Water Craft are jet boats. Specifically designed to operate in very shallow water. Let us secure and protect what remains of our critical habitat. Personal Water Craft have a large volume of other areas to enjoy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Rona Fried, Ph.D | Rona Fried <Rona@sustainablebusiness.com> | | I live on a lake in Maine and know how disturbing jet skis are to wildlife like loons. Jet Skis are completely inappropriate in areas designated as Critical Habitat like Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats.<br>Do jetskis have to be everywhere? Isn't it enough that they are allowed on 99% of Alaska's waters?<br><br>I'm sure tourism is very important to Alaska as it is in Maine. In both states it makes no sense to threaten critical wildlife habitat for a few people who like jetskis.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500.<br><br>See 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Sharon Bauer | Sharon McKemie Bauer <smckemie@gmail.com> | P. O. Box 15363 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | •The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br>Please keep jet skis out of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Alison Cooke | Alison Cooke <acookeak@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Please keep Jetskis and personal watercraft (PWC) out of Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Marcus Geist | Marcus Geist <muclers@yahoo.com> | Anchorage | See message: Prohibit PWCs in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | (Lucille) Cici Conti Schoenberger | cici schoenberger <cscho02642@yahoo.com> | 14330 E. Spruce Circle Talkeetna, AK 99676 | I am writing to express my dismay at the proposal to open the Katchemak Bay Critical Habitat Area to the use of Personal Watercraft (Jetskis, etc). This is an issue that has been studied over many years and the recommendation has always been to NOT allow use of PWCs in this highly protected area. The ADFG itself has concluded, as recently as 2017, that upholding the ban on PWCs is appropriate and supported by science. What is the reason that after so many years of study that there should be a change in this highly researched ban? If it is to please a few Alaskans, I would ask you to remind them of the vast access to areas where use is allowed. The Katchemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is too important to sacrifice to the desire of the few who care only about their own personal "thrills." There are so many other ways to enjoy Katchemak Bay while preserving the fragile environment and eco-system.<br><br>Please stop this proposal to open use to Personal Watercraft and maintain the ban against the use in this particular area of Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | M. H. DeMers | Contract Consultants <contractconsultants@gmail.com> | | Please do not allow jet skis on Katchemak Bay<br>•Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent NPS EIS, a literature review by ADF&G and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff and experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br>Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | wsiegel | wsiegel <wsiegel@protonmail.com> | | Please no jetskis there!! Save it for people seeking an undisturbed natural place, and for birds and marine life. There are so many other great places for jetskis in Alaska. . | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | (Ms.) Thetus Smith | Thetus Smith <thetus@gci.net> | Alaska | Dear Rick Green:<br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br>It would be totally unconscionable for the state to decide on your proposed rule without considering direct input from Alaskans, especially those most immediately impacted in Homer and all other areas of the bay. Many, many more people who are NOT jet skiers must not be ignored for the benefit of only a few. The majority rules in favor of NO JET SKIS! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Rebecca Siegel | Rebecca Siegel <rebecca.s.siegel@gmail.com> | 2 High School Rd Brevig Mission AK 99785 | For five years I worked in Kachemak bay as a naturalist-educator with the Center for Alaskan Coastal Studies and as a kayak guide with St. Augustine's Kayak and Tours. I have had the privilege of sharing the vibrant Kachemak Bay ecosystem with its stunning abundance and biodiversity with hundreds on children and adults from Alaska, the lower 48, and as far away as Australia. I have been fortunate enough to be able to introduce all these people to the tranquility of Peterson Bay, China Poot Bay, Tutka Bay, Jakolof Bay, and Kastitsna Bay.<br><br>I believe that jetskis and other thrillcraft have no place in Kachemak Bay. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br><br>Furthermore, the science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Bjorn Olson | Bjørn Olson <fatbikebjorn@gmail.com> | PO Box 237 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: PWCs in Critical Habitat.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Diana Carbonell | Diana Carbonell <fritzcreekgeneralstore@gmail.com> | Homer | I am emailing you to let you know my opposition to personal watercraft use in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area. I have been a Homer resident for 28 years and now own a small business and a vacation rental. Tourist come to Homer for a variety of reasons, but they overwhelmingly want to come to fish and observe wildlife on the bay. I am not a scientist, but I do know that jet skis are loud and completely obnoxious to everyone who isn't on one. Why would you consider wrecking a tourist economy based on the protections of the critical habitat area to cater to a small group of thrill seekers who are welcome to have fun on the other 99% of Alaskan waters.<br>it's mind boggling! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Jill Rife | Jill Rife <jmrife@alaska.edu> | PO Box 15184 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | See message: Retain ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Paul C. Fleenor | Paul Fleenor <emsalaska@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I am sending this email to support the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, Alaska and would like to see the ban on personal watercraft repealed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Barbara Evans | Barbara Evans <kenbarbevans@gmail.com> | Kenai | I am totally against having jet skis in beautiful Kachemak Bay. The disturbance of the wildlife of these machines would change the beautiful uniqueness of our Bay. I don't live in Homer but spend much of my summer there fishing & camping.<br>I live on the Kenai River and we have regulations that restrict the use of certain boats & motor limits to protect our river ... same as having restrictions on Kachemak Bay.<br>Please rethink your decision or let knowledgeable people make this decision. You are our governor not our king to make decisions without people in the know to help you make this decision. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Pixie Smith | Gmail <pixie.smith.23@gmail.com> | | I am in favor of opening up access to Kachemak Bay to all users and allow all Alaskans use of our waters. To much of Alaska is off limits to one group or another and limits some of us from enjoying the same freedoms small special interest groups with wider agendas. We all are citizens of the State and as so under our constitution shall have equal rights. Lets go back to the real meaning of equal rights where everyone has a opportunity if they want to spend time as they wish on our State lands. Open up Kachemak Bay to all watercraft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Karen Wuestenfeld | Karen Wuestenfeld <karenwuestenfeld@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 2150 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Comments opposing repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Kate Finn | Kate Finn <hundredthmonk21@gmail.com> | POBox 3364 Homer Alaska 99603 | I am writing to you to ask you to PLESE NOT LIFT THE BAN ON JET-SKIS AND PWC IN KACHEMAK BAY!!<br>The process for making a rule changes WAS NOT followed. The rule change should have been considered as part of the ongoing revision process for the Management Plans of Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.<br>There are so many reasons that the ban is currently in place. Kachemak Bay is a unique, pristine natural habitat, recognized for it's biodiversity, by AK state, national and international agencies. It is a National Park and Wilderness area, a National Estuarine Research Reserve and a NOAA designated Critical Habitat Area. 99% of AK waters are available for jet-skis, there is no logical, economic, scientific or ethical reason that they need to invade Kachemak Bay!!!<br>Additionally this high speed, high risk sport could open up a major "can of worms" for the City of Homer, regarding regulation for use, enforcement of the rules, and liability issues when people get hurt. As a citizen of Homer i resent these extra financial burdens likely imposed by he use of PWCs on/in the Bay. It's like we citizens will be paying for the destruction of our environment.<br><br>PLEASE PRESERVE KACHEMAK BAY'S CRITICAL HABITAT BY KEEPING OUR<br>CURRENT BAN ON JET-SKIS AND "PERSON WATER CRAFT" | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ginger Drais | Ginger Drais <virgidr@hotmail.com> | | Jet skis have easy access to almost all of the waterways in and around Alaska. Big Lake and Nancy Lake are examples of noisy, hard to patrol Alaskan lakes that have deaths and tragic injuries each year due to authorized use of personal watercraft, often attributed to alcohol and drug use.<br>Kachemak Bay, even with the horrors of climate change we see in Alaska and more particularly on the Peninsula, still is relatively intact and pristine. Please Mr Green, do not let greed and politics ruin these critical habitat areas. It has been said in many different ways that wilderness is what will save us. May we continue to have wilderness so that this can be true! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ann Rappoport | Ann Rappoport <agrappoport@gmail.com> | 17053 Aries Court Anchorage, AK 99516 | See message: Do not allow personal watercraft (jet skis) in Kachemak Bay!.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ted Eischeid | Theodore Eischeid <eischeid@mac.com> | 410 Mellow Place Anchorage AK 99508 | I'm writing to express my wish that Personal Water Craft continue to be banned from the Katchemak Bay State Critical Habitat Area. The decision to ban this craft was based on science and public comment. To change these protections without a change in scientific understanding or in public opinion undercuts the concept of rationale government of, by, and for the people.<br><br>Please log in this comment as in opposition to any change in the KBSCHA management plan. Alaska's a big place, and there is ample areas elsewhere for PWC use other than Katchemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Clark & Cheryl Whitney | Clark Whitney <wildalaska@acsalaska.net> | 43735 Sports Lake Rd. Soldotna AK 99669 | As property owners in Bear Cove on Kachemak Bay, we are adamantly opposed to allowing the operation of jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats areas.<br><br>These machines are disruptive and destructive to wildlife, having access to the nests and living areas of both land and sea birds, as well as other animals living on the banks and coves of Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats.<br>A big NO to allowing these extremely destructive machines access to the Bay or adjoining areas.<br><br>Operators of these machines have adequate access to other waters just about everywhere on the Kenai Peninsula! | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Bill Wuestenfeld | Bill Wuestenfeld <billwuestenfeld@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 2150 Homer, AK 99603 | I also strongly oppose repeal of the personal watercraft ban in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. My views are consistent with those of my wife, provided below.<br><br>See message: Fwd: Comments opposing repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Vicky Metts | vicky metts <vmetts1@hotmail.com> | | It is very disturbing to learn the ban on jet skis may be lifted in Kachemak Bay. Boats going to and fro to deliver goods, people etc. is one thing but to have the wildlife and this serene environment marred for the sake of spinning circles or jumping waves is quite another. We were married in Katchemak Bay in 2015 and there is nothing to compare with Kayaking in the serenity of this pristine environment and the encompassing silence of everything but whale spouts. I am sure this is just for some monetary benefit to someone but I can only pray that stronger minds will prevail and listen to the experts who concur that this habitat should be protected. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ron Swartz | ron swartz <swartz_ron@hotmail.com> | 6642 E. 99th ave Anchorage Ak99507 | I oppose the rule change that would allow jet skis, personnel watercraft, in Kachamack bay. This is no place for the noise and annoyance of these machines. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Mike and Cathy McCarthy | cathmac@gci.net | P. O. Box 957 Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: Jet Ski Ban.msg in PWC9 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | G. Fries | Gregory Fries <kickbatkool@icloud.com> | Homer | Watercraft such as jet skiis belong in theme parks and trhill ride settings, NOT designated (and marketed) nature preserves such as Kachemak Bay.<br>The irritating noise and smell of these machines assaults the nerves of humans and wildlife.<br>Please keep them off Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Eileen Faulkner | Eileen Faulkner <ejf@gci.net> | | My recommendation is a resounding NO. There are several reasons for my decision to include: what entity is going to enforce the specific no boats etc allowed in the bay critical areas? Jet ski operators will not be familiar with the bay and state functions are already down to bare bones with personnel/budgets. Another reason is unfortunately they have a reputation of a lot of drinking/partying meaning the individuals will pull up to beaches and party etc. Some of the beach areas are "owned" by private individuals, will interfere with folks that might have personal set nets in the water for personal fishing. I respectfully request that this proposal not be approved. It has been voted down 2 times in the past and the key word is VOTE. I don't believe the decision should be at the whim of the governor. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Keith and Randi Iverson | Sadie Cove, Alaska - The Iversons <mail@sadiecove.com> | | See message: Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay - final copy - please read and post.msg in PWC9 | 2 | | | business/ individual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Greg Demers | Greg Demers <gdemers@horizonsatellite.com> | Anchor Point, AK | I have lived and worked around Kachemak Bay for the past 42 years, 28 of which I was employed by ADF&G commercial fisheries division.I am intimately familier with the Bay and it's wildlife resources, and I am convinced that the use of jetskis there would have a severe negative impact on those resources.Much of my professional career was spent on the ground and shoreline of the many river estuaries in Kachemak Bay.<br>I must advise you to quash this ill-concieved idea to allow jetskis within this designated critical habitat area! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Anne Kahn | Anne Coray <northshoreink@exede.net> | | I am writing to voice my strong opposition to lifting the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. I urge you to read this entire email, because I have a concern that I have not yet seen expressed. Namely, that is a SAFETY risk. Have you visited Homer at the height of the tourism and fishing season? Have you witnessed the extensive boat traffic in the bay? Many fishing and tourism boats are much bigger than jetskis, and that means jetski operators could easily perish if their machine comes into contact with a large vessel.<br>I have personally witnessed jetskis on Crooked Lake (near Big Lake) in the Mat-Valley. The drivers seemed oblivious to what was around them, traveling in circles and intent on one thing: speed. What a nightmare to think that big boats and jetskis would be operating in the same waters—it would be like allowing go-carts on the highway, putting them at the mercy of diesel trucks and 18 wheelers.<br>I fail to understand why the restriction on jet skis in Kachemak Bay is being revisited. Apparently it is a political move only. The people of Alaska and ADF&G staff have made their voices clear in years past: NO JET SKIS IN THIS CRITICAL HABITAT AREA!!!<br>We have to protect our resources, which incidentally bring in thousands and thousands of dollars in revenue to the state.<br>Please think hard about this new proposal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Gretchen Keiser | Gretchen Keiser <gekeiser@gmail.com> | 3271 Nowell Ave Juneau, AK 99801 | Hello - I oppose allowing Jet skis in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Jet skis are not compatible with the primary purpose of this area which is to protect habitat critical to maritime fish and wildlife. As an Alaskan who enjoys another State protected area- Mendenhall Wetlands State Refuge - I understand the value of these areas to wildlife and adjacent communities.<br><br>There are plenty of SC coastal areas open to jet skis. Leave Kachemak Bay ski-free. Besides its fundamental value as habitat, the Bay provides a recreational place for Alaskans and tourism industry using traditional and non-injurious modes of transportation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Evelyn Seguela | evelyn seguela <earthacres2@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | Practically speaking, Kachemak Bay is Not getting any bigger but, our human population Is.. Seems like wildlife is having a hard time keeping up with the changes we humans are putting it thru and I think we ought to give it more of a chance. After all, I believe 75% of visitors to Alaska, come to view wildlife as their number 1 goal. We can't make more wildlife and we cant make a bigger bay but, we can protect what we have. Kachemak Bay has already been designated as Critical habitat for this wildlife and adding jet skis to the mix is not going to help.<br>Why do humans Need to be able to go anywhere they want, when ever the want? That just seems spoiled to me. We could be better stewards and conserve what we have for our kids kids... | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Dale Spence Chorman | Dale Spence Chorman <dalechorman@gmail.com> | | Please don't allow jet ski's on Kachemak Bay. I've seen too many other places destroyed by there presence! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Beth Nehus | Beth Nehus <bnehus@gmail.com> | Homer | Jet skis should not be allowed in a critical habitat area. They unlike boats would be totally used for fun. Because of their ability to turn quickly, accelerate quickly and often be used in a group, they would be extremely disruptive to the birds and other wildlife. There nothing stopping people from using kachemak bay. They need to find something other than jet skis. This should not be a political decision, but based on the studies done and recommendations of the fish and game. I am a resident of homer and very concerned about this. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Vicki Albert | Vicki Albert <vickia@gci.net> | Homer | Jet skis/PWC are not in any way a good idea for Kachemak Bay. Jet skis are all about having fun, wildly zipping, spinning and jumping about in the water.<br>And it's ok to have fun, it's absolutely great, but not everywhere. Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats, by law, are a critical habitat area. This law means, that the area's goal is to protect and preserve habitat, to perpetuate fish and wildlife. It is common sense that having this type of watercraft will totally change the face of Kachemak Bay. Think about it: the noise they will make and the incredible stirring of the water, will affect/harm fish and birds. Do you really believe otters will be all around the bay, as they are now? Relocation of many species will occur. I live in Homer, and I am down at the spit daily, in the spring and summer. We watch the people fishing at Lands End, we watch others that are there because they are in awe as are we, of the surrounding beauty of the bay, the mountains and the critters. Cruise ships come to Homer, to see "wild Alaska," not jet skis screaming around the bay. Having people on jet skis will change everything. Also of great importance, allowing jet skis, would open up the likelihood of boats coming into contact with them. Accidents are going to happen.<br>We are slowly watching climate change, destroy all that we love, world wide, due to greed, ignorance, and short sightedness. Individuals thinking only about, RIGHT NOW, and not future deleterious effects. Let us not lose this, "piece of heaven," and all it stands for, right here in Homer. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Diana Conway | alaskadiana@gmail.com | Halibut Cove | I strongly oppose opening Kachemak Bay to jetskis.<br>My concern is not the impacts to local property owners, of which I am one but the impact to animal life in the bay.<br>In particular I worry about the otters who mate, give birth, and raise their young in Halibut Cove where I live.<br>Otters take refuge in our community from storms on the bay, or human noise and annoyance.<br>Sometimes we have more than 100 of them in residence.<br>In addition Halibut Cove serves as a nesting area for Great Blue Herons. We have counted up to a dozen at a time, and these birds are extremely rare in the area and very sensitive to any noise, even as little as two people speaking.<br>Finally, you should be aware that many schools of herring, salmon, greenling, and other immature fish circle around Ishmalof Island as do flocks of Golden Eye, Harlequin, Long tail ducks, Mallards and countless other sea birds.<br>Finally, you should be aware of the danger jetskis potentially represent to children and adults who travel in kayaks, row boats, paddle boards and other non-motorized transportation frequently used in this area.<br>I urge you to restrict jetskis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Kathleen Trump | kathy trump <kathy.trump@yahoo.com> | P.O. Box 470 Talkeetna, Alaska | I am writing in order to voice my opinion that jetskis do not belong in Kachemak Bay. The purpose of Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife. The science is clear--Jetskis and critical habitat in Kachemak Bay are incompatible. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game did a thorough review of scientific studies and found no reason to lift the ban on personal watercraft and jetskis.<br><br>Jetskis are fun and allowed in 90% of Alaskan waterways. They are incompatible in the critical habitat for birds and fish of Kachemak Bay, however. We are smart enough to allow fun devices where they fit and stop them from places critical to our wildlife and fish. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Harold Parker | Barbara Parker <dippercreek@hotmail.com> | | We've successfully petitioned at least three times in very recent history to disallow jet skis there. National Park Service agreed, ADF&G agreed, the science agreed. They all still agree. It is very upsetting to see it pop up again so soon. The Governor has no moral right to reopen it up unilaterally. Open to jet skis, equates to closed to a vast majority of other people and purposes and uses and livelihoods and wildlife habitat, right away and for the future of all.<br>Thank you, for dismissing the request to undo the rightful will of many, and for maintaining protection of our greatest resources, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Nancy Bloczynski | Nancy Bloczynski <bertnanc@gmail.com> | | Please do not propose a regulation that would allow Jetskis and PWC in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The legislature designated it a state critical habitat area.<br><br>The plan reads:<br>“protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose.” Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br><br>Almost all other AK waters are open to PWC and Jetskis. Please follow what the legislature has put in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Jennifer Edwards | Jennifer Edwards <jedwardslat59@gmail.com> | Homer | No! The science has not changed. The need to protect critical marine habitats ha not changed. My opinion and desires have not changed. Please, please, please fix, in stone, the ban on jet skis on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Anne Wieland | Anne Wieland <agpacsu@yahoo.com> | P.O. Box 1395 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Kachemak Bay Ban on PWCs and Jet Skis.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Glenn and Claudia Roberts | caroberts@ak.net | 550 N. Hyer Road Palmer, AK 99645 | ver the holidays we have read numerous Letters to the Editor in the Anchorage Daily News regarding lifting a ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. As residents of Alaska since 1971, we have seen many instances of harassment of water birds nesting in the brush along the shorelines of Nancy Lake, Big Lake, and Stephan Lake. Jet skis are designed for fast maneuvers generating a large wake, and the engines are very loud. The crafts destroy bird nests along the shoreline with their wake and more often run over a mama bird and chicks. This harassment seems to be the purpose of these vehicles. The drivers are of both sexes, usually young (very young and unsupervised). Often we have seen young eagles perched on a low hanging limb or spruce trunk extending over the banks.. The jet skiers go after them. Confrontations with the drivers have never been pleasant. They will boast a privilege do this with no consequences. We find the proposed lifting of restrictions for jet skis in Kachemak Bay appalling. Overall, there is a long coastline framing a thriving wildlife population. It is as a Critical Habitat Area. The wildlife there have not been exposed to such bad human behavior. It would take many years to study the impact to the wildlife and it may not be reversible in our lifetime. We urge you to keep such activities out of Kachemak Bay. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Patti Berkhahn | Patti Berkhahn <pgberkhahn@gmail.com> | 39195 Coulter Ct Soldotna, AK 99669 | I am vehemently opposed to the opening of Kachemak Bay to the use of personal watercraft, otherwise known as jet skis.<br><br>Alaska Statute 16.20.500 designated Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas (KBCHA and FRFCHA, respectively), to “protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.”<br>As you know, Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Habitat Areas are unique because they attract thousands of birds throughout the year that depend on theses areas for feeding and rest during their spring and fall migrations, as well as resident species. It is also Critical Habitat for marine mammals, i.e., sea otters, whales, seals, etc. that find KBCHA rich in foods vital for their survival. Jet skis (personal watercraft) are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water. As a result, they pose threats to birds and marine mammals if their use is allowed in Kachemak Bay. Even the bigger and newer personal watercraft are quite capable in performing these maneuvers and are used in that manner.<br>The natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on their personal watercraft. Please listen to all the Alaskans speaking out against opening the Critical Habitat Area to personal use; there are plenty of lakes and other saltwater areas they can use this watercraft. Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is very special; let’s keep it that way and the way our predecessors took the forethought to protect. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | William H. Bell | Bill Bell <wmbell51@gmail.com> | 4136 Bartlett Homer, AK 99603 | Add my voice to those against the use pf PWC in Kachemak Bay . IN the fifty years I have been associated with this area I have seen a tremendous loss of biodiversity and species in the Bay. As a critical habitat area we must do all we can to protect the nurseries and breeding gournds for all the organisms that make this place vital. The use of PWC in shallow areas that skiffs can ot get into will be exceedingly disruptive to the life wb that starts with small organisms in the flats and lead to large organisms in the depths of the bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | David Malzac | David Malzac <hymey2@gmail.com> | | Restriction of watercraft in Kachemak Bay seems to be a response to a few peoples complaints and not the majority. To repeat what a recent flyer stated and I agree, please read the following.<br><br>This is about fair and equal access for all Alaskans to Alaska’s public waters.<br>The ban was put in place based on questionable “studies” that had no scientific basis.<br>PWC are some of the most environmentally friendly boats available.<br>Conservation concerns are already addressed by current regulations which apply to all<br>boats in Alaska.<br>Kachemak Bay belongs to ALL Alaskans – not just the self-chosen few. Equal access for all. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Mike Blair | Mike Blair <blairolson2015@gmail.com> | 1850 Count Road 247 New Castle CO 81647 | Please accept my following comments regarding the proposed opening of Kachemak Bay to jet skis and personal watercraft.<br><br>I am very concerned about the Governor's plan to open Kachemak Bay to jet skis and personal water craft.<br><br>I am a State of Alaska retiree, born and raised in Seward and spend at least 3 months a year at our cabin in the Bear Cove vicinity. We have owned the cabin since 1992 and have enjoyed the peace and tranquility that it affords my family.<br><br>I detest the Governor's plan to open up Kachemak Bay. I have been following this news every day and believe that this plan will be harmful to ALL of the wildlife that inhabit the Bay. Besides adding to the pollution and its effects on mammals & fish, humans who enjoy the wonders of the Bay will be also drastically affected. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Karen Strid-Chadwick | Karen Strid-Chadwick <stridwick@gci.net> | Homer | See message: Kachemak PMW.msg in PWC9 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Kate Finn | Kate Finn <hundredthmonk21@gmail.com> | | Let me state a couple of my objections to a rule change that would allow jet-skis and PWC onto the waters of Kachemak Bay and her shores:<br><br>1-The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 ).<br><br>2-It seems that 99% of Alaskan waters are available to Jetskis and PWC.Please let's preserve Kachemak Bay, the one and only remaining sanctuary in Alaska where the waters have been set aside, where people and animals can find a quiet and peaceful refuge!!<br>Marketing research has clearly established that QUIET is the most sought after quality for people, and Kachemak Bay is recognized by international, national and state agencies/organizations as a rare area of unusual bio-diversity and pristine natural habitat. That is because it is a Critical Habitat Area, a National Estuarine Research Reserve, and a National Park and Wilderness area.<br>Kachemak Bay is also an internationally designated a critical migration site on the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network. Because of our fabulous annual springtime Shorebird Festival, tourists are being drawn here for nearly a month before our regular summer season of fishing begins—a huge boost to the local businesses, and the awareness of the importance of birds!<br><br>From an economic as well as scientific and ethical perspective, Kachemak Bay must remain protected from PWC thrill craft use! Jet ski users have 99% of Alaskan waters available to them.<br>PLEASE PRESERVE KACHEMAK BAY'S CRITICAL HABITAT!!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Beth Blankenship | Beth Blankenship <bethbeadsandbeads@gmail.com> | | In 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The State revisited the issue in 2011 and 2016, and again, Alaskans spoke-out to maintain the ban. The inherent design and intended use of jetskis makes them incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, which is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.<br><br>The State is currently undergoing revisions to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, and any changes to jetski policy or rules should occur within the context of the management plan revisions. Staff biologists and managers at the ADFG support the jetski ban in Kachemak Bay. They have reviewed all the scientific literature on the matter and they conclude the ban is appropriate and justified.<br><br>Some activities are simply too unsafe or a nuisance to other users. Jetskis and other personal watercraft are "thrillcraft" which can reach speeds over 60 mph and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is one place that should be left free of them.<br><br>I repeat: A strong majority of Alaskans supported a jetski ban in 2001, and again in 2011 and 2016.<br><br>Please keep the ban on personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Miro Schaad | Miro Schaad <miro.schaad@gmail.com> | | I am writing in support of maintaining the current jet ski ban in the Kachemak Bay. With the amount of tourism traffic on the Kenai Peninsula, a repeal of this ban would result in a complete conflict with the original intention of the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habiat Area. The purpose is defined in the Alaska Statute 16.20.500, which is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Michael S. Burns | 19072421131 <19072421131@mms.gci.net> | | **Message:** Dear Rick Green, I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. Sincerely, Michael S. Burns | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Laura Baldwin | Laura Baldwin <laura.baldwin.ak@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | The purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." This is from Alaska Statutes 16.20.500.<br><br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br><br>Let's choose not to do this. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Joan Diamond | Joan Diamond <buddy4@ak.net> | | Kachemak Bay and jet skis do not mix. I have seen the problems on Big Lake when people, jet skis and alcohol mix. The state does not even have the money to enforce public safety regulations. It is not a sport that people do quietly or calmly. It is not in the best interests of the bay to add jet skiing.<br><br>Wrong sport in the wrong area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Travis Rector | Travis Rector <tarector@alaska.edu> | | I am writing to let you know I am opposed to jetskis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Maureen Knutsen | Maureen Knutsen <maureen.knutsen@gmail.com> | Naknek, AK | I am writing to express my opposition to allowing jet skis in waters of Kachemak Bay designated as critical habitat for fish and wildlife.<br><br>Jet skis are noisy, polluting and need to be restricted to areas that do not support valuable, renewable resources, which are already being stressed by warming, acidifying waters. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Max Neale | Max Neale <max.neale@gmail.com> | | The purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose."<br><br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are not compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Stephanie Dickerson | Stephanie Dickerson <stephanielynnedickerson@gmail.com> | | I am writing to voice my support for continuing to disallow PWC in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>Sometimes in the past I used to laugh at the ban and say that it wasn't needed, who would want to use PWC here but the much warmer summer and fall temperatures, improvement in wetsuit technology and increased visitors to the area over the last 10+ years have all made the possibility much much less laughable.<br><br>As a resident and local business owner I foresee great impact to my home and livelihood in addition to wildlife impacts.<br><br>As an recreational user and operator in the Bay, we value the relative quiet and safety that the lack of PWC allows. Stand up paddling, kayaking and surfing would all feel quite different, less safe and lose some of its appeal to ourselves and clients. (And as surfers we have nothing against PWC but it's place is not in this critical habitat area).<br><br>The increase in noise is also a consideration. Summer is anything but quiet already and adding to the float planes, boats and traffic seems unnecessary and short sighted.<br><br>I expect that you have a lot of more powerful people lobbying in the other direction but I impart you listen to my voice anyway. | 1 | | | business/individual | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | John Sanborn | John Sanborn <jws38stu@hotmail.com> | 347 Porcupine Ct. Unit 13 Soldotna, AK 99669 | I am writing to you to share my opposition to allow jetskis on/in Kachmack Bay. I am a former resident of Homer and now reside in Soldotna. I tell you this cause having lived there I saw something wonderful there. No Jet Skis. There are lots of reasons to not allow jet skis. First marine life is fragile and deserves our respect by not allowing wild reckless abandonment to such devices. The Jet ski when you watch them is not a means of transportation or for harvesting sea life for food. It is like a dirt bike designed for sporting dare deviling play in water. It is unpredictable in its direction or its purpose. I can only imagine sea life being terrified of them. The K Bay is still much like a wilderness area, where peaceful boats fishing, kayaking or sightseeing with predictable direction and noise to sea life ply the waters. I often think of the Sierra Club's motto, " Not blind opposition to progress, but rather opposition to blind progress" . Please do not allow for Jet Skis on Kachmack Bay there is good sound reason to not allow them and only disrespectful reckless personal greed and selfishness to allow it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Steve Kahn | Steve Kahn <22zulu@exede.net> | | I am a lifelong Alaskan who is totally opposed to repealing the Jetski (and other personal watercraft) ban in Kachemak Bay.<br>I am aware that in 2001, ADFG underwent a robust public process that resulted in banning Jetskis. As you well know, ADFG staff conducted an exhaustive review of the scientific literature surrounding Jetski risks and impacts—and it concluded again in 2017 that the ban on personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area was appropriate and supported by science. Please share with me the reports and studies recently conducted by ADF&G staff (biologists and other scientists) that support the decision to repeal the ban.<br>Please pass on to the Commissioner and the Governor that I don't appreciate the administration elevating the interests of a small group of people over the staff biologists and managers at the ADFG and the majority of Alaskans.<br>I have voted in every election since turning voting age and I will not miss a special election, especially if one comes up that could correct a politician who ignores both science and the will of the majority of Alaskans. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Christine Byl | Christine Byl <cmbyl.ak@gmail.com> | Healy, AK | I was quite disturbed to read a recent article in the ADN which implied that amount of public opinion opposed is not going to sway your decision to open Kachemak Bay to jet-skis. I think this is unfortunate and and a dereliction of duty. There is no scientific basis that says jet-skis would be helpful to the K-Bay ecosystem. And there is plenty of science to say it could harm wildlife populations and fisheries. There are tons of ways to recreate in Kachemak Bay, and allowing one of the loudest, fastest, most polluting, and most obnoxious water craft is not necessary in order to provide fair access.<br>It sounds like you are taking your marching orders from lobbying interests which you consider higher priority than the Alaskan public, which is a shame. Nonetheless, I am going on record as completely opposed to this move. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Connie Markis | Connie Markis <cmarkis@gci.net> | Alaska | I am writing to request that you protect the natural habitat and values of Kachemak Bay by continuing to ban Jetskis from those waters. In studying the issue that has been in the news recently, it is clear that the science shows that Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat for protecting fish and wildlife. This is supported by the 2019 National Park Service Environmental Impact Statement and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game literature review as well as ADF&G staff experts' informed opinions. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year and help drive the local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can use Jetskis in this area | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Don Pitcher | Don Pitcher <pitcher@xyz.net> | | See message: Protect Kachemak Bay from.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Dave Eckwert | David Eckwert <eckwert@yahoo.com> | Homer, Alaska | I'm asking you to ensure the protection of the critical habitat of Kachemak Bay by retaining the current regulations restricting the use of personal water crafts like Jetskis. This is vital to maintain the safety and integrity of this important ecosystem. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Poppy Benson | Poppy Benson <poppyb.ak@gmail.com> | 157 Island View Ct. Homer, AK 99603 | See message: PWC (Jet skis) don't belong in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Lisa Climo | Lisa Climo <lclimo58@gmail.com> | Anchor Point | I strongly oppose the proposed repeal of the personal watercraft ban in the critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay. I disagree with you that repealing the ban does not go against the purpose of the critical habitat areas, to protect and preserve habitat crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife. Personal watercraft are definitely incompatible with that purpose, I have witnessed that myself when studying shorebirds along the Gulf Coast of the US. Several times I saw jet-ski users ride up loud and fast into nearshore waters and flush foraging shorebirds, sometimes on purpose. I have also seen a small overpowered open boat purposely drive through rafts of sea ducks off the Homer Spit-- that, unfortunately, is not prohibited, but allowing jet skis into the same habitats in the name of "fairness" is only going to compound the problem of intentional or unintentional harassment of wildlife.<br><br>As I understand it, there are many places in Alaska where personal watercraft are allowed for recreational purposes. Opening up the critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay to their use as well is frankly "unfair" to the fish and wildlife which are meant to be protected in these areas, as well as to the many residents and visitors here who enjoy the relatively calm and quiet PWC-less quality of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ron Bennett | Ron Bennett <fisheronak@gmail.com> | 304 Linwood Ln Kenai, AK 99611 | I am writing to ask you to keep the ban in place on Kachemak Bay. I fish, boat and sight see on Kachemak Bay. I also do the same out of Seward on Resurrection Bay. Last summer I was fishing on Resurrection Bay and was passed by a PWC twice. It was noisy and fast. It reminded me how out of place it was and how glad I was they are not allowed on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>There are plenty of other places in the state they are allowed. Please keep the ban in place and keep them off of Kachemak Bay. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Jenifer Cameron | Jenifer Cameron <cameronoriginals@gmail.com> | | As a year round resident of Kachemak Bay and a 40+ year resident of Alaska, I'm voicing my opposition to lifting the ban. The ban was put in place as part of a comprehensive plan for Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area and to "cherry pick" this out of the comprehensive plan would be compromising the effectiveness and goal of the Critical Habitat designation. We need to be stewards for that which has no voice or vote...the land, water and the fragile ecosystems for future generations to come. Now is not the time to lift the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Charles & Hannah Kahahawai | Hannah Kahahawai <hckahahawai101@gmail.com> | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Kevin and Margaret Keene | Margaret <kmkeene@gci.net> | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Andy and Stephanie George | Stephanie George <asgeorge89@yahoo.com> | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Amanda Johnston | The Salmon People <thesalmonpeople@gmail.com> | 41005 created crane st Homer Ak 99603 | As a resident of Kachemak city, I oppose the use of PWC in our critical habitat. These machines will effect not the wild life and the peaceful environment that people come from all over the world to enjoy. There is a reason Homer is such a special place and we hope to keep it this way. Jet skis run at high RPMs and make a crazy amount of noise. Please don't let this happen to our bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Sue Christiansen | Sue Christiansen <suechristiansen@yahoo.com> | | Like Monteray Bay, Kachemak Bay is a marine sanctuary.<br>99% of coastal waters in Alaska are open and available to PWC.<br>Please allow Kachemak Bay to remain off limits to them. On behalf of the many wild species that take refuge here.<br>Please work with the lovers of this place. Let us know you hear our concerns and are able to show compassion and respect for individuals and species who have different needs then you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Lisa Sinnott | Lisa Sinnott <lisawsinnott@gmail.com> | | I am a resident of Alaska who enjoys visiting Kachemak Bay. I oppose the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area because of the potential harm to wildlife. It was designated a "critical habitat area" by our Legislature for a reason! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ian Blake | Ian Blake <tele-skier@hotmail.com> | 2151 Alder Dr. Anchorage, AK 99508 | See message: RE: Kachemak Bay PWC proposal.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Angela Lindberg | Angie Lindberg <akcdoo@yahoo.com> | 18212 S. Birchwood Loop Rd Chugiak, AK 99567 | Thank you for your efforts in trying to get this changed.<br><br>My wife and I bought Seadoos back in the late 1990s. We owned one of the first 3 seaters and a two seater. We loved them and used them more of a boat than a thrill ride. We witnessed the transition from the loud joy riding, tearing up the water days of the stand-up to the quiet riding 4 stroke engines.<br><br>Personal water craft (PWC) are much better environmentally these days. They are quieter and do far less damage to the beaches and shore sides than boats.<br><br>I support the repeal of the ban in Katchemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Joe Lindberg | Joe Lindberg <akseadoo@yahoo.com> | 18212 S. Birchwood Loop Rd Chugiak, AK 99567 | Thank you for your efforts in trying to get this changed.<br><br>My wife and I bought Seadoos back in the late 1990s. We owned one of the first 3 seaters and a two seater. We loved them and used them more of a boat than a thrill ride. We witnessed the transition from the loud joy riding, tearing up the water days of the stand-up to the quiet riding 4 stroke engines.<br><br>Personal water craft (PWC) are much better environmentally these days. They are quieter and do far less damage to the beaches and shore sides than boats.<br><br>I support the repeal of the ban in Katchemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Marjorie Dunn | Marge Dunn <margerandlett@gmail.com> | 357 Lee Drive Homer, Alaska 99603 | I am writing to request that the State retain the current regulations prohibiting jet ski use in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I have been a Homer resident for 5 years and have spent summers across the bay from Homer for over 20 years. I cherish the natural environment and especially the fish and wildlife in the bay. The fish and wildlife have been at least partially protected I the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area due to the current regulations prohibiting jet skis. Jet ski lend themselves to quick maneuvers for chasing wildlife, are typically used for touring around the bay rather than reaching a destination. I understand that the noise element is decreasing in newer models of personal watercraft, but nonetheless I think it is an unnecessary noise factor that will also reach swallow parts of the bay. Simply put, allowing "thrillcraft" would degrade the natural habitat for both the fauna and for humans.<br>Providing another opportunity for "fun" for a few is not worth degrading our natural habitat. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | A.Van Dinther | Andrea Van Dinther <a.vandinther@gmail.com> | | There are all kinds of arguments people will give about wildlife and emissions and I agree with those sentiments. They are true and must be considered. What also must be considered is the economics of the area.<br><br>I am a Homer resident. I work as a wildlife guide and have traveled the world seeing different communities that earn a livelihood from tourism. What I have learned is that places that maintain preservation of their wilderness areas are able to bring in much higher dollars for tours and accommodations in that area. Near wilderness, lodges can bring in hundreds/night. Disturb that, make it just another loud crowded beach, and that number goes down.<br><br>We need to maintain Kachemak Bay as a treasured pristine wilderness area so that we can continue to bring in top-dollar for the tourism industry here in Kachemak Bay. Without it we are just another town.<br><br>If you would like comparative numbers,I have that data.<br><br>Please retain current prohibitions and keep Kachemak Bay reserve safe for wildlife, and economically viable for our future. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | CAREN CORCORAN | CAREN CORCORAN <caren@mtaonline.net> | | I do not believe the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay should be lifted. Sea otters WILL be injured as the people can not be trusted to watch out for wildlife. They can't even pick up their own trash. Why would you even let them go out there when you know they can't be trusted??? They are trying to make this another California and we DO NOT need it here. We value our wildlife and we want them protected from the insanity of disrespectful humans that don't value anything but their own personal thrill. DO NOT ALLOW PERSONAL WATERCRAFT OUT IN KACHEMAK BAY. IT WILL BE DISASTROUS IF YOU DO. AND WE WILL KNOW WHERE THE BLAME SHOULD RESIDE WHEN OTTERS ARE KILLED. QUIT CAVING TO PRESSURE. DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR OUR WILDLIFE. THEY WERE HERE BEFORE PEOPLE. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Steve Albert | Steve Albert <hockyman@gci.net> | | See message: Watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC9 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Charlene Ditton | Charlene <bobdit@alaska.net> | PO Box 601 Homer, Alaska. 99603 | I oppose lifting the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Karen Medak | Karen Medak <karenhmedak@gmail.com> | | See messages: ban on jetskis in Kachemack Bay.msg in PWC10 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Judy Brakel | Judy Brakel <outlook_64630292AA2641C2@outlook.com> | Gustavus, Alaska | You must not allow these high-speed, super-maneuverable jet skis and personal water-craft run around in the critical habitat areas. To my knowledge nothing of the kind is allowed in other critical habitat areas. There is a critical habitat area near where I live in Gustavus and the only mechanical conveyance allowed there is for hunting by someone who is physically disabled, a use that has very rarely occurred.<br><br>These high-speed little machines would disturb waterfowl, marine mammals and fish, leading to declines in wildlife. The peaceful character of these places would be radically disturbed for wildlife and human visitors alike. The proposed use is radically unsuitable. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | walt sonen | Walt Sonen <ijit31@gmail.com> | Seldovia | i object to the proposal being advanced to introduce personal water craft to the critical habitat area in kachemak bay. we have all observed the extreme operators of these machines and i think that it would be foolish not to assume that a large portion of these operators, should the proposal succeed, would be folks with little experience who would rent. many folks compare jet skis to skiffs, i don't think that this is a valid comparison. jet skis can access shallow water at high speeds, not can, but will, just for fun. the multitude of quiet coves, nooks and crannies that provide shelter for waterfowl of all types are easily accessed. it was headlined in just this week's anchorage paper how the "blob" has stressed the bird populations, especially the murres—major die offs. i think that we will see the otters harassed by the less sensitive riders as well. doesn't it make sense that we leave kachemak bay as something of a sanctuary, that we have that responsibility? especially those of you at ADFG, who must have a greater awareness of and hopefully sensitivity to the situation.<br><br>here in seldovia, it is fair to say that as a community we have established a reputation as a quiet respite for ourselves and our visitors as well. kayaking, walking, and bird watching are the norm for people who come to town. we have a "human powered" fishing derby that has become quite popular. jet skis will have an adverse affect on these activities without so much as a glance in the rear view mirror. i am a 40+ year resident of seldovia, and i can tell you that i don't at all look forward to the possibility of a jet ski rental place opening up in this area. and who and how will enforcement be addressed?<br>it's the wrong way to go! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Barbara Crews | Barbara <barbaracrews@alaska.net> | PO Box 649 Girdwood, AK 99587 | Please support the science behind the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. It is important to make decisions based on the studies and information provided by your own state fish and game managers.<br><br>This is not simply a question of equal access. In this instance, the use of jet skis will destroy this special habitat for both the human visitors and the animals who live there. There is plenty of water available to jet ski riders on other waterways in the state where their presence will not preclude other users. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Toni B. London | Toni London <toni.b.london@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | Allowing jet skis to operate in Kachemak Bay would be like opening the Appalachian Trail to formula one automobile racing; destructive, foolish and utterly inconsistent with the Bay's designation as a Critical Habitat . Our first priority in managing this unique area must be the protection of the wildlife and the habitat it depends upon. ADF&G has repeatedly determined that jet ski use is NOT CONSISTENT with Kachemak Bay's critical habitat designation.<br>Nor is allowing jet ski operation in the Bay compatible with the use and enjoyment of other human users of the area. Only in Kachemak Bay can the thousands of us who seek to spend a few quiet hours fishing, kayaking, observing nature up close and personal, or simply admiring the stunning natural beauty of our amazing state, find a place to do so in peace. Many people in the area make their living based on the pristine and quiet nature of this special place (lodge owners, fishing and wildlife guides, kayaking guides, etc.). These people bring in thousands of visitors every year and contribute millions to the economy. You cannot simply assume that these businesses or the economy to which they contribute will be unaffected by the dramatic change you propose.<br>This is not a matter of equal access. Jet ski riders have the entire state in which to indulge in their noisy, disruptive activity. What will you propose next under the guise of equal access? Motocross on the Crow Pass Trail? The jet skiers are welcome to come to Kachemak Bay, but they should leave their jet skis behind. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | David J. Swarthout | Dave Swarthout <daveswarthout@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I'm writing to protest the rule change that would overturn the limitation on the use of personal watercraft, Jetskis, in the waters of Kachemak Bay. These sport vehicles are not suitable for use in the protected and resource rich critical habitat area like Kachemak Bay. There are plenty of other areas that would be better suited for this type of sport. The actual, and for me much more important "primary purpose" of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area, is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other use not compatible with that primary purpose. Those aren't my words. They from the law that was passed to prevent just such access to an area that is still relatively pristine and scenic. There is simply no compelling reason to jettison that important and clearly written restriction which would put precious wildlife resources at risk for the sake of a few people who want to race around on Jetskis.<br><br>Moreover, the City of Homer does not have the ability or the funds required to monitor any such use. The City derives economic and cultural benefits from the Bay as is. The city does not have the funds to monitor a bunch of people who are playing around on Jetskis. For those reasons and others, the Homer City Council has come out strongly against this rule change. They're against it because it would be a senseless threat to a resource highly valued by all the residents of Homer.<br><br>It's a very bad idea that really should never have seen the light of day yet here I am writing a letter to prevent something that was so clearly never meant to happen. Keep Kachemak Bay wild, keep it special, and keep personal watercraft out of it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | John Brooks | John Brooks <johnebrooks12221968@gmail.com> | | Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish & wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts. Please don't sacrifice this area to the power sports industry. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Judith Lund | Judith Lund <jclhomer@gmail.com> | Homer Alaska | Please keep the current regulations about Jetskis. They are not compatible with the purpose of the Critical Habitat areas in Kachemak Bay and Fox River. They also are not safe for kayaks and canoe users who are growing in numbers. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Debra Caldera | Debra Caldera <debrac@acsalaska.net> | | I am writing this comment in opposition to lifting the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. As a property owner in the Bay, I am strongly opposed to the noise and the disruption to wildlife posed by these machines. Because of the lack of public notice, many of us only learned of this proposed rule change from a recent article in the Daily News. The comment period needs to remain open long enough for Alaskans to express their opinions on this. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | P.Linehan | Pat Linehan <linehan3@hotmail.com> | | Please do not allow jet skis in our bay!<br>We cherish the chance to kayak while observing birds, otters and other wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Adam Ebnet | Adam Ebnet <adam1n907@gmail.com> | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Brian Okonek and Diane Calamar Okonek | Brian Okonek <brianokonek@gmail.com> | | We do not agree with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's proposal to repeal the ban on operating jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas. It is necessary to keep the jet ski ban in place, as it has been for years, to protect wildlife and their habitat.<br><br>These areas were recognized for the rich wildlife habitat that exists there and designated as critical habitat to protect the resources that the wildlife depends on. Almost twenty years ago land managers recognized that operating jet skis in these critical habitat areas would be detrimental to wildlife and with forethought banned their use. The public has supported this ban realizing that jet ski activity is not compatible with protecting wildlife and the habitat they depend on.<br><br>It is well documented that the high speeds, quick maneuverability, wakes, near shore riding, exhaust and noise from jet skis negatively impact birds, animals and habitat. It would be terribly irresponsible to allow jet skis to be ridden in these or any other areas designated for Critical Habitat.<br><br>With ever increasing human activities that affect wildlife and the changes to the environment caused by climate change protecting critical habitat is more important than ever before. Please do not repeal the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Bill Berkhahn | Bill Berkhahn <billberkhahn@gmail.com> | | I am opposed to the opening of Kachemak Bay to the use of personal watercraft (Jetskis).<br><br>Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas were established to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500<br>Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Habitat Areas are unique in that that they attract thousands of birds throughout the year that depend on theses areas for feeding and rest during their spring migration north and fall migration south. Jetskis are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water. As a result, they pose threats to birds and marine mammals if their use is allowed in Kachemak Bay.<br>The natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | gary miller | Gary Miller <garymillerak@gmail.com> | Homer | hi, i'm writing to say we'd prefer kachemak bay remain with jet skiis making noise, getting hit by the many boats, please. dont' allow them… we live in old town homer, near the bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Susan Borko | Susan Downes Borko <sdownesb@icloud.com> | Seward | I am writing to voice my strong opposition to allowing jet skis (PWC's) to operate in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>1) Jet ski use would be in complete disregard of the law. That area, by law, is for the official purpose of protecting and preserving habitat.<br><br>2) The vast majority of our waters are open to jet skis. PWC users do not need this one other place when so much is at risk.<br><br>3) Alaskans time and again have stood in opposition. Why aren't you listening?<br><br>4) Scientists are in overwhelming agreement that PWC's would have a negative affect on the Bay.<br>Please stand up and do the right thing by keeping this area free from PWC's. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Eben Sargent | Eben Sargent <ebensargent@gmail.com> | | I am writing to express opposition to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. I also would like to request the state publish a summary of comments for and against this proposal including comment totals for both options. I do not buy into the equal access argument that has been presented by PWC groups, if you take that line of thinking to it's obvious end there are many examples where different uses shouldn't be allowed under some twisted idea of fairness. We regulate many things in this world for the common good, though it would be fun as hell to ride my sled around the bike paths in anchorage that would be inconsiderate to the majority of users. In the case of jet skis and k bay, the existing policy has worked well for years and there are many other areas in the state for unrestricted pwc use. If this policy is to be changed It should be because the vast majority of commenters or other public representation process demonstrate that most people want the jet skis allowed. Otherwise it just looks like a favor done for a minority by those in power presently. As a member of government I hope you feel a moral obligation to govern in a way that serves the people and not just cheats to win a couple victories for your team. Circumventing public process prevents the collaborative problem solving we need to solve real problems facing this state. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Terence Carroll | Terence Carroll <terence727@verizon.net> | 700 Ardmore Ave., #524 Ardmore, PA 19003 | As a frequent visitor to Alaska I am writing to urge you not to change the rules for Jetskis and PWC for Kachemark Bay and Fox River Flats. This area needs to be preserved from that nonsense. One can Jetski ad nauseum in the lower 48, but let's try to preserve Alaska.<br>Also:<br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Doug Smith | Douglas Smith <dougseabird@gmail.com> | Talkeetna | I had to write you to ask that you keep the restriction on PWC's in place in Katchemak Bay. The restriction is reasonable, supported by science and ADF&G. I accept reasonable restrictions on my snowmachine use, car, firearms and drinking to name a few. Makes society work for everybody.<br>Keep this one on PWC in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Larry Rundquist | rundquist@gci.net | Anchorage | Please do not allow jet skis on Katchemak Bay. The bay is currently known as a good place for kayaks. Putting jet skis on Katchemak Bay is like putting a motocross track in a school zone. Strict speed limits should be imposed if they are allowed. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Amanda Campbell | Amanda Neal <amanda22u@yahoo.com> | P.O. Box 3803 Homer Alaska 99603 | For the record, Amanda Campbell of Homer Alaska says no to jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>What does critical habitat mean to you? To me it means wildlife and natural, peaceful habitat are more important than a bunch of loud, potentially hazardous to wildlife jet skis. It's not worth it.<br>We have been here before, we don't want them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | ***Anna-Maria Mueller*** | Anna-Maria Mueller <a-mmueller@alaska.net> | 39805 Smith Rd Soldotna AK 99669 | I am vehemently opposed to the idea of allowing jetskis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The science is clear, jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats CRITICAL Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>I am appalled, annoyed and angry how everything is being ruined by people who think their fun is more important than the protection of fish and wildlife.<br><br>Please do not allow jetskis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Jeanne Schaaf | jeanne schaaf <jmbschaaf@gmail.com> | 6961 Rabbit Creek Road Anchorage, AK. 99516 | I am writing to urge you to keep jet skis out of Kachemak Bay. Over 99% of Alaska waters are open to these noisy, disruptive pleasure craft, and very little quiet water remains for those of us who want to hear and see the natural environment. Jetskis and PWCs are not compatible with the established purpose of the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. I have lived in Alaska for nearly 4 decades and the peace and quiet of Kachemak Bay are very important to me and my family. Please protect it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Michal sheffer | Michal <michalsheff@gmail.com> | seattle | I just heard that Cook Inletkeeper is asking for comments on Dunleavy's attempts to keep Kachemak Bay jetski-free.<br>As a neighbor of your lovely state and often a visitor I want to add my concerns, in hope that you will manage to keep Homer's waters and beaches as serene as they are at the present. Bringing jet skis to kachemak bay will disturb animals and people alike. Jetskis are noisy , polluting, and dangerous. these small speedy and noisy vessels can collide with sea mammals, trouble beach combers and drive away tourists. The peace of the whole area will be in danger.<br><br>It is absolutely essential to continue the current prohibition on jet skis in Kachemak Bay, both for the safety and well being of wildlife and humans. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Mike Mungoven | Michael Mungoven <mungo60@gmail.com> | Anchor Point, Aaska | No to repealing the Jet Ski ban on Kachemak Bay. No to Jet skis on the bay. Jet Skis are a screamingly different tool than skiffs with outboards.<br>It's alright to have one place in this state without the noise and disturbance of this sort of recreation.<br>The proposal to repeal the ban is a perfect example of government bureaucrats disregarding local communities.<br>I heard you on the radio for years and I am stunned at your hypocrisy with regard to State action, shame on you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Gabriela Husmann | Gabriela Husmann <gabrielahusmann@gmail.com> | | I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed 2019-2020 changes to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br>I am strongly opposed to removing the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay because I believe it will ruin a magical and peaceful experience to thousands of visitors who come here annually to enjoy wilderness, solitude and wildlife viewing and not having their magical experience ruined by noisy and stinky jet boats.<br>It seems to me like such a nobrainer, bowing to a few motor heads instead of caring for a fragile environment and animals for visitors and school groups to enjoy.<br>Please listen to the people and not our corrupt government and heartless and selfish governor. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Brandon Mclean | Brandon Mclean <brandonsmclean@gmail.com> | Homer | NO JET SKIS in Kachemak Bay! Please in what ways is this good for the protection of Kachemak bay? The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Craig Matkin | Craig Matkin <comatkin@gmail.com> | 3430 Main St Ste B1 Homer, AK 99603 | I have lived in Alaska for 47 years and in Homer most of that time. I have commercial fished and used the bay for recreation since 1974. It is an amazing, productive area that will not be enhanced but degraded by the use of jet skis. For the wildlife and well as the human population I ask that you not indulge the few folks that would like to use these high speed watercraft in the bay and please protect the interests of the majority and the protected habitat of our unique and irreplaceable bay. Just say NO to jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Mark Turner | Mark <harpethnarrows@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I oppose allowing Jetskis in Kachemak Bay for three reasons:<br>1) it is a critical habitat area and personal watercraft will only add more stress to it;<br>2) Jetskis "play" in waterways where all others are headed to a destination. These are not compatible;<br>3) There are plenty of other places personal watercraft can operate, such as in Cook Inlet out of Anchor Point. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Mike Ryan | Mike Ryan <mikeryanfo@gmail.com> | | Absolutely no PWC should be allowed on Kachemak Bay!!!!!!!!!!!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Jerry Hupp | jerry hupp <huppjerry@gmail.com> | PO Box 1529 Palmer, AK 99645 | This is a dumb idea for a Critical Habitat Area, and one that's been previously rejected by professional ADF&G staff. Keep jet skis the hell out of Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Andrea Lang | Andrea Lang <andrealang827@gmail.com> | 1351 Early View Drive Anchorage, AK 99504 | I am writing to voice my strong opposition to jetski use in Kachemak Bay. I believe jetskis will negatively impact the marine wildlife in the bay and interfere with existing fishing operations.<br><br>Please reconsider this misguided plan to accommodate a few thrill seekers and endanger the ecology, fisheries and solitude of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Pete McKay | Peter McKay <mckaype@outlook.com> | 55441 Chinook Rd. Kenai, AK 99611 | I do not support allowing personal watercraft (jetski's) in Kachemak Bay.<br>Current marine activities in the area are entirely enough. The proposed introduction of these water craft would cause injury or death - unnecessarily. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Steve Lewis | Steve Lewis <lewis.stevek@gmail.com> | | Lifting the prohibition on the use of personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area will create an unintended consequence of increased personal risk to both the watercraft operators and other users of area.<br>I was Chief of the Seldovia Volunteer Fire Department prior to the implementation of the current prohibition. During that time there were repeated instances of watercraft operators arriving in Seldovia improperly attired and hypothermic, low on fuel and without money or identification. As a community we were called upon to assist these individuals at our own expense and risk. While it can be argued that these events were caused by an irresponsible few, it is inarguable that they did happen and that similar events will happen again if the prohibition is lifted. The public safety risks created by personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay far outweigh the recreational aspirations of this user group. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Julia Bockmon | Judy Bockmon <jbbockmon@gmail.com> | Anchorage | I am one of the tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year that visit Kachemak Bay to experience its unique natural values, and help drive the area's local economy. It makes no sense to threaten those resources and damage the economy so a few people can use Jetskis. The scientific studies have clearly shown that Jetskis and similar personal water craft are NOT compatible with the purposes of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife. My family and I vehemently object to this change in permitted use. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Rebecca Cozad | Rebecca Cozad <rebfisher@gmail.com> | PO Box 848 Talkeetna, aK 99676 | See message: Public Comment PWC Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC10 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Emma Bauer | Emma Bauer <ejb427@gmail.com> | | See message: PWC ban.msg in PWC10 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Margi Clifford | Margi Clifford <margi.clifford@alaska.net> | | Thank you for the work you do on behalf of Alaska's land, seas and inhabitants. We are a diverse group and it can't be easy.<br><br>I'm writing as a longtime Alaskan, world traveler, small business owner and outdoor enthusiast to implore that you uphold the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. There is a precious resource that we enjoy in Alaska and is difficult to come by in other places. It is silence, it is stillness, it is space.<br><br>I have led an annual retreat across the Bay for the past 13 years. I also lead retreats to Central America, Asia and Europe. Everyone I meet is fascinated by Alaska and drawn to it for it for the promise of serenity and beauty. This is why tourism is our most important and sustainable industry!<br><br>Boats, kayaks, paddle boards are already available to Alaskans and visitors who want to spend time on the water. I have watched countless peaceful moments on beaches and lakes around the world disturbed by the roar and hollar of personal watercraft and their riders. Please help preserve this most precious resource.<br><br>Don't hesitate to contact me with comments or questions.<br><br>Again, thank you for serving our great State! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Aaron Johnston | Aaron Johnston <theaaronjohnston@yahoo.com> | | Thanks for taking comments on allowing jet skis in the bay. I'm a Homer resident, Bristol Bay fisherman and a Teacher. I'm opposed to allowing PWC in the bay primarily due to its legitimate status as a sensitive marine environment. We don't need more noise and water pollution than we already have. There are plenty of other places for them. If businesses are lobbying for them for tourists dollars please tell them to choose a different sport, like sailing.<br>Thanks for support. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Jennifer Huvar | Me <jhuvar@gci.net> | Anchorage | Jetskis are dangerous to wildlife in Kachemak Bay. Let's keep one water body peaceful. I vote to keep the ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | GeorgeAnne Sprinkle | GeorgeAnne Sprinkle <red.in.glow@gmail.com> | | I am come from an avid hunting and fishing family. I oppose the use of Jet skis in fox river and kachemak bay. There are plenty of areas for that activity already. Kachemak bay is special and a wonderful place for hunting and fishing in part, because of the absence of these disturbing watercraft. Hunting and fishing for subsistence or for sport rely on undisturbed wildlife. Do not change a good thing, stick with the science, the lessons of other communities and leave Kachemak bay free of jetski traffic. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Curt Wilcox | Curt Wilcox <curtwilcox@hotmail.com> | Kenai, AK | We are Kenai Borough property tax payers, registered voters, community volunteers, a retired teacher and a retired union 302 union member, college educated, environmentally conscious citizens that take offense of the blatant disregard of what we the people of Alaska have already established previously to prohibit jet skis In Kachemak Bay.<br>We also fully support the recall movement. Mike Dunleavy is a disaster to the wonderful state of Alaska in our opinion. This jet ski issue is just another example of his compromised position putting his ignorance on display for all to see. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Capt. Jerry | +15614454007@mymetropcs.com | Florida | The wave riders are a menus to socioty. The leave Fuel on the water. Fumes in the air and noise that does'nt stop.. Just the way to ruin a peacefull area. Capt. Jerry from Florida | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Stan Dunagan | affappak@ak.net | 7131 Northpark Drive Anchorage, Alaska | This is to voice my opposition to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. The reasons are many, you have heard them all many times, so I won't bore you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Bob Crosby | bob@mosquito-enterprises.com | | Dear Mr. Rick Green,<br>I would like to give my opinion about the jet ski issue that is up for public comment.<br><br>I am a land owner of property in Bear Cove, tax # 19326220. After considerable thinking on this issue, my feelings about jet skis running around in coves like Bear Cove is, I am against it. There are numerous areas in Alaska where jet skis can play and have less impact on the wildlife, ocean life, coastal vegetation, coastal erosion and the noise impacts associated with jet skis. This end of the bay is listed as a critical habitat area and again there is no place for this type of watercraft to be playing around. I have watched people play with them and have seen where they have done damage if they intend to do so that can't be undone. I know not all of them would be tearing things up, but it doesn't take many to make an impact that won't go away.<br><br>Also owning a boat and knowing that as is hard enough to spot other boats in the water at times, I shudder to even think about watching for a craft that can hide behind a wave. There is also a lot of traffic to be watching for as is. I know that when the water starts getting choppy that most the time the kayaks will be ashore, but jet skis will be out playing to catch that big wave.<br><br>Please take my comments into consideration when addressing this issue and the longtime impacts this could have in some of the areas of the bay that they would be playing in.<br><br>Please vote no on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I thank you for your time. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Diane Frank | dfrank61@gmail.com | 2224 Turnagain Pkwy, Anchorage AK 99517 907-248-5078 | Mr. Green,<br><br>I am opposed to allowing the use of PWC in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>There seems to be no rationale/justification for this repeal other than equal access to all Alaskans. The "equal access" argument is specious and provides absolutely no factual basis for changing the regulation so that PWC use would be allowed. All Alaskans (and others) currently do have access to the bay. Well over 90% of waters in Alaska are open to PWC use. Kachemak Bay is a unique water body as its designation as a CHA indicates.<br><br>If the State proceeds with this, a thorough and comprehensive study of the impacts on wildlife and other user groups must be undertaken. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Patricia Peach | peach@alaskan.net | | *Dear Sir,*<br><br>*Before the ban on Kachemak jet skis, I had the opportunity to stay at a hotel at the end of Homer Spit. The room was on the water/bay side. Looking out the window there were many otters swimming near the shore. Although otters usually remain separate and independent, I learned it was the time of year they congregate as a family.*<br>*It was later in September with Homer quiet on an off season. Around 5:30 in the morning I woke to much noise outside the window on the water. There were 5-6 people on jet skis and they were swerving in and out of each other. I worried they would crash and someone would get hurt. I did wonder if they had been drinking; it seemed so early in the morning.*<br>*What happened next caught my breath. The people on jet skis ran over to the otter population and ran through and around them. I could not see what happened to the otters and if any were injured. This event went on for over 15 minutes. I did not see the otters after the jet skis left.*<br>*This incident not only disturbed my early morning sleep but it disturbed the otters, disturbed the waters and convinced me that jet skis have no place in Kachemak bay. The ban was put in for good reasons and should not be withdrawn.* | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Cherie Northon | cheries@mapmakers.com | P.O. Box 230329 Anchorage, AK 99523 907-561-4627 | After reading about the effects and knowing the general usage of jet skis--it is my opinion that there should not be ANY rules that allow them to operate in Kachemak Bay. Period! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Laurie Gentle | gentlelaurie@gmail.com | 299-5732 | Please, please there are 1000 reasons not to harm this beautiful and rare space!<br><br>Jetskis and personal watercraft (PWC) are not like skiffs and boats. With overpowered 200-300 horsepower engines, Jetskis are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water and congregate in small areas. As a result, they pose unique threats to birds, marine mammals and humans alike.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br><br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Martha Siebe | pixie@alaska.net | 8700 Solar Drive Anchorage, AK 99507 907-346-3329 | Dear Commissioner Green, Representative Gillis, and Senator Revak,<br><br>I am concerned about the decision that Governor Dunleavy appears to be making regarding Kachemak Bay. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game oversees the management of this area, and has procedures to follow. I do not believe that the Governor should override an established policy without the proper procedure preceding the decision.<br><br>I am concerned with the use of personal watercraft in areas where whales are feeding, waterfowl are breeding, and fish are foraging. I believe their safety should override the use of pleasure craft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Brian Carter Boyd | BCBoyd@bcfaklaw.com | 911 W. 8th Avenue, Suite 302 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-272-8401 | See message: Fwd: Proposed Repeal of the Jet Ski/Person Water Craft Prohibition in Kachemak Bay.msg in folder PWC 11 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Jan Welt | janwelt@me.com | Anchorage | I add my name to adjure the allowing of jet skis in the areas around Homer, AK. Please be advised citizens do not welcome such arrivals and I ask that the government understand **no** is the answer. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Aron Peterson | aep@horizonsatellite.com | 907-226-2201 | As a board member of the Kachemak Bay Water Trail, Kachemak Bay State Park Citizen Advisory Board, advocate and volunteer in the park, I stand opposed to the 2019-2020 changes to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft (PWC) in the Fox River and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitant Areas. Jet skis are not compatible with the bay, can upset wildlife, make excessive noise, upset kayakers and other boaters and because of excessive horsepower, speed, lack of control and braking, are dangerous to the rider, wildlife, others and other water craft. Their ability to navigate shallow water makes them less compatible in Kachemak Bay particularly in the critical habitat areas. Please, Fox River and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitant Areas are not a place for PWC. If this ill-conceived proposal were to go to fruition it needs to be funded, as the bay is presently very underfunded. Thanks in advance for not allowing this ill-conceived proposal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Michelle Gillete | mirogi715@gmail.com | | Please keep the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Bonnie DeArmoun | bdearmoun@yahoo.com | Bear Island resident | Mr. Green,<br>I am writing as a property owner of land on Bear Island at the head of Kachemak Bay. Personal jetskis do not belong in this Bay. Kachemak Bay is a Critical Habitat Area for many species under stress due to changes in temperature, the last thing we need is another stressor in this environment. Jet skis are very different than traditional vessels already in the area. Law enforcement is already so limited at the head of the bay, when these new machines are allowed in who is to police their actions? The differences lay in the noise these crafts make and the areas they can access. Who is stop them from running up China Poot at low tide when the rest of us are up to our chests in cold water? Who is to ask them to slow down when children are swimming/ wading? The rate of speed these machines can achieve in such a small area is terrific, we are already facing enough dangers from small boats, why add another device to the water now? Alaska already has so many places where jetskis are allowed. Please look beyond the politics surrounding this issue and reassess the biological impacts these loud machines will have on our already infiltrated islands and bays.<br><br>I am commenting on behalf of my children who have never tasted the Dungeness crab, shrimp and King Crab and who now have to be very weary of shellfish consumption, bird die offs and star fish wasting, please take into consideration all that has already been effected in the bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Louise Driscoll | ldriscollak@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK | I am opposed to allowing jet skis/personal water craft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I have had the privilege of visiting a small bay there for short stays over many summers. A few summers ago the shoreline was littered with dead murre due to starvation. Jet skis will adversely impact bird rookeries and breeding sites and further stress the population of murres. Jet skis will encroach on the shore line and harm kelp beds and stress the sea otter that are slowly returning to the bay after their own population crash about five years ago..<br><br>A jet ski is used for going fast, zipping along with twists and turns. It can be a ton of fun, but there's no justification to reverse a ban that has been placed to protect birds, water fowl, marine mammals and kelp beds, particularly when the areas can be accessed by less intrusive craft such as kayaks and row boats. Certainly, a jet ski isn't necessary to explore the shoreline.<br><br>The motorized craft I typically see in the small bays are skiffs travelling to or from a site. The journey's purpose is to get somewhere and it's direct and streamlined. Jet skis are used differently and will impact people who go to Kachemak Bay to experience nature and escape the noise of our industrialized society. Tourists pay lots of money for the 'back to nature' peace and solitude on offer at very expensive wilderness lodges in Kachemak Bay. Reserving one body of water to allow for that experience doesn't harm the ability of jet skiers to pursue their joy in other Alaska waters.<br><br>I learned that ADF&G's mission is "to protect, maintain, and improve the fish, game, and aquatic plant resources of the state, and manage their use and development in the best interest of the economy and the well-being of the people of the state, consistent with the sustained yield principle." Introducing jet skis into a critical habitat area seems antithetical to that mission.<br><br>Finally, I'm uncomfortable with the process of directing public comment to political appointee, Rick Green, a former radio talk show host, rather than a career employee with experience handling such reviews and the agency expertise to fully and fairly evaluate comments. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Matt Monnens | matt.monnens@gmail.com | | I wanted to take a minute to let you know that I support the use of PWCs in Kachemak Bay. This is public water and the public should be able to use it the way they want as long as they are not harming it. PWCs cause no more or possibly less damage then full sized boats do. Thank you. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Stephen Olendorff | olendorff@mac.com | 907-252-3288 | Emailing to show my support for removing the PWC ban in Kachemak bay! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Nina Burkholder | ninab99603@gmail.com | | My name is Nina Burkholder and I've been a Homer (outside City) residence for 30 years.<br>I am going on record as strongly opposing the lifting of the ban on personal use watercraft on Kachemak Bay for the following reasons:<br><br>1) They are used for the most part for sport and play similar to a snow machine and like a snow machine they are very noise and disrupt any solitude and quiet one may seek to have. (Which is getting harder and harder to find.)<br><br>2) The people of Kachemak Bay area have worked hard to attract and acheive quiet recreation with a focus on wildlife observation. Kiss that goodbye if this was adopted. You will trade one recreation for another and I personally don't want to live with the other.<br><br>3) I'm sure there are plenty of other places they are allowed unlike a few places where they are not. They have access else where.<br><br>I could live with point A to B travel but not full access to the entire Bay. So say Cook Inlet along shipping chanel to the harbor in Homer with speed restrictions. ( The intent would be passing through-NOT PLAYING) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Dr. Christina Livesey | chris_in_alaska@yahoo.com | 4670 Southpark Bluff Drive Anchorage, AK 99516 | Dear Mr. Geen,<br><br>Kachemak Bay is a large estuary that supports millions of waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds and marine mammals and abundant populations of fish, shellfish and other marine life. It was designated “critical habitat” by the Legislature in 1974 to protect those resources and to restrict all human uses incompatible with that goal.<br><br>More than a dozen studies on the adverse effects of PWCs have been published since then. All boats are capable of disturbing wildlife, but jet skis are especially problematic because they tend to be operated erratically at higher speeds, generate different and cumulatively more disturbing noises, and perform loop-de-loops in shallower, near-shore waters and protected bays where wildlife are concentrated.<br><br>A recent analysis published in the scientific journal Marine Policy found jet-skiing had the highest potential for impact compared with 15 other recreational and scientific activities in 91 marine reserves in 36 countries.<br><br>A study in Florida found that jet ski operators are more likely+E422 than others to blatantly disregard boating regulations. Another found that, while people operating jet skis seldom have problems with other users, those users — particularly anglers — experience lots of problems with jet skis.<br><br>The handful of people who want to ride PWCs in Kachemak Bay could have a seriously detrimental effect on the animals and people who depend on the marine estuary for survival.<br><br>Please do not ignore the overwhelming science and the overwhelming majority of people who want to prohibit jet skis in Katchemak Bay. Please keep Alaska serene and beautiful. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Jackie Robertson | irondogger01@yahoo.com | | I hope you would reconsider the ban on PWC’s in Kachemak Bay.<br>Allowing the few to dictate the whole is not a solution.<br>PWC’s are continually reducing their footprint and are a much more economical and environmentally friendly way to explore this beautiful state we call home. With limited roads and access to our land, a PWC can provide remote land owners a legitimate cost effective way to their land.<br>Allowing professional guided tour groups is a great way to open the area and begin the transition forward.<br>Alaska depends upon tourism and offering the responsible usage of PWC with experienced guides is a excellent source of positive experiences and return visits.<br>The benefits offer an incredible opportunity for the area and the state to responsible operation of personal watercraft.<br>Adults shouldn’t be treated like children and punished for the acts of the ignorant. Allowing the worst of society to dictate the freedoms of the best of society shouldn’t be considered a solution. It’s a knee-jerk reaction.<br>It’s 2020, we can and should do better than this. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Michael Bavarsky | mbavers@yahoo.com | P.O. Box 15115 Fitz Creek, AK 99603 907-299-0163 | I am going on record as strongly opposing the lifting of the ban on personal use watercraft on Kachemak Bay for the following reasons:<br><br>1: Their very nature encourages erratic, dangerous, destructive, and annoying use. Comparing them to other boats is like comparing a military automatic weapon to a hunting rifle.<br><br>2: There are many, many places that are already frequented by such noisy and disruptive craft, where their disharmony would not be as noticeable. There are few places like Kachemak Bay.<br><br>3: Their use, even on an infrequent basis, would be destructive to wildlife, tourism, and peaceful and quiet recreation that persons such as myself enjoy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Dr. Rebecca McGuire, Alaska Shore Bird Group | rmcGuire@wcs.org | 907-505-0071 | See message: Alaska Shorebird Group Comments on ADF&G's proposed repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg | 1 | | | Organization | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Terry Cummings | cummingst44@yahoo.com | 6740 E. 10th Anchorage, AK 99504 907-333-7809 | Good Day:<br>The management plan for the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, as you well know, is to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.<br>Repealing the Personal Watercraft Prohibition definitely would go against the management plan.<br><br>The Jet Ski Ban should stay in place. There is only one purpose of riding jet skis and that, as you know, is go as fast as you can, jump boat wakes, etc. Marine animals, boats, other people recreating would be at great risk. Jet skis can't avoid or even see, say, a couple of otters, or other things just below the surface and don't have the ability to slow down quickly at high speed. Collisions with boats would happen, drinking and riding would certainly happen, animals and birds could be targets, and whose to stop them. It would be a free for all.<br><br>Jet skis are not compatible with this Critical Habitat Area and should not be allowed under any circumstances. Frankly, the DF&G should be totally against this proposed action. Their job is to protect Alaska's Wildlife, not to exploit it.<br><br>Thanks for reading this. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Chuck Wirschem | kellyitt@gmail.com | | I can't believe that an Alaskan, as part of the Governors office can support a Virginian lobby (Chris Manthos: All Alaskans Should Have Access to Kachemak Bay, 1/14) to support an activity so offensive to the values and character of Kachemak Bay than allowing personal water craft. This research is from Florida, and has no bearing on what Alaskans want.We have been in the Bay for 40 years and we enjoy our peace and quiet. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Jennifer Carr | jwcarr907@yahoo.com | Seward, AK | What a dumb idea to take off jet ski restrictions from Kachemak Bay! There is a reason they have been banned. They should continue to be so. How can one person interested in skiing meet with the governor and have the whole thing changed? That says loud and clear that the governor changes with every breeze. No. Please reconsider this consequential change. Alaska's wildlife need all the help they can get. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Johnna Kohl | johnna.kohl@gmail.com | Bear Cove resident | Hello Rick,<br><br>My husband Mike Wirschem and I are property owners in Bear Cove on Kachemak Bay. His family have been property owners there since the mid 70s. I strongly oppose allowing jet skis on Kachemak Bay. The wildlife in the bay is a big part of its beauty and we have a duty to protect it. Our kids have grown up spending time in Bear Cove as my husband did and I expect that they will bring their kids there someday.<br><br>In addition to the safety of wildlife in the Bay, I have concerns about our safety as recreation users. We kayak frequently as a family and my husband swims (with a wetsuit!). I was involved in a jet ski accident in my 20s in Montana on Canyon Ferry Reservoir outside of Helena. A 13 year old boy was driving a jet ski alone (way too fast and out of control) and ran into the jet ski I was on with a friend. I was fine but this resulted in an ER visit for my friend to suture lacerations in his leg. At the time, I felt we were pretty lucky. It could have been a lot worse. The kid was not mature enough to handle the responsibility of a motorized vehicle with that much power nor mature enough to make judgements about how to avoid other jet skiers. Jet Skis are fun, but I don't believe Kachemak Bay should be opened up to the kind of use that jet skiers tend to enjoy. If you change the rules regarding jet skis, who is going to monitor the problems and ensure the safety of other users and the wildlife?<br><br>I really hope that you take into consideration the views of the public at large as well as the views of Kachemak Bay property owners when you make your decision. If the majority of people are opposed to jet skis in the bay please respect that.<br><br>Thanks for your time. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Donald McKay | donmcmln@gci.net | Kachemak Bay resident | Good morning Mr. Green. I am responding to the proposed lifting of the prohibition of the use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. My wife and I own property in the bay and spend much of the spring, summer and fall there and strongly support the prohibition of personal watercraft. We have observed that some of the species the Critical Habitat Area supports are stressed as a result of changing conditions resulting from warming. Adding another stressor, the operation of personal water craft will only cause more harm to these animals. In addition, reintroducing jet skis to the area will directly conflict with recreational fishing and quiet uses such as paddle boards and kayaks. The purpose of the CHA is to protect fish and wildlife resources and existing public uses of Kachemak Bay. People who own jet skis have plenty of alternatives available to recreate including access to the bay via other means of access. The issue is protecting the CHA, not super- imposing an incompatible use. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Leslie and Kirk Johnson | leslie4alaska@gmail.com | Bear Cove resident 907-345-7026 | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>My family have been property owners in Bear Cove since 1978. We are strongly opposed to jet ski usage in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>We, together with many landowners in Bear Cove value peace and quiet. We kayak so we can be nearly silent, so we can listen and watch for birds and other wildlife.<br><br>We cannot imagine a more offensive intrusion to our values and the culture, wildlife, and character of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Wendy Robbins | wwrobbins@gmail.com | | I am against the use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay. They are noisy. I would not want to spend a day on the water only to hear jet skis. The wakes damage shore lines and moored boats. Allowing jet skis is a bad idea. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Robert Vernon | gogovernon@yahoo.com | PO Box 15096<br>Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | Rick,<br>Politics brings out differing opinions.<br>Most people mask theirs.<br>I won't.<br>I consider jet-skis to be ecoterrorists.<br>You might not, but then you're not a red-necked phalarope. You're not a town trying to run a successful shorebird festival (the first infusion of cash after a paltry winter's take) with a few bubbas destroying what a thousand people have come to see.<br>You're not here, you're there, in Wasilla where you've already destroyed the environment.<br>With 99.94% of Alaska open to jet ski use, why must you destroy the .06% of the state that people are trying to preserve - where nature isn't subject to 60 mph watercraft? When you say we must share, what sort of pig would demand 99.94% of the trough? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Nicoli Bailey | nicoli.bailey@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK 907-771-5977 | For shame that this is even being considered. We protect our beauty here in this State. There will be no jet skies in Kachemak Bay! Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Chris Perry | fishyarns@yahoo.com | PO Box 1808<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Please do not repeal jet ski ban in kachemak bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | D. Lilja | d.lilja@q.com | | CenturyLink Customer <d.lilja@q.com><br>To: Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov><br>F.Y.I.<br><br>_____<br>From: "CenturyLink Customer" <d.lilja@q.com><br>To: "rickjsinnott" <rickjsinnott@gmail.com><br>Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2020 5:31:19 AM<br>Subject: Selfish Flaming Homer Environmentalists<br><br>Dear Rick,<br><br>You, better than anyone else, should know that when you are more than 3 nautical miles from Alaska's shoreline, you are in FEDERAL waters.<br><br>Federal waters are owned by all 330 million Americans, not just the measly 2/10ths of 1% who are Alaskans, or the flaming environmentalists, liberals, and retired state employees that saturate Homer.<br><br>I'd appreciate it if you would concern yourself with your state waters, and keep your myopic nose out of federal water policy.<br><br>D. Lilja, 22 yr. AK resident, ret'd Phoenix | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Mary Fulkerson | maryinalaska1@gmail.com | 2544 Tulane St.<br>Anchorage, AK 99504 | I would like to add my voice to those against allowing the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I believe we owe it to ourselves and our future to protect this area. The flora and fauna can't speak for themselves, it's up to us to do it. I believe the use of pwc would be devastating. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Dave Harr | dave@harrconstruction.com | 1409 W. 45th Street<br>Anchorage, AK 99503 907-441-0912 | My vote is for no PWC in Kachemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Gary Handrich | fullcurl@gmail.com | | I was on the Homer fish and Game advisory board for 14 years. Between early 1980's till mid 1990's. I studied Wildlife management at University of Wisconsin- Stevens Point. I am an outdoorsmen, hunter/fishermen. I was on the local board when this watercraft ban came up. There was a lot of discussion about this from all user groups. We as a board unanimously voted on the ban for many reasons. First, our wildlife, if anything has diminished over the years with more humans living in the area. We felt the added pressure from Jet Skis would further harass the shallow based waterfowl, seabirds, and subsurface fish and wildlife, Also contribute harassing noise pollution. With many opportunities around south-central Alaska for Jet Ski use, the need for good habitat, without harassment was more important for wildlife than this user group on Kachemak Bay. So therefore, lifting the ban would be counter productive for all the other user groups and of course, Fish and wildlife here in the nursery | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Ben Gibson | benjagibson@gmail.com | Homer, AK | I'm disheartened by the dismissal of process and research in the decision to remove the ban on personal watercraft in the critical habitat area. The ADF&G review that was conducted in 2017 resulted in a confirmation that the values of a critical habitat area were undermined by the operation of these personal watercraft. The review suggested that, if anything, the research reinforced the importance of the limits on these types of vessels.<br><br>The abrupt turnaround from this position, without explanation or justification to these early findings, suggest that there are ulterior motives at play. Promises made to lobbying groups or to friends and donors should not infect the science behind the management of our collective resources. This arbitrary decision seems so obviously unfounded that it seems destined for the courts. I urge you to abandon this shortcut and stick with the traditional process of working through the review process to develop good sound science, and if that allows the introduction of PWC, then so be it. But this is merely a hijacking. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Rolland Grabbe PHD | rolly@mtaonline.net | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Glenn Seaman | glennseaman@gci.net | 1435 Bay Avenue Homer, AK 99603 | See messge: Comments on Proposed Repeal 5 AAC 95.310.msg in folder PWC 11 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Jennifer J. Kottra | jkottra@yahoo.com | Little Tutka Bay 928-699-6853 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I was born and raised in Alaska. Every summer I get away to our cabin in Little Tutka Bay to enjoy the peace and quiet of the Alaskan wilderness. My family hikes, kayaks, tide walks, picks berries and enjoys the true essence of Alaska away from the noise and chaos of the rest of the world. We love watching the sea otters, seals, whales, eagles and other wildlife in our bay. We fish from our small boat. So I am extremely upset to hear of the potential repeal of the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>I strongly urge you to reconsider repealing the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat areas. Jet skis don't belong in this wilderness area, certainly not within 300 yards of the shore, where the otters and other sea life need undisturbed waters to thrive.<br>The state agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, in charge of these areas has TWICE indicated that these are sensitive areas in need of protection stating in their management plan that it is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetration of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." The last revision of the plan was in 2017 and there has not been a review since. Kachemak Bay is a sensitive environment for fish,marine organisms, marine mammals and bird life. And the great majority of Alaskans has always agreed and supported this position.<br><br>The term Personal Watercraft is merely a euphemism for a vehicle which, unlike traditional boats, is designed and advertised for high speed riding, circling and wave jumping. These vehicles are noisy and travel at high speeds close to shore disrupting the shoreline and intertidal zone, which contain an abundance of smaller marine organisms, terrorizing marine mammals and waterfowl. Along with the noise pollution they will be a safety hazard for kayakers and fisherman in the Bay. They will also impact the local residents, both permanent and seasonal, who have chosen to live in the bays and coves and tourists who wish to see wildlife in a natural setting. All will now have to tolerate the noise pollution, safety concerns and degradation of the marine environment that jet skis entail.<br><br>For years Ms. Potts and the jet ski lobby have been agitating to rescind the ban on jet skis in the Bay. Suddenly it appears to be a "done deal." What has changed? Have the biologists with Fish and Game changed their stance? Has there been an outcry from a majority of Alaskans asking for this change? Or only a small persistent lobby who have gained the ear of the governor citing fairness and equal access. 99% of Alaskan waterways are already open to jet skis and there is ample precedent for areas being closed to certain uses due to impacts on animal population negating the fairness and equal access arguments.<br><br>Do not overturn what has been an essential element in a well thought out plan for the Kachemak Bay Critical Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Paul Zimmerman | pcz@gmx.us | PO Box 414, Kasilof, AK 99610 907-262-7223 | I want to add my voice in the strongest sense to those many voices who wish to continue the ban concerning jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Kachemak Bay, it's people and it's wildlife deserves to remain protected from intrusions jet skis would impose.<br><br>The ban should remain in place in perpetuity. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Rachel Lord | rachel.e.lord@gmail.com | 602 Shellfish Ave<br>Homer, AK<br>99603 907-435-7209 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing to submit my opposition to the proposed change to use of PWC in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats CHAs. In 2017, your department did a full review of the literature surrounding PWC - looking to see if the prohibition should be lifted.<br><br>In case you haven't recently read the report, from ADF&G dated May 9, 2017, it concludes:<br>"In summary, based on our review of information available since the PWC prohibition was adopted in 2001, we feel there is no new information that would warrant rescinding the prohibition, and in fact the newer information highlights most of the concerns identified when the prohibition was adopted."<br><br>Regulations should be based on facts and findings. ADF&G has provided NO information to my knowledge as rationale for the propose change to 5 AAC 95.310. The only information I have, from your department, supports leaving the regs as they are.<br><br>Changing this regulation in the absence of any rationale, beyond loud lobbyists, is bad government and does not engender the public's trust.<br><br>Please do not repeal 5 AAC 95.310. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Karen M. Procter | kmprocter@gci.net | 2500 St. Elias Drive<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99517 | Dear Mr. Green:<br><br>I am writing to strongly oppose the repeal of the jet ski ban in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. The ban, which has been in effect for over two decades, protects these critical areas from the inappropriate activity that jet ski watercraft represent.<br><br>Members of the Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska may believe that they are entitled to access these areas. However, their activities would interrupt the critical habitat and pose danger to the fish, wildlife, and other life forms that the ban protects. Governor Dunleavy should not be swayed by the Club's "equal access" argument. As Bill Sherwonit describes in his opinion piece of January 9, 2020, in the Anchorage Daily News, "the state places recreational restrictions on many of its lands and waters to prevent harm." His examples refer to snowmachining, trapping, hunting, and mountain biking restrictions in various state park units.<br><br>The primary objectives of the management plan for the area are "...to protect and preserve critical habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Obviously, jet skis are "not compatible."<br><br>What is needed is a thorough review of the area management plan, with some modeling of potential impacts. Credible quantitative estimates of current and future use of jet skis and an up-to-date review of relevant literature are also necessary.<br><br>I look forward to your response.<br><br>Thank you.<br><br>Sincerely,<br><br>Karen M. Procter | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Laurel Doyle | laureldoyle.alaska@gmail.com | Wasilla, AK | Mr Green,<br>I lived on a local lake for several decades and witnessed use of that lake by many craft; airplanes, assorted boats, and personal watercraft like jet skis. It is my observation that personal watercraft users seldom obey safe boating regulations, disturb waterfowl while nesting, ignore the safety of loons, grebes, ducks and other wildlife, and leave oily little slicks on the lake surface. A lift of the prohibition on personal watercraft/jet skis in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas would be a crime against wildlife and foul yet another sanctuary. Do not allow it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Kay McNevin | tidal.zone@yahoo.com | Halibut Cove, AK | NO to lifting the ban on Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Jet skis will still be banned in the state park. With only one Ranger to patrol and enforce the regulations of the park, new temporary rangers should be hired and trained to patrol the state park adding to financial burden of the State of Alaska.<br><br>The south side of the bay is home to a colony of federally protected migratory birds, Great Blue Herons, that live and nest outside of the State Park and must be protected.<br><br>JUST SAY NO! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Charles Landmesser | cwland@mtaonline.net | PO Box 3136<br>Homer, AK | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing to voice my objection to repeal of the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. I am a property owner across the Bay since 1993 and a permanent Homer resident since 2014. From what I understand, the proponents of repeal are arguing on the basis of equal access. Everyone wishing to enjoy Kachemak Bay currently has equal opportunity for access through a variety of resources. In reality, the issue is more importantly about continuing to properly manage recreational activities in the Bay in a way that will protect sensitive wildlife habitat that has been recognized by designation of Critical Habitat Areas. I have a vision of personal watercraft zooming along the waters adjacent to Homer Spit where rafts of sea otters and sea birds are a common attraction for those visiting Homer. Surely such activity would have a disruptive impact on wildlife in the area, and have a negative impact on the experience of those visiting our community. The same can be said for areas throughout the Bay where additional traffic created by personal watercraft will have negative impact. Without strict regulations in place and a plan that includes enforcement of t hose regulations, the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay should remain in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Penelope Haas | kbayconservation@gmail.com | Homer, AK | Please see comments from NOAA regarding updated information on PWC impacts to fish and wildlife and why they still need to be managed differently from other watercraft.<br><br>-Penelope Haas<br>Kachemak Bay Conservation Society<br><br>---------- Forwarded message ---------<br>From: Scott Kathey - NOAA Federal <scott.kathey@noaa.gov><br>Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 5:10 PM<br>Subject: Re: Basis for PWC restrictions<br>To: Kachemak Bay Conservation Society <kbayconservation@gmail.com><br>Cc: Erica Burton <erica.burton@noaa.gov>, Karen Grimmer <karen.grimmer@noaa.gov><br><br>Penelope,<br><br>Please see the information on our website about management of Motorized Personal Watercraft (MPWC) within MBNMS.<br><br>The "Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) About MPWC" link has some useful information and links pertaining to specific questions, such as, "Is there scientific and public information demonstrating that MPWC cause a unique disturbance to marine wildlife?" The response to that question includes a list of references (some are post-2003 publications) that might be of interest to you.<br><br>In an open marine system (such as an open coast, broad bay or wide inlet), pollution concerns from MPWC are not typically at issue. Four-stroke technology, though it provides cleaner emissions, does not change wildlife disturbance concerns caused by unpredictable navigation patterns and high-speed maneuvers common to MPWC operations. MPWC owners tend to operate in pairs or groups, thus expanding their footprint in an area considerably more than a single vessel transiting through at | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Michael Erstrom | m_erstrom@hotmail.com | PO Box 27<br>Soldotna, AK<br>99669 908-398-6906 | I fully support removing the ban in KBay. It seems unfair to not let all users groups have access, and the “no” group has no logical reasoning or proof of why they would be as or more harmful then current watercraft that use waters in question. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Alice Samuelson | asamuelson@ak.net | 8000 Lucy Street<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99502 | Hello Mr. Green,<br><br>My name is Alice Samuelson and I own property in Bear Cove in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I am opposed to personal watercraft in the Bay . We owned a boat which we kept in Whittier for about 30 years. When personal watercraft were allowed in Prince Williams Sound, I saw them roar up the salmon stream at the head of Long’s Bay while I personally was fishing that river. It is an understatement to say that the fish were disturbed.<br><br>If you could guarantee that all people using the personal watercraft were responsible users and honored the environment they were in I would be fine with them, but they have a strong history of being thrill seekers and fairly wild while on their machines. We owned a house on Lake Pend Oreille in northern Idaho for 15 years and saw many personal watercraft near our beach. They were noisy and irritating, especially when they spent time in front of our dock roaring in circles to jump their waves. They would even follow our boat to jump our wake. I have no love for those machines.<br><br>I am not sure of the need to open Kachemak Bay to personal water watercraft, over 99% of Alaska waters are already open to them. I think it would very good to keep them out of the Bay to give non jet ski owners a reprieve from them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Rebecca Charles | snowgogal@gmail.com | | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | City of Homer | rtussey@ci.homer.ak.us | 491 E. Pioneer Avenue Honer, AK 99603 | See message: City of Homer Reso 20-007(S).msg in folder PWC 11 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Elaine Burgess | eburgess216@gmail.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>As an owner of two properties on Kachemak Bay, I strongly object to allowing jet ski use in Kachemak Bay. Please include me on the substantial list of people that oppose Governor Dunleavy's intent to remove the ban on jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Mary Ann Cooper | acooper2506@gmail.com | Homer, AK | Hello,<br>I would like to submit my comments on the Kachemak Bay Jet Ski Ban Repeal. As a 40+ year Alaska resident and a 35 year Kachemak Bay resident I have spent many hours plying the waters of Kachemak Bay. It is my opinion that jet skis do not belong in this body of water.<br>There is no scientific evidence justifying a reversal of the ban. Extensive research over several years that had been done leading up to the ban in the first place has not changed. The scientists are all still on the same page as when the ban was put in place. There are plenty of other places for people to ride their jet skis - please allow this ban to stay in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Eileen Probasco | eileenprobasco@yahoo.com | AK | I am expressing my opposition to the changes being proposed by Fish and Game to the use of personal watercraft in the areas listed above.<br><br>Please keep the PWC prohibition in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Edwin Richards | eerich@compuserve.com | Willow, AK | Keep the ban in place please. We live on a small lake in the Willow (AK) area and have to deal with the PWCs all summer long. As a group, these operators are generally not responsible. I base this on almost twenty years of personal observation here at the lake. They, again as a group, are inconsiderate of others, inconsiderate of docks and shorelines and inconsiderate of hours of operation. We have also seen operation under the influence on a regular basis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | James Knox | corax50@icloud.com | 21480 Sterling Hwy Ninilchik, AK 99639 | Dear Rick Green,<br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br><br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay.¿ With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban.¿ Our state constitution¿ provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Patrick Nephew | nephewracing5@gmail.com | | Hello sir,<br>I am writing to you today as a concerned Alaskan that has been made aware of the personal water craft issue. I feel that we find ourselves in a another situation where a small number of well connected individuals have made changes that do not align with the majority.<br><br>1. This is about fair and equal access to Alaska's public waters by all Alaskans<br><br>2. The ban was put in place based on questionable "studies" that had no scientific basis. PWC are some of the most environmentally friendly boats available.<br><br>3. Conservation concerns are already addressed by current regulations which apply to all boats in Alaska.<br><br>4. Kachemak Bay belongs to ALL Alaskans – not just the chosen few. Equal access for all.<br><br>I have a PWC and use it quite often in the Prince William Sound area. I feel that if this passes it will only be a matter of time before it makes it's way to the other PWC areas.<br><br>Thank you for your time. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Brook Felker | brook.felker@brp.com | Plano, Texas | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.<br><br>Thank you for your time on this matter, | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Donna Strait | donna.strait@yahoo.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br>My famity has resided in Little Jakaloff Bay since the 1940's. We have and continue, to see the detrimental impact increased human activity has had. This proposed change will exasperate, excerrate and irreparably harm the eco-balance of our fragile Bay Area.<br>PLEASE reconsider this I'll-advised and short-sighted roll-back of protection of this pristine and fragile area. There is NO new or apparent scientific research to support the safety/hold harmlessness of this rule change. How can an elite, vocal and very small special interest prevail, motivated only by financial gain & short-term thrill-seeking?<br>For goodnesssakes, please think this through. Be on the right side of history on this one. This is not your best option to advance your political stature. This is not the the issue to 'fall on your sword' for. Think about it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Jim Browning | pbandj01@gci.net | 907-350-8860 | Dear Mr. Green, I was a commercial fisheries management biologist for 25 years or so in Cook Inlet, and a Regional Mgmt. Biologist with Upper & Lower Cook Inlet, P.W.S. and Bristol Bay as my regional responsibilities. I've done many research activities in Kachemak Bay, including trawl surveys, octopus surveys, clam surveys, etc.<br><br>I am very much opposed to the allowance of jet skis in the Kachemak Bay area. You wrote that they were the same as a 14' – 16' dinghy. This is wrong. They are not the same. They are usually operated much faster than a small vessel, have a much lower profile, and would generally be a safety hazard for both the jet ski operator and the vessel operator in the case of a collision. The chances of a collision are 100%; it's not matter of "if" a collision would occur, but "when". The fallout of such collisions will be directly resulting from your and the commissioner's unfamiliarity with the area and the current vessel traffic.<br><br>Can't wait to hear the Jet Ski Association's outrage and fingerpointing when the first collision happens | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Louie Flora | louieflora@hotmail.com | 64535 Sheep Drive Homer, AK 99603 | Hello Mr. Green,<br><br>The substance of the issue has been debated for two decades and the public process outcome has been an upholding of the ban on Jetskis in the Kachemak Bay Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area. What the Governor and his advisors are doing here is something different, and is obviously an end-run around critical habitat area rules that displease a group of people who now have the Governor's ear. It runs counter to a democratic process and sets a precedent where administrations can unilaterally repeal provisions of a critical habitat area management plan they disagree with. Supporters of the repeal talk about their opposition to government control. While this move may provide them a sense of agency, unilateral policy moves that circumvent two decades of citizen informed management of a state area takes away a citizen's control over their government.<br><br>This appears to be less about the sport of jetskiing, or using jetskis to access someplace than it is an avenue for sweet political revenge. Imagine how gratifying it will feel to jetski around China Poot Bay while well-heeled lower 48 lefties try to enjoy some quiet at the Kachemak Bay Wilderness Lodge, or jetskiing around mud bay scaring up flocks of shorebirds during the Kachemak Bay Shorebird Festival causing a hundred geriatric Obama loving birdwatchers to shake their fists in anger! At least this makes sense!<br><br>But seriously. Thousands of dollars and hours of debate have already gone into this issue. Listen to your biologists and quit wasting everyone's precious time. This punitive rule change will have to be reversed by a subsequent administration or by legislation, but you can count on a policy response as many business owners and residents are opposed to this unilateral move.<br><br>Thank you and I wish you, the Governor, and the Legislature good luck with the 2020 legislative session and budget/fiscal debate. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Nick Lee | aktruss@gmail.com | | Rick, thank you for considering personal watercraft to use in Kachemak Bay i support the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, And think that all user group should be able to use Kachemak bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Dave Bachrach | david.bachrack@gmail.com | PO Box 2828<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Dear Mr. Green:<br>RE: Personal Watercraft use on Kachemak Bay<br>As a local resident, business owner, former EMT and current Kachemak Emergency Services Area board member, I am OPPOSED to the Repeal of 5 AAC 95.310 and the opening of Kachemak Bay for use by personal watercraft. I believe this type of activity is incompatible with the community values of Homer and residents of other communities around Kachemak Bay.<br>I am concerned about the safety aspects personal watercraft use within the bay. For some this is becoming an "extreme" form of recreation which increases the risk of severe injuries, hypothermia and even death. The addition of this type activity could put additional resource demands on local volunteer first responders which are stretched thinnest during the peak times for personal watercraft use. By allowing the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay it will change the quality of life for residents, visitors and wildlife have to come to enjoy, and NOT for the better. Their use will degrade quality of life in and around Kachemak Bay disrupting the tranquility of coves, bays, and by displacing, stressing or injuring wildlife and damaging fragile ecosystems.<br>There are plenty of places in Alaska where people can use personal watercraft if they choose to do so. Having places where people and wildlife can coexist without jet skis racing around "on principle" is a special quality that needs to be preserved.<br>Thank you for the opportunity of comment on the use of personal watercraft use on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Caroline Ahrens | dcahrens@alaska.net | | Please keep the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay intact.<br>These craft are loud and obnoxious and prone to bad actions by the people using them. The harassed whales in Resurrection Bay is just one example. The speed of these crafts makes it almost impossible to see the areas otters that surface or sleep on the surface.<br>The engine noise is loud and piercing which shatters the small area of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Please, just NO! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Michael W. Robbins | mike@robbinsalaska.com | 907-344-4405 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.<br>It is tough to be formal sometimes. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Deonn Torkelson | lifeiscomfy@icloud.com | 1331 S. Paddly Place Wasilla, AK 99623 | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br><br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay.¿ With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban.¿ Our state constitution¿ provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Victoria Gutschow | vegutschow@gmail.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing to let you know that I support a continued jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Jasdon Weisser | jasonweisser@gci.net | Homer, AK | Mr Green, My name Is Jason Weisser and I live in Homer. I am in favor of removing the jet ski ban in Kachemak bay on the grounds that it is not reasonable to limit one type of watercraft over another. Thanks for your time | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Dane Ferguson | dane@aksnox.com | | Hello Mr. Green<br>I am writing you this letter in support of PWC use in the Katchemak by and Homer area. In addition to the following 4 points:<br>1. This is about fair and equal access to Alaska's public waters by all Alaskans<br>2. The ban was put in place based on questionable "studies" that had no scientific basis. PWC are some of the most environmentally friendly boats available.<br>3. Conservation concerns are already addressed by current regulations which apply to all boats in Alaska.<br>4. Kachemak Bay belongs to ALL Alaskans – not just the chosen few. Equal access for all.<br><br>I believe that recreational use of PWC's can generate funds for local communities and businesses when managed correctly. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Deonn Torkelson | lifeiscomfy@icloud.com | | Of the 3<br>Administrative codes banning watercraft<br><br>Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br><br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay.¿ With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban.¿ Our state constitution¿ provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.<br><br>Thank you,<br><br>Your name n address | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Lloyd Toepel | ltoep44@yahoo.com | | Repeal the watercraft ban in Kachemak bay, never should have happened in the first place. Not the same as kids spinning around big lake, more like adults who want to fish and or explore the bay. And they should be allowed to just like anyone else. Thanks for your time. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Warren Keogh | warrenkeogh@gmail.com | PO Box 1166<br>Chickaloon, AK<br>99674 | Rick Green,<br><br>Keeping the ban on jet ski use in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas is absolutely necessary to protect the wildlife and habitat that these areas were recognized and established for. The way in which jet skis are operated and the noise they produce are not compatible with safeguarding critical habitat. Repealing the ban on jet ski use is an extraordinarily bad idea and the proposal to repeal the ban so should be rejected. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | John J. McClain | johnjmcclain@gmail.com | | Good Morning Rick,<br><br>I support the repeal of the ban of personal watercraft from the entire 220,000 acres of kachemak bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Tom Gummer | tgummer@chugach.net | Anchorage, AK | Hello Rick: please tell those tree-hugging greenie idiots to back off the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. It’s all BS!!! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Eleanor McMahon | emcmahon58@icloud.com | | Good Morning,<br>With great sadness,I read the commentary by the director of Watercraft Association this morning. He cites an anecdotal manatee confrontation in Florida as defense of the Impact these personal watercraft have on marine wildlife. Yes the public waters belong to all Alaskans, however , these noisy ,speeding ,Whale chasing joy riders are a hazard To wildlife ,fisherman, small boat owners, and commercial vessels.<br>There is not enough solid science supporting Chris Manthos’s claim that these Watercraft do not impact wildlife. I do not support his claims . | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | D. Lilja | d.lilja@q.com | | Dear Rick,<br><br>When you are more than 3 nautical miles from Alaska shoreline, you are in FEDERAL waters.<br><br>Federal waters are owned by all 330 million Americans, not just the measly 2/10ths of 1% who are Alaskans.<br><br>I'd appreciate it if you would concern yourself with your state waters, and keep your nose out of federal water policy. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Joe Ray Skrha | joeray_muse@me.com | 110 North<br>Willow Street;<br>Suite 137<br>Kenai, AK 99611<br>USA<br><br>907-283-7100 | Dear Rick,<br>I was so saddened to read in the Anchorage Daily News, the comments Chris Manthos about personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay... I have a Yamaha Jet Ski and love using it on some lakes in a reasonable manner. I would never use it on the Kenai River or Kachemak Bay because it has the potential to be so offensive in an area that many Alaskans believe wildlife deserves a priority and that jet skis should be off limits.<br>That said, why would you ever want a person using a jet ski around a pod of whales? Whales can be dangerous animals especially if threatened or scared. I've have seen a jet ski destroyed by a killer whale that was being observed by a young person on a jet ski. Fortunately, the operator escaped death by having another person on a fishing boat offer assistance to an unconscious driver. I'm all for fairness and equality but jet skis' on Kachemak Bay is just stupid and should not be permitted. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Nathan A. Madreger | aklife1982@gmail.com | | Mr. Green,<br><br>I am hoping that some of what I will say about this will catch your attention and your heart on the matter.<br><br>I am a Veteran of the US. Marines and also the US ARMY. I served 12 years for so many reasons. But all of those reasons always came down to our freedoms.<br>Some studies to ban PWC use in areas of Alaska is beyond absurd. We have so many boats and other things allowed to be used. However people like The cheaper operational costs and more environmentally friendly in order to make a living, spend time with family, save money on a water craft that costs less to getting around and other many great options for PWC.<br>Please do something about this on our behalf to save our rights and freedoms to choose what we would like to use in order to enjoy Alaska.<br><br>Thank you for your time. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Esther Sanderlin | akesther@yahoo.com | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Tim Kemp | tgtkemp@gci.net | Eagle River, AK | Dear Rick Green,<br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Kathleen Budd | budd5@gci.net | | Hello Rick, Please open the bay for personal watercraft. Open to all Alaskans. Thank you | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Lorraine Kottra, M.D. | lorrainekottra@yahoo.com | Little Tutka Bay | Dear Mr. Green,<br>I am writing to urge you to reconsider repealing the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat areas.<br>The state agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, in charge of these areas has TWICE indicated that these are sensitive areas in need of protection stating in their management plan that it is to " protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetration of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." The last revision of the plan was in 2017 and there has not been a review since. Kachemak Bay is a sensitive environment for fish,marine organisms, marine mammals and bird life. And the great majority of Alaskans has always agreed and supported this position.<br><br>The term Personal Watercraft is merely a euphemism for a vehicle which,unlike traditional boats, is designed and advertised for high speed riding, circling and wave jumping. These vehicles are noisy and travel at high speeds close to shore disrupting the shoreline and intertidal zone, which contain an abundance of smaller marine organisms, terrorizing marine mammals and waterfowl. Along with the noise pollution they will be a safety hazard for kayakers and fisherman in the Bay. They will also impact the local residents, both permanent and seasonal, who have chosen to live in the bays and coves and tourists who wish to see wildlife in a natural setting. All will now have to tolerate the noise pollution, safety concerns and degradation of the marine environment that jet skis entail.<br><br>For years Ms. Potts and the jet ski lobby have been agitating to rescind the ban on jet skis in the Bay. Suddenly it appears to be a "done deal." What has changed? Have the biologists with Fish and Game changed their stance? Has there been an outcry from a majority of Alaskans asking for this change? Or only a small persistent lobby who have gained the ear of the governor citing fairness and equal access. 99% ofAlaskan waterways are already open to jet skis. And there is ample precedent for areas being closed to certain uses due to impacts on animal population negating the fairness and equal access arguments.<br><br>Do not overturn what has been an essential element in a well thought out plan for the Kachemak Bay Critical Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | James Tingley | tingleypdx@yahoo.com | Homer, AK | Hello Mr. Green. My name is James Tingley. I'm a life long Homer area resident and Navy veteran. I fully support the use of personal water craft in Katchemak bay. Thank you for your time. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Mark Dickson | marksd@gci.net | Homer, AK 399-7088 | Mr Green.<br>I say no jet skis in kachemak bay including the critical habitat area. I heard you say on a radio interview no comments necessary. That's mildly insulting. Here's a short one: I agree that a 14' jet ski can be classified by the USCG as similar to a conventional boat of the similar size. However, you (the department) are fooling yourselves in believing that the impact is similar. Jet skis are never operated similar to traditional boats. They're always operated in a fast, erratic and loud manner; they were designed to do so. That was the reason they were banned in the first place. Nothing has changed. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Cory DeCook | corydecook@yahoo.com | Homer, AK | My name is Cory DeCook and I am a resident of Homer Alaska. I support lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Katchemak bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Joe Sallee | 907dcjoe@gmail.com | Homer, AK | To whom it may concern,<br><br>My name is Joe Sallee I am a resident of Homer Ak . I support lifting the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak bay.<br>Thanks you | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Cassie Ricciardi | mcneilcab@gmail.com | Homer, AK | I Cassie am opposed to the repeal of the jet skis in Kachemak bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Antonio Ricciardi | tncricciardi@gmail.com | PO Box 2590<br>Honmer, AK<br>99603 | I do not support the repeal of the ban on jet skis. The residents have already addressed this. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Lora Wilke | lorawilke@gmail.com | PO Box 85<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Mr. Green,<br><br>I adamantly oppose lifting the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area waters. Jet skis are small enough to get into smaller areas and threaten wildlife like otters, especially otters, and kayakers and ruin the peace in our secluded coves.<br><br>This is a critical habitat area, so please, jet skis are better off used elsewhere, not in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Also, where on earth did this come from? All of a sudden here we are defending the ban. Who wants this? Not the residents of Kachemak Country, not me.<br><br>Thank you for considering my comment, and others. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Kendall Soares | kendallcsoares@gmail.com | | Hey Rick, just letting you know that I am for lifting the ban on PWC in Kachemak bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Justin Rutledge | js_rutledge@yahoo.com | Sterling, AK | Dear Rick Green,<br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | John Reeb | johnreeb@ymail.com | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.Thanks | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Ritchie Ramstad | rjramstad@gmail.com | Eagle River, AK | Rick,<br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Chris Holland | aksledneck@hotmail.com | | Dear Rick Green,<br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Christopher Russell | orion94us@yahoo.com | | Sir,<br><br>My name is Christopher Russell, and I support the fill repeal of the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Phil Gordon | alaskafil@hotmail.com | Homer, AK 299-7015 | Rick,<br>I'm against jet skis in critical habitat until I hear from the biologists overturning their conclusions about the impact of skis on habitat and wildlife.<br>It occurs to me that the majority of tourists also find jet skis discouraging here.<br>So in the spirit of education from way back in Oceanview Elementary School PTA, teach me how the science has changed to require this policy change.<br>Plus:<br>How are those two very different sons of yours doing? I admired both as their librarian. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Charles Snyder | 907akcsnyder@gmail.com | | I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Sailor, Tamika and Clint Kyffin | intellect23@hotmail.com | | Mr. Green<br><br>I am writing to voice my opposition to the Kachemak bay personal watercraft ban. My family and I access all Alaskan waters by PWC. It is our preferred mode of transportation as it is efficient and affordable. I do not believe there is any reason whatsoever to deny equal access to our Alaskan waters. These vessels are coast guard approved and used around the world by ocean safety as fast efficient rescue and response vehicles.<br><br>I feel this ban is unfair and unreasonable.<br>I strongly call for a recall on this ban.<br>If large polluting oil exploration vessels can access the bay I think my daughters and I should be able to as well. Sincerely and with respect. | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Michael Rush | mrush_78@hotmail.com | 907-240-7963 | Mr. Green<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Gene Pool | gene@oxfordmetals.com | 3406 Arctic Blvd<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99503<br>(907) 561-5237 | Rick,<br><br>I hope the new year is treating you well so far.<br><br>I would like to express my support in opening up Kachemak Bay for equal access to all Alaskans. As it stands now PWC are not allowed in Kachemak Bay based on old environmental studies that may not have the scientific basis required for such a decision. Currently, today's personal watercraft are more environmentally friendly than many other watercraft (such as old 2-strokes) that are operating. It is my belief that current environmental regulations which apply to all boats\watercraft in Alaska are sufficient not only for today's boats but also PWC's. Kachemak Bay belongs to all Alaskans not just the few who can afford another vessel to operate these waters. As a lifetime Alaskan and one that currently operates my boat in Kachemak Bay I know we can all share these waters and the opportunities they offer. Feel free to reach out to me if you have further questions.<br>Enjoy the new year! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Deborah Townsend | thefrozenchosen49@yahoo.com | Homer, AK | Dear Sir,<br><br>Please, No to jet skis in this wildlife area<br><br>We have a responsibility to protect the flora, fauna, and sea wildlife including migrating birds through habitat preservation without the noise pollution, and increased wave action from high abrupt movements.<br><br>This area | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Molly Hobbs | thehobbs@gci.net | Wasilla, AK | Rick,<br>Personally I think that jet skis should not be allowed in Kachemak Bay due to their own safety & to preserve habitat and ensure no harassment of wildlife which would undoubtedly happen.<br>Please don't let this happen and oppose this asinine idea! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Willy Nye | eat.alaska@gmail.com | | I support the effort to lift the ban on the jet-skiis in the Kachemak Bay. It is not right to exclude one user group from access to the bay! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Todd Palin | tmp64@sarapalin.com | | Dear Rick,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK. Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Cory Crawford | coryj.13@gmail.com | 907-444-4296 | Dear Rick,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br>Today's PWC meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.<br><br>I don't buy skis or fat tire bike to be limited on my access, same goes for my snowmachine and four wheeler. I would like to use my PWC in various areas to see the sights, fish, recreate etc. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | James and Dianne Mahaffey | mahaffeydj1@gmail.com | 9601 Midden Way<br>Anchorage, AK 99507<br><br>907-333-9632 | We are strongly opposed to the repeal of the PWC (Jet Ski) ban in Kachemak Bay. It is necessary for the protection of our seabirds and other aquatic wildlife. The nature of jet skis is to use swift movements and turns and that puts sealife at a distinct disadvantage for avoiding fatal accidents.<br><br>Jet skis are also noisy and disruptive for visitors who visit Kachemak Bay for its beauty, serenity, and wildlife.<br><br>Please retain the original ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Jeremy Hansen | jhansen@yukonfire.com | 22804 Whispering Birch Drive<br>Chugiak, AK 99567<br>(907) 748-0205 | Hello Mr. Rick Green,<br><br>I support removing the Ban of Personal Watercraft (PWC) from the entire 220,00 acres of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The use of PWC should have never been banned in Kachemak Bay. PWC are some of the most environmentally friendly boats available, with respect to emissions and direct impacts on the environment. If environmental concerns was the driving factor for banning the use of PWC in Kachemak Bay, then all commercial and privately owned vessels utilizing inboard or outboard internal combustion engines for propulsion should also be banned. These larger and less fuel efficient vessels produce a larger carbon foot print and directly impact the environment more than a PWC.<br><br>Kachemak Bay belongs to all Alaskans to enjoy, including PWC owners. This reason alone is why we should remove the ban of PWC in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Please feel free to contact me directly if you would like to discuss this matter further.<br><br>Thank you for your consideration! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Vanessa Fefelov | fefelov.vanessa@gmail.com | | Mr. Green,<br><br>I support the repeal of the personal watercraft ban in Homer, AK. There is enough room for all types of watercraft in Kachemak Bay! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Randy Dobbs | rdobbsak@msn.com | | I support removing the pwc ban in Kachamak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Alex Roth | foorballman4545@hotmail.com | | Hi<br>I support the removal of the jetski ban in Kachemak bay.<br>Thanks | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Dirk V. Derksen | dirkderksen@aol.com | | I oppose the governor's ambition to remove the ban on use of jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. This plan to allow jet ski use in the KBCHA is little more than an invitation to a small group of motor-heads to destroy the relative peace of one of the very few marine and freshwater areas of the state where such activity is precluded. Importantly, allowing jet skis in the KBCHA is inconsistent with the purposes of this world class marine habitat. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Gordy Vernon | gogovernon@yahoo.com | Box 3 Homer, AK 99603 | Sirs:<br>I own a tranquil B&B as close as you can get to Bishop's Beach without being in the water.<br>If you want a TV, you'll have to book another B&B. TV destroys tranquility.<br>Although Sheryl Vitale gets comments about lack of a TV in other homes she books, she never gets that comment for the bungalow by Bishop's Beach. Why? Tranquility is a fast disappearing commodity.<br>So the idea of "power sport enthusiasts" launching jet-skis off of Bishop's Beach (an area I have seen families letting toddlers go into the water in bathing suits in recent years) makes my ear lobes reverberate.<br>Plus, where are all of these pick-up trucks with their trailers going to park?.<br>To say that jet-skis have a place in Kachemak Bay is like saying that a grafitti tag benefits a van Gogh.<br>That a trend in recreation should be allowed to destroy milleniea of what nature has preserved i$ fooli$h.<br>It will downgrade Homer's draw for tourism. Can you see jetskis jumping the wakes of the occassional cruise boat?<br>It's akin to allowing helicopters into Denali because planes have been flying in there for decades.<br>At least helicopter pilots have licenses, but the residents in that part of Alaska won't tolerate helicopters intrusions.<br>A park is to preserve what was, not to sponsor what is.<br>So "No thank you."<br>What part of that doesn't Rick Green, Doug Vincent Lang and Ben Stevens understand?<br>It's not their economy to destroy. p.s. It's not their economy to destroy (although Mikey's done a pretty good job of that to achieve a 4% budget reduction from Walker's proposal).<br>That's what the recall is about - when 90% of the comments come in against one of his proposals, he's not having a conversation with Alaskans. He's proving he's bought and sold<br>p.s. It's not their economy to destroy (although Mikey's done a pretty good job of that to achieve a 4% budget reduction from Walker's proposal).<br>That's what the recall is about - when 90% of the comments come in against one of his proposals, he's not having a conversation with Alaskans. He's proving he's bought and sold | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Crystal Collier Seldovia Village Tribe | ccollier@svt.org | PO Drawer L Seldovia, AK 9963 907-234-7897 | Re: Proposed Changes on Personal Watercraft – Kachemak Bay<br>The Seldovia Village Tribe, IRA would like to express our review and opinion on the repeal of the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. The Seldovia Tribal Council considered this at our meeting on January 2, 2020 and determined that we are in favor of the repeal of the prohibition.<br>The Seldovia Village Tribe, IRA jurisdictional area includes Seldovia to Anchor Point. We would appreciate the Department of Fish & Games removal of the ban on personal watercraft. With all the uses of all the watercraft in the Kachemak Bay to exclude a certain class is not a reasonable rule. We look forward to the lifting of the ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Chip Anderson | akpm907@gmail.com | 907-982-9696 | Mr. Green,<br><br>I just wanted to take a minute and express my opposition to the banning of Personal Watercraft in Kachemak bay. These overreaching regulations need to be repealed.<br><br>I appreciate your time and consideration in this important matter. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Christina Twogood | cmtwogood@gmail.com | 907-378-7323 | Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of repealing the ban of PWC usage from the entire 220,000 acres of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I am a lifelong, 3rd generation Alaskan and care deeply about ensuring the environment is protected in a way that allows Alaska to be a place where all can recreate. I strongly believe that motorized, personal watercraft use in Alaska's waterways (particularly Kachemak Bay) is an environmentally appropriate (not to mention amazing) way to access our amazing state. I strongly oppose restrictions that create specialized access restrictions to any Alaskans.<br><br>Thank you for your attention to this issue. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | W Keys | flybynightclub@gci.net | | See message: Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in folder PWC 12 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Tom and Maria Allison | mlaalaska1764@gmail.com | Kenai, AK | Dear Sir, We have been reading about the proposal to open Kachemak Bay to jetskis, and would like to write you to voice our concerns and urging you and those who are in the decision making positions, to disallow the use of jetskis. Kachemak Bay area is home to so many waterbirds and mammals, and the interference of the jetskis out away from the shore lines, out in the open waters, where there are rafts of birds, and otters, whales and other sea mammals, will be extremely detrimental and disturbing to them, to say nothing of the noise pollution for those of us who enjoy fishing, sailing, kayaking and so on. We urge you to consider the many environmental issues and to ban the use of jetskis in Kachemak Bay. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Michelle Harrington | michellemabelle48@yahoo.com | | No! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Patricia McLoughlin | patty99501@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK<br>907-223-3184 | I oppose all jet skis in all bays in Alaska.<br>I tolerate them in PWS as they stay in very deep water and go out (mostly) to only the first glacier from Whittier.<br>They will be a horrible idea for all of the environmental impact reasons stated in the ADN and told to you earlier. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Jon Erickson | erickson76499@gmail.com | P.O. Box 15417<br>Homer am<br>99603<br>9972994110 | I support opening Kachemak bay to personal water craft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Mike Grew | mikegrew57@yahoo.com | | Of concern to me is the danger all wildlife face from motorized vehicles. One time on a boat in Cook Inlet I witnessed a speeding boat failing to avoid Sea Otters. The adults Otters can dive under water to avoid a collision the pups however cannot. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Jamie Okonek-Parkhurst | jamieparkhurst@alaskan.com | | Please stop the allowance of these loud obnoxious machines in such a prized area known for birds and marine animals that many enjoy in their natural settings. These “recreational “ vehicles make such a negative impact that would ruin this area for a larger number of people. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Amy Fetterhoff | homerpioneerinn@gmail.com | PO Box 1430<br>244 W. Pioneer Ave.<br>Homer, Alaska<br>99603<br>(907) 235-5670 | Just for the record, Mr. Green, if the Homer City Council should send forth a resolution opposing the use of Personal Watercraft in the Kachemak Bay, please keep in mind those people do not speak for me, a resident and business owner in Homer since 1991. They were elected by a very small voter turnout and even though they think it's their job to represent me on matters with their own personal opinions via "Resolution", they are dreaming. Ignore them. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Ted Moore | tgmoore@gci.net | 14530 Echo Canyon Road<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99516 | Dear Mr. Green –<br><br>I wish to add my plea to the many others you have already received requesting that the proposal to open Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Critical Habitat Area to usage by personal watercraft (jet skis) be withdrawn. The present ban was instituted after extensive research and public involvement showed that such a ban is necessary to protect the natural wildlife in those areas. As a 49+ year resident of Alaska and frequent visitor to Kachemak Bay, I thank you for taking my opinion into consideration and, hopefully, reversing this proposal before it is too late. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Kevin Walker | homerkev@gmail.com | | Fish and Game scientists and officials formed the Kachemak Bay Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area to maintain and preserve this sensitive environment. The Management Plan for the CHA states it's purpose: "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.”<br>Riding PWC's, or "thrill craft", is fun and thrilling, and is allowed in most waters in the State of Alaska. However, Kachemak Bay is known for peace and solitude, fishing, and quietly watching birds and marine creatures.<br><br>As a resident of Kachemak City, I strongly support the BAN of PWC's in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Amy Russell | aktadpole@icloud.com | Homer, AK | Thanks<br>I use a water taxi, equal access. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | David Lockard | dlockard@gci.net | 2401 Ingra Street<br>Anchorage AK<br>99508<br>907-444-5326 | Mr. Green-<br><br>I am a 27 year resident of Alaska. My children were born here and my wife has lived here for 43 years.<br><br>I am writing to document my opposition to the proposed regulatory change in 5 AAC 95.310. Specifically, Personal watercraft are not consistent with the other uses of these valuable natural resources of Alaska. They would interfere with fishing, kayak and birdwatching tourism, disrupt the marine mammal, fish and birds commonly found in that area, and create economic harm by their impacts on fisheries, tourism, and the enjoyment of Alaska residents of these pristine natural resources. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Beverly Cronen | bcronen@gmail.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I’m writing to encourage a continuation of the ban on jet skiing in and around Kachemak Bay. I worked in the maritime industry for many years in areas where jet skis were permitted—the impact was negative on many levels—primarily related to noise levels, impact and damage to other watercraft, and stress, injury or death to avian and maritime animals.<br><br>Many local residents and tourists visit or stay around Kachemak Bay because it offers an opportunity to be in a more pristine setting. Kachemak Bay’s designation as a critical habitat is an oasis for wildlife, many species of which are struggling . Please don’t destroy this respite for humans and animals. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Jeanne Walker | jeannemarie.walker@gmail.com | PO Box 1542<br>Homer, AK 99603<br>907-435-7649 | Revisiting this ban is ludicrous. The Dept. has not presented any new science to support a reversal. Not every public area can serve everyone's needs. A critical habitat area should take precedent over noisy recreators that are a detriment to wildlife. The community of businesses and recreators in Kachemak Bay have certainly grown in response to this ban. This reversal would have a negative effect on them.<br><br>Many years ago my husband and I built a home on a lake near Seward. In the four years prior to occupying the house, the area was quiet: quiet residents, quiet sports. Someone started using PWC and would do circles on the lake just off our dock. Summer quiet was gone. When we later moved for a job opportunity, the jet skis were the major factor determining whether to sell the house or keep it. We sold. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Rika Mouw | rikamouw@gmail.com | | To Commissioner Lang and Rick Green,<br>I am adamantly opposed to repealing the current PWC ban in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. As you know and have heard time and time again, the ban on these water craft was established through a long public process with an overwhelming conclusion by not only the public but by state staff itself. There were 3 separate occasions when the public and ADFG concluded that the ban is merited in this special marine critical habitat. The first time in 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Staff biologists and managers at the ADFG supported the ban. The State revisited the issue in 2011 and 2016, and again, Alaskans spoke-out to maintain the ban as did ADF&G. They reviewed all the scientific literature on the matter and they concluded the ban is appropriate and justified. Science matters and so does the public process and public will. My husband and I worked on this issue from the very beginning and we know how appreciated this ban is by a vast majority of residents, visitors and users of the bay.<br>Now, by Governor Dunleavy's direction, without a true public process and with the State currently undergoing updates to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, any changes to a PWC policy or rules should occur within the context of the management plan revisions. Outside of this process, it is just very bad government and unmerited. To answer to a small interest group outside of a true public process on an issue this important is truly offensive and creates even more distrust of government than there already is.<br>Please listen and please do not allow for a repeal to this much needed PWC bad in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Craig Phillips | wizardousone@gmail.com | | Hey,<br>As the damage we are doing to the planet through our irresponsible use of energy becomes irrefutable I would encourage minimizing our waste and destruction any way that would help. Please, keep the ban on personal water craft in Kachemak Bay in the interest of the planets health. It could help to mandate 4 cycle engines and an efficiency requirement [horse power to weight ration??] while your at it.<br>Having lived 60 years in this state I've been sad to watch the constant and continued degradation of the natural resources and the lack of effective protection by the regulatory agencies here. Could you please step up and leave a legacy of something other than inept mismanagement? Your great grandchildren might not have to be embarrassed for you and they could experience the natural wonders you've protected for their sakes. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mike Mildbrand | mwtalaska@gmail.com | Sterling, Alaska | I personally would not like the ban lifted on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. They have plenty of other areas they can utilize rather than K bay. Let's keep that area peaceful. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Eric Tutt | erixtut@yahoo.com | | I would like to see the ban lifted and jet skis allowed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Crisi Matthews | shop@homershores.com | 1 | I'm writing this letter in support of all personal watercraft on Kachemak bay. We own an acre of property on the spit fronting Kachemak Bay and I believe personal use watercraft currently in use such as Paddleboards and kayaks should be expanded to include motorized watercraft. There is a great market for it in terms of summer activity in business enterprise but in addition I believe it would help in some circumstances to better the quality of life. We have seen Great deal of erosion in front of our property which has created an artificial Sandbar. Last summer alone we had two swimmers (now that the temperatures are warm enough to enter the bay for swimming) come close to drowning because they dropped off the sandbar and didn't realize there was an undertow that started to take them out to sea. Multiple people re-entered the water to help them causing more danger in my mind if they were not strong swimmers. That being said if there was a motorized watercraft nearby it could have been used in such a condition to assist. While I realize it could also increase the potential for accidents on the water, I can see that the advantage of having them could outweigh that risk. As a waterfront resident and user of motorized large vessels non-motorized kayaks and paddle boards I feel there is enough space on the water to be shared. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Joy Huffman | joyhuffman76@gmail.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br>My name is Joy Huffman. I was born and raised just outside of the City limits in Homer, Alaska. My husband and I are currently raising our four children in this wonderful community.<br>I am very disappointed in our Homer City Council. They are grossly overreaching with their resolution to get the possible personal watercraft ban lift squashed.<br>Please take anything you get from them with a grain of salt. They DO NOT speak for a LARGE number of Homer AREA residents. Why should their inability to see the potential positive aspects of being able to use PWC's impact EVERYONE? Unfortunately we've had some pretty significant drama down here and our Council has become very politically imbalanced and they are running with it.<br>Many of us who have been here our whole lives...2nd & 3rd, even 4th generations...live on homesteads or property outside city limits. We would love to see regulated PWC use!! This is something that can not only boost the economy, but provide family fun and even potentially cut down on the number of oil and gas guzzling boats that pollute our Bay.<br>Please, please...do not think the Homer Community Council's resolution in any way speaks for our actual community...MANY of us are not permitted to vote, even if the proposed resolution would directly affect us. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Matthew S. King | mattsking@mac.com | 35555 Kenai Spur Hwy #276<br>Soldotna, AK. 99669 | Greetings Mr. Rick Green,<br><br>I would like to express my support to repeal the ban on personal watercraft in the critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Cami Dalton | camihdalton@gmail.com | 2551 Foraker Dr.<br>Anchorage, Alaska 99517 | I am strongly OPPOSED to the proposed rule change to allow jet ski use in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area! I am upset and disturbed tby the fact that Governor Dunleavy is allowing his personal connections to direct government agency policy. There is no justification for this rule change.<br><br>The ban on jet skis received overwhelming support when it was instituted and protects essential wildlife habitat and marine mammals. Neither of those facts have changed. The habitat is way more important to protect than allowing the unnecessary recreation of a few Alaskans to recreate on jet skis.<br>In addition, these personal watercraft are annoyingly loud and quite dangersous. Use of jet skis would only lead to an increase in accidents and incidents in Kachemak Bay. When I lived in Juneau, I was witness to a number of accidents and deaths as a result of personal watercraft on Lynn Canal.<br><br>It is my expecation of the Department of Fish & Game to uphold this regulation and I encourage you to extend the comment period. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Giulia Tortora | gmtortora@icloud.com | PO Box 1489<br>Homer, AK | Mr. Green-<br><br>I am opposed to the removal of the jet ski/personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay<br><br>The scientific studies clearly show detriment to this critical habitat area. This has not changed<br>The public has voted on this issue. Twice.<br><br>Changing that ban has no advantages, and many disadvantages. Please do not reverse it | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mary Ann Higgins and Steve Renke | mahiggins@hotmail.com | | Good Evening, Mr. Green,<br><br>I noted in an online article that you request a simple Yes/No on this issue. So,<br><br>NO! PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THE BAN ON JET SKIS.<br><br>WE go to Homer several times a year. Kachemak Bay is a beautiful, diverse, serene habitat for a multitude of wildlife.<br><br>These are critical habitat areas.<br><br>Plus, my experience with jet skis is that they ARE A LOT MORE INTRUSIVE DUE TO THEIR NOISE AND AIR POLUTION/WATER POLLUTION and LACK OF MANEUVERABILITY… THAN A DINGHY…and frankly the MO of those who drive/ride jet skis seems to be more "in the moment" read possibly reckless and often immature.<br><br>AGAIN: OUR VOTE IS NO!<br><br>Thank you for extending the deadline for comments until Jan. 21.<br>We appreciate it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Judy Alderson | judyntana@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK | I am writing to oppose the lifting of the Personal Watercraft moratorium in Kachemak Bay. I have safety concerns for both the general boating community as well as the personal watercraft users due to the heavy boat traffic that occurs in the bay each summer. What are the plans to have emergency responders available to address accidents that occur and who will incur the costs for those rescues?<br>In addition, the noise from these personal watercraft will negatively affect other users of the bay, especially those using the beaches and shorelines as the expected use of the personal watercraft will likely be largely in the near shore environs.<br>The noise and the high speed of the personal watercraft will increase possible impacts to marine mammals from this new use. These impacts should be studied and documented prior to any changes to the regulations in Kachemak Bay.<br>To more adequately allow for the public to review and digest the changes that would result from this regulatory change, the public comment period needs to be extended for at least 30 days. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Shelly Erickson | shellyhro31@gmail.com | PO Box 3670<br>Homer, Ak.<br>99603 | I want to encourage you to allow the use of PWC in Kachemak Bay<br><br>Targeting one user group for years while other types of boats do far more to disturb is unfair. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mako Haggerty | mako@xyz.net | | Dear Mr Green<br>I oppose the lifting of the PWC (Jet-ski) ban.<br>I am a businessman. I have built a business here on Kachemak Bay that depends on consistent rules and regulations. Same as any business in the private sector. I have not asked for help from the government or asked for subsidies from any public funds.<br>Jet skis will have a huge adverse effect on the experience we have promised our customers and developed here.<br>One jet ski can upset the quality of experience for many.<br>The jet ski lobby will complain that some Alaskans are being denied access to Kachemak Bay. Nobody is denied access. Jet skis are denied access as a boom box is denied access in a movie theater or a high school basketball game.<br>By lifting the ban you have ruined many businesses for the benefit(?) of a few.<br>Do not lift the ban on jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Joy Ballard | joylee@ak.net | 907-240-4345 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>As a lifelong Alaskan and a frequent visitor to Kachemak Bay, I strongly oppose the opening of the Kachemak Bay critical habit area to jet skis.<br><br>Kachemak Bay is an incredibly unique place where Alaskans and visitors alike come to seek a quiet and peaceful experience in nature in Alaska's coastal waters with the marine mammals, seabirds, otters and etc.<br>Kachemak Bay is known for its natural beauty and richness and is the reason why it is my favorite place in this state to visit and spend time.<br><br>The jet ski experience is one of high speed operations, noise and thrills which is in complete opposition to the quiet enjoyment one expects to find in a critical habitat area.<br><br>Jet ski activities threaten marine life and will ruin the quiet experience for the many who come to enjoy all the activities – kayaking, paddle boarding, hiking and etc – that Kachemak Bay offers.<br><br>I strongly recommend you maintain the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay critical habitat area.<br><br>Thank you for your consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Deanna L. Chesser | rddcr@acsalaska.net | PO Box 515<br>Anchor Point, AK<br>99556 | See message: Jetski Ban- Kachemak Bay.msg in folder PWC 13 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Larry Mentzel | h82luz@gmail.com | | Old NBC article worth a quick read. No Environmental impact study was ever completed. The ban was indeed a witch hunt.<br><br>So what next? Ban black boats because locals don't like them? How about blue boats? If it might impact business ban them..?<br><br>Time for equal access!<br><br>https://abcnews.go.com/Travel/story?id=118871&page=1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Eric and Crystal Beeman | eric_beeman@yahoo.com | | Dear Mr Green:<br>Im Eric M Beeman, 53930 Peterson Bay Rem SW, Homer, AK 99603.<br>Im writing today to express my opposition to opening the waters of Kachemak Bay to PWC (jet ski) use. My wife and I live in Peterson Bay, on the south side of Kachemak Bay, across from Homer. This is our main residence in Alaska. Peterson Bay is a smaller bay, located between Halibut Cove and China Poot Bay. Approximately 20 families reside in Peterson Bay during the summer months. Many depart in the autumn, but a few of us stay for most of the year. In addition, Peterson Bay hosts 3 commercial oyster farms, a sea kayaking business, and the Center For Alaskan Coastal Studies. By and large, the residents of Peterson Bay live here to enjoy the solitude and wildlife that a few miles of ocean separation from the road system can bring. In discussions with my neighbors, there is overwhelming opposition to lifting the ban on PWCs in Kachemak Bay. Concerns range from wildlife disturbance, safety, and excessive noise. Since I live here, I'll offer my reasons that jet skis are a bad idea. Unlike kayakers, who are low impact (quiet!), and existing vessel traffic, which is either going from destination "A" to destination "B", or slowly trolling/anchored to fish, jet skis are more likely to be manned by the 'thrill seeker" types getting enjoyment from high speed and rapid maneuvers. I understand that there is a place for this, but that place has not been in Kachemak Bay, nor should it be, despite our current governors motives. The additional noise is another factor that none of our Bay residents would welcome. Furthermore, jet skis can be operated in fairly shallow water, leading to increased potential negative interactions with nesting or resting waterfowl.<br>Ill conclude with an excerpt from the Cook Inlet Keeper website: "Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PWC's, and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is one area that should be left alone."<br>My wife and I strongly feel that the waters of Kachemak Bay should remain off limits to PWCs. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Ralph Basner | rensab.rb@gmail.com | 5290 N. Brywood Cir. Palmer, Alaska 99645 | Dear Sir:<br><br>Please count my name as an emphatic NO on lifting the ban on jet skis on Kachemak Bay State Critical Habitat Area. On two previous occasions Alaskans have spoken loudly and clearly in favor of the jet ski restrictions. The past determination by both DNR and ADF&G that such use was incompatible with the values for which these lands and waters were legislatively designated was, and is, correct based on the adverse effects personal watercraft has on wildlife, including fish and birds, and wildlife habitat.<br><br>The restriction was put in place through a robust public process and the governor's attempt to ram this change through at the behest of a special interest represents a cynical slap in the face of the majority of Alaskans who voiced their support for this protection. It's high time that the decision-making process affecting our lands and waters be based upon science and its accompanying public process.<br><br>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Colleen and Jay Bickford | c2mizzc@gmail.com | | To Whom it May Concern:<br><br>We are property owners in the Homer area. Keeping the ban on jet ski use in the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas is absolutely necessary to protect the wildlife and habitat that these areas were recognized and established for. The way in which jet skis are operated and the noise they produce are not compatible with safeguarding critical habitat or a peaceful paddle in the area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Kim Bailey | kimofalaska@hotmail.com | Anchorage, AK | Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing to protest the re-opening of jet-skis in the protected area of Kachemak Bay. Years of studies by biologists and scientists have shown that this area is critical habitat for many migrating birds, sea otters, etc. Jet-skis would be devastating in this area. Not only could they hit and/or kill animals but just the sound and motion of them would be disturbing to the birds that use the area. Governor Dunleavy does not have the best interest of Alaska or Alaskans in his decision regarding this matter. It would be detrimental to tourism, since people come from all over the world to view wildlife in the area. People spend vast amounts of money to be able to come to Homer and see the wildlife. The last thing they want to see is jet-skis zooming around in the wildlife habitat area. Making a decision that helps a small special interest group (jet-ski operators) is not fair to the residents of Homer as it would hurt wildlife and the tourist industry in that area.<br><br>I have seen in person what jet-skis can do in a similar area. Visiting Seward one year, I saw two jet-skis zooming around in Resurrection Bay in the same waters as sea otters and sea lions. The operators seemed to have no regard for the possibility that they might hit one of the animals or that they were disturbing them and the people who were trying to view them. It was a turn-off for me, as a "tourist" from Anchorage, that this would be allowed to happen. And even though it was over a decade ago, the picture is still clear in my head. I'm sure many tourists would feel the same way if they saw this happening in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Please keep the restrictions on jet-skis as they have been for the past decades in Kachemak Bay. There is a reason they're there. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Bud Rice | budr@mtaonline.net | | Yo Man,<br>Operating PWCs is fun, but not in a Critical Habitat Area for our fish and wildlife. Don't wreck these areas for the reckless enjoyment of a few. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Kaylene Johnson-Sullivan | kaylene.johnson@gmail.com | Palmer, AK 907-360-4080 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I will be brief but would like to register my comment opposing the rescinding of the ban on jet skis on Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats.<br><br>Through the previous public process and in step with long-standing opinions of scientists and fish and game managers, the use of PWC is a bad idea in these areas. Nothing has changed to alter the facts. To open these areas to PWCs is counter to science, conservation ethics, and what most of the general public wants.<br><br>Please do not allow jet skis in these areas. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Michael Bavarsky | mbavers@yahoo.com | PO Box 15115 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 907-299-0163 | I am going on record as strongly opposing the lifting of the ban on personal use watercraft on Kachemak Bay for the following reasons:<br><br>1: Their very nature encourages erratic, dangerous, destructive, and annoying use. Comparing them to other boats is like comparing a military automatic weapon to a hunting rifle.<br><br>2: There are many, many places that are already frequented by such noisy and disruptive craft, where their disharmony would not be as noticeable. There are few places like Kachemak Bay.<br><br>3: Their use, even on an infrequent basis, would be destructive to wildlife, tourism, and peaceful and quiet recreation that persons such as myself enjoy. | repeat | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Randall Wiest | northwiest@gmail.com | Homer, AK | Mr. Green:<br><br>I'm writing to register my opposition to the recent ADF&G proposal to remove the existing ban on jet skis/ personal watercraft in the Critical Habitat zone of Kachemak Bay. Nothing appears to have changed on the scientific consensus that use of these high speed craft is not compatible with fish and wildlife values in an area designated as Critical Habitat. Moreover, the issue has been openly discussed in public process at least twice previously over the years and the vast majority of Alaskans clearly spoke out against their use in Kachemak Bay. I'm a Homer power boater myself but given the volume of vessel traffic already here in the Bay for commercial charter fishing, kayak tours, wildlife viewing trips, and personal sport fishing there are additional safety concerns associated with use of personal water craft locally. 99% of Alaskan waters are already open to the use of jet skis; I see no reason why their use has to be expanded to Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Billy Jones | billandsteph@gmail.com | | Hello,<br>It has recently come to my attention that the city of Homer intends to pass a resolution opposing the lift of the jet ski / personal watercraft ban in Kachemak bay.<br><br>As a community member that lives outside of Homer city limits, I urge you to remember that the city of Homer does not own Kachemak Bay. Many of us who live in the Kachemak Bay Area, but outside Homer city limits, do not agree with many of the opinions of the the Homer city council. Though we are often effected by the choices they make, we have no voice or representation in the city of Homer because we can not vote if we live outside the city limits.<br><br>Please do not allow the city of Homer to regulate watercraft use in Kachemak Bay, it does not belong to them, and they should not be allowed to act like it does.<br><br>Thank you for your service to Alaska. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Gil Blankinship | hurricanegil@comcast.net | 9841 51st Ave, Seattle, WA 98136 206.335.0562 | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>As a frequent visitor to Kachemak Bay, Little Tutka Bay property owner, long time boater, and outdoor enthusiast, I am strongly opposed to the opening of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area to the use of jet skis.<br><br>The Jet ski ethos is the complete antithesis to the quiet enjoyment one expects to find in a Critical Habitat Area. We retreat to Little Tutka Bay for its peaceful serenity; seeing mother nature at its best. Let's not stain the best that Homer has to offer.<br><br>I urge you to maintain the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay CHA.<br><br>Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Ronald Van Bergeyk | rvanbergeyk@gmail.com | | Yes ,I think it is high time to lift the ban on jet skis on Kachemak bay. You could also lift the ban on motorized vehicles in chugach state park while you're at it. Here's how it really is: there is no critical habitat, and all these "parks" are just the mountains. They only belong to those who can actually physically get there and only while they're there. That's it. So hell yeah: lift that ban baby!!! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Sarah Ballard | ballardsr@hotmail.com | | See message: PWC ban in Kachemak Bay.msg in folder PWC 13 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Steve and Karen Joynt | joyntks@icloud.com | | Mr. Green,<br>We urge you in the strongest terms, do not allow the state to lift the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay. As long-term Alaska residents (Stephen since 1949, Karen since 1980) we are appalled that this directive came from our Governor. In addition to extensive parts of the Bay being critical habitat areas, the long term appeal for tourism is highly dependent on preserving our natural resources — people from elsewhere visit us because that type of environment is gone, never to return where they live. Future revenue to that area from tourism will far outweigh the recreational aspects of PWCs. Ask the folks in Seward if they'd like Kenai Fjords National Park to go away; it was initially opposed but is now essential to their economy. The existing PWC ban is heavily supported by Alaskans as well as being considered crucial by Fish and Game biologists and you know it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Tam and Hans Gisler | tamag5@me.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>Simply put, it's a bad idea to put jet skis in Katchemak Bay. The appropriate place for them are the bigger lakes like Big Lake, Wasilla Lake, etc. Those areas where marine wildlife currently flourish will suffer if these motorized toys are allowed. Thank you, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Cliff Eames | cliff520@kennylakeak.net | Kenny Lake, AK | Dear Mr. Green,<br><br>I am adamantly opposed to the ADF&G proposal to repeal the jet ski ban in the Kachemak Bay CHA. The ban has been supported overwhelmingly by the public in the past--more than once--and repealing the ban is opposed by ADF&G's own staffers--the ones most familiar with the issue.<br><br>Jet skis are an abomination socially. They are very loud, they very irritatingly change pitch, and they ruin the experience of other users of Alaska's waters. These thrillcraft should be allowed in only a small percentage of Alaska's waters, and certainly not in a Critical Habitat Area as important as Kachemak Bay.<br><br>In addition, of course, and especially in an instance like this where a highly valuable Special Use Area is at stake, they can all too easily adversely affect fish and wildlife and their habitat as they travel in nearshore waters critical as feeding, resting, and nesting areas.<br><br>This proposal has no good natural resource justification but instead is a very obvious attempt to curry favor with recreational public interest groups. ADF&G should steward the resources for which they are responsible, not sacrifice them for political expediency.<br><br>Thank you for the chance to comment on this very unwise proposal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Petr Bucinsky | violins@gci.net | 1408 Hyder Street Anchorage, Alaska 99501 | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br><br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay.¿ With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban.¿ Our state constitution¿ provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Loren Wheat | lorenwheat@gmail.com | | Dear Sir,<br>I do not agree with the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay.<br>I fully support the the repeal of the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay.<br>Thank you for your efforts to repeal the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Jacque Graham | totallyjacque@gmail.com | 9980 Hampton Circle<br>Anchorage, AK 99507<br>907-519-1032 | Dear Rick Green:<br><br>This is to support the repeal on the ban of PWCs in Kachemak Bay for the purpose of accessing the Alaska marine highway and travelling from Homer to Seldovia, Kodiak, Seward and beyond.<br><br>Personal watercrafts are boats and are actually cleaner and quieter than a majority of the vessels that currently operate in the bay. Individuals who purchase PWCs may have higher disposable incomes than many of the regional operators. In every instance of numerous overnight trips via PWC, including riding from Anchorage to Seattle, our group of pwc riders have boosted the local economy by purchasing thousands of gallons of gas, have always overnighted in a hotel or lodge, have eaten every meal in local restaurants and purchased necessary supplies from local retailers. During our travels while we may have initially been met with skepticism, in the end the small boost that we provided to local businesses seemed to override any misplaced prejudice or unwarranted fear.<br><br>It is also possible that PWC owners are better educated, more environmentally and ecologically aware, as well as more respectful of the marine wilderness than many boat owners who operate legally in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Thank you very much for the consideration of this request. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Steve Hodgdon | alaskaoffroad@yahoo.com | Anchorage, AK | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br><br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay.¿ With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban.¿ Our state constitution¿ provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Yolanda Garoutte | yolanda.garoutte@yahoo.com | | Mr. Green,<br>I oppose the ban against PWC's in Katchemak bay. It is a navigable waterway and should be open to all water craft.<br>Thank you | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Kan Kijne | j.kijne@hetnet.nl | Leiden, The Netherlands | Dear Rick,<br><br>Nature's beauties are vital to all citizens of the world. So, as a regular visitor of Alaska too, I feel entitled to give my opinion about the presence of jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Jet skis in Kachemak Bay are like allowing graffiti in the Sistine Chapel in Rome. I am sure to represent many tourists from abroad by urgently requesting the Alaskan Government to keep jetskis out of this uniquely beautiful and quiet environment, if only because of the damage to all wildlife.<br><br>I wish you and your colleagues wisdom.<br>Kind greetings from the Netherlands, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | John E Watsjold | jerik1969@gmail.com | 7400 Randamar PL<br>Anchorage, Ak 99507<br><br>907-787-9651 | I oppose the repealing of the Kachemak jet ski ban | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Janice Higbee | jambolaya13@yahoo.com | 40508 Waterman Rd.<br>Homer, Alaska 99603 | Hi Mr. Green,<br><br>I am opposed to personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. The current ban should stand.<br><br>This is not an access issue. Land, water and roads often have "restrictions". Dirt bikes and ATV's are not allowed many roads and public lands, snow machines are not allowed on designated ski areas, helicopters are restricted from landing in certain areas. PWC can operate in 99% of Alaska waters.<br><br>The critical habitat designation of Kachemak Bay and Fox river flats allow restrictions to protect wildlife and habitat. PWC is not an appropriate use. In 2017 an ADFG memorandum references studies that document harm from PWC.<br><br>Uphold the current ban! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mary Miller | mhlisok@yahoo.com | AK | I trust Alaska Dept of Fish & Game's assessment and say no, no, no to personal water craft in Katchemak Bay. I am a voting resident. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Thomas Byers | oasisofsnow@yahoo.com | 4814 Newcastle Way<br>Anchorage, AK 99503 | Dear Rick Green,<br><br>I am writing in support of the repeal of the 3 administrative codes that ban personal watercraft from the waters of Kachemak Bay, Homer, AK.<br>Today's pwc meet strict environmental emissions standards and are cleaner and quieter than most vessels that are allowed to operate in Kachemak Bay. With no scientific evidence stating a personal watercraft is any different from other boats, the state has a duty to repeal the ban. Our state constitution provides language allowing all vessels to operate in the state's navigable waters.<br><br>There are so many positives for a jet ski and even the coast guard knows this as they have jet skis in their inventory. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Eric Klein | ericklein11@hotmail.com | Anchorage, AK | Hello,<br><br>I would like to express my support for sustaining the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay (KB), Alaska. My three main reasons for this are as follows:<br><br>1) The extensive studies previously undertaken resulted in many justifiable reasons for this ban to be enacted and remain in place (e.g., incompatible with critical habitat).<br><br>2) The majority of Alaskans support the ban on PWC in KB. This has been shown multiple times.<br><br>3) Not all parts of Alaska are multiple use for all interests. It is neither expected nor a current precedent to open public areas to all uses.<br><br>Thanks for your consideration of my opinion. Moreover, a change of direction like this should not be made unilaterally by the State Government. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Jane Wiebe | janewiebe@gmail.com | Homer, AK | Please do not repeal the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. We have a precious marine ecosystem to preserve as best we can. Jet-skis are also notoriously fast and noisy, and would ruin the peace that people come here to experience. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Carol Swartz | cswartz165@gmail.com | | Hello,<br>Please retain current regulations regarding jet skis in KBay and do not change rules that would allow them. This is a designated critical habitat area. It has been well documented how jet skis will adversely impact marine life and mammals and cause significant noise in the various bays where people come for a more quiet stay. Why would the State if Alaska want to do this and for a small segment of people? The tourism, fishing and outdoor recreation industries are economic drivers of the local .....and Alaskan....economy and will be also negatively impacted. There is also a safety factor to consider. I have lived in the Homer area for 40 years and truly fear the effects of jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Diane Patch | depatchalaska@gmail.com | 39042 Cannnonball Cir<br>Homer AK 99603 | As a resident of Kachemak Bay Area for over 30 years I ask that you keep prohibiting jet skis from our bay. Sea life is already stressed by climate change and sonic exploration.<br>There are many places in our state where people can enjoy recreating on jet skis. Let us keep this critical habitat free of them . Quiet is becoming scarce..already vehicles are allowed on beach areas and it is hard to take a quiet walk on the beach in Homer. Let's keep some beaches free of noise. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Phillip Lopez | philliplopez75@gmail.com | Ninilchik Ak | They should not be allowed. They will be used to harass wild life and marine life as well. Just say no | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Spencer Smith | spencersmith579@msn.com | AK | My name is Spencer Smith. I live in Kasilof and spend a lot of time in Homer and on the bay.<br><br>I am Strongly Apposed to removing the ban on jet skis!!!<br><br>I voted for Dunleavy, but am on the fence now. This decision, if the ban is lifted, would push me into the recall camp. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Gregory Collins | greg_allseasons@hotmail.com | 55090 Finch Ave.<br>Homer, AK.<br>99603<br>907-299-2625 | Sir,<br><br>This Ban was put in place by a Very Vocal Minority. It needs to be Lifted as PWC of today are Not what they were years ago. Boats run Dirtier than a PWC. The pollution caused by big boats that are really noisy is much larger and Louder than 4 Stroke PWC.<br><br>This would also bring more tourists to the Homer Area. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Jan Agosta | shutterbugsnapshot@gmail.com | Homer, AK | As a resident of Homer, I am avidly opposed to the use of jet skis on the bay. Wildlife and human activities will be adversely affected by the noise and high incidence of accidents associated with these difficult to control play toys. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Bill Sherwonit | akgriz@hotmail.com | 2441 Tulik Drive Anchorage, AK 99517 | See message: Comment: proposed repeal of jet ski ban in two Kachemak Bay critical habitat areas.msg in folder PWC 13 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Tim Steinberg | tim@visualadventures.net | | Hi Rick,<br>I am a local kayak guide who is opposed to allowing jet skis in the bay. My clients come to the Bay to experience the natural surroundings, I think the noise, the fumes will only take away from the experience of Alaska wilderness; I don't think it's good for the Otter's, the seals, for the fishing it's something we just don't need in Kachemak Bay. My clients have been coming for 25 years to Alaska and I'll Bet you cant find one of them who would support this idea.<br>I'm a local small business man who thinks this will hurt my business.<br>Thank you | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mary Landoli | iandolimary@gmail.com | | Dear Mr. Green,<br>I am writing to the Administration in opposition of the proposal to allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay. K-bay is one of the richest estuaries in the world. Please, listen to the experts at Fish and Game who state that the jet skis will destroy habitat and impact fish nurseries. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Ben C. Oien | boien@gci.net | | Mr Green<br><br>I wanted to personally let you know that I'm against opening Kachemak Bay to personal watercraft. I cross the bay from Home several times a year toward Seldovia and see wildlife each time that would be affected by the use of jetskis and such in the bay.<br><br>Please be reasonable and let the AK Fish and wildlife continue with their determination that this is critical habitat, and personal watercraft should not be allowed. THEY are the experts. They determined (again) in 2017 that this is STILL critical habitat and personal watercraft should not be allowed.<br><br>Thanks for listening. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Will Frost | wdfrost56@gmail.com | 225 East 11th Ave.<br>Anchorage, Alaska 99501 | Mr. Green,<br><br>I am writing to state my opposition to the repeal of the prohibition of jet skis from the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas. Unless there is new data that contradicts past analysis of the need to close these areas and show no harm will occur from jet skis, the closure should remain in place.<br><br>Thank you, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Nancy Schrag | schragnm@gmail.com | | I do not support lifting the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Please keep our beautiful bay off limits to jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Julia Person | juliaperson@gmail.com | | I live in Homer and have property in Tutka Bay. I am have been around jet skis in lakes and in Seward.<br><br>I oppose allowing jetskis into Kachemack Bay. Some have framed this as an access issue. That is nonsense. People can access the bays in this area multiple ways.<br><br>Jetskis and other personal watercraft are "thrillcraft" designed for recreation. Their inherent design, maneuverability and high speeds make them very different from skiffs and boats.Where boats typically go from point A to point B, jetskis tend to congregate in small areas and shallow waters, jumping wakes and circling.<br><br>This high speed thrill seeking behavior is what I have repeatedly witnessed when I have observed jetskis.<br><br>We are talking about critical habitat. Fish and Game researched this issue and determined jet skis are incompatible with critical habitats.<br><br>Stop this process. Riders have access to the rest of Cook Inlet so they are not being denied places to play. If they wish to access the critical habitat area, they are welcome to use the many options currently available. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Mark Schrag | schragnm@gmail.com | Homer, AK | DO NOT lift the ban on jet ski use in Kachemak Bay! They have no place in this pristine critical habitat area! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Casey Compton | We.Care@susitnaenergy.com | | Hello Rick,<br>I am a resident of Alaska born and raised and I believe the PWC ban for Kachemak Bay should be repealed. There is scientific evidence to support the claim that PWC's have no more harmful effects to the environment or wildlife then any other boats. This alone is reason enough to repeal the ban. I feel as though the arbitrary ban of one specific type of boat is unconstitutional, unamerican, and above all us unalaskan. Please tally my vote under repealing the ban.<br>Thank you, | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Henry T. Munson | henryt12653oegr@icloud.com | | See message: Re: Private watercraft restriction in Kachemak Bay.msg in folder PWC 13 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Gretchen T. Bersch | gtb@alaska.net | | See message: Repealing Personal Use Watercraft Prohibition in Kachemak Bay and Fox River | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Tim Dunne | woodsedgetreefarm@gmail.com | | I have visited Homer, Alaska 6 times over the last 25 years. My family and friends visiting with me have enjoyed fishing, hunting, birding, hiking, kayaking and more. Please do not lift the ban on jet skis in the critical habitats in and around Katchemak Bay. Jet skis would ruin the aesthetics and harm water quality and fish and wildlife populations in the area. Thank you for your consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Karen Berger | homerbrew96@gmail.com | 1411 Lake Shore Drive Homer, AK | As a 27 year resident of the Kachemak Bay area, I am asking you to do all you can to maintain the current jet ski regulations that are in place for this critical habitat and its dangerous waters. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Augusta R. | augusta.r@gci.net | | Please do all in your power to protect our sacred Kachemak Bay from jet skis and any other disturbance of the waters and animal life in this Bay and others in Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Ray Bulson | rbulson@mac.com | Wilderness Visions, Inc.<br>26034 Wildflower Circle<br>Eagle River, AK 99577<br>rb@wilderness-visions.com<br>907.952.2679 | am opposed to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. Please respect the will of the Alaskan people over the narrow interest of the jet ski industry. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | MaryEllen Ashton | maryellenashton@gmail.com | 1150 P St<br>Anchorage AK 99501 | I am opposed to repealing the Kachemak jet ski ban for the following reasons:<br>Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats are critical habitat areas. Personal watercraft are inappropriate vehicles in these areas in that they will negatively impact habitats, marine organisms, wildlife, quiet sports tourism, fishing and so on. I have personally come close to being decapitated by wave runners and jet skis while paddling. I have personally witnessed personal watercraft drivers intentionally (and also inadvertently) harassing waterfowl including tundra swans, puffins, loons, and other threatened species. As a 40 plus year resident of Alaska who always votes, I demand that the jet ski ban remain in effect. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | John Miller | jmmlaw@gci.net | 2448 Brooke Dr.<br>Anchorage, AK 99517<br>(907) 243-0849 | My wife and I want to add our voices to the many folks who strongly object to allowing personal water craft ("PWC") in the Katchemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. Every study by Fish & Game confirm that PWCs damage this unique environment, cause harm to marine life as well as fish. PWCs also create a safety hazard for kayakers, skiffs and other small boats. The speed, quick course changes and significant wakes from PWCs make them incompatible with shallows within the Critical Habitat, the resident and transitory fish and marine life, and other watercraft. When this issue has come up in the past there had been overwhelming public support for the current ban. There are plenty of other places where PWCs can be operated without creating all of the hazards they present in the Critical Habitat Area. Removing the ban on PWCs would be a terrible mistake. This is a special place and the current ban should remain in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Lori Landstrom | ljlandstrom81@gmail.com | Kenai Peninsula resident | I am not in favor of lifting the ban on jet skis in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. It has served the area and animals well. It does not need to be lifted.<br>Please leave it in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Janet Romig | janetlarue@hotmail.com | | Seriously? Personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay? It is short sighted, at absolute odds with biological data, and frankly, vulgar. Equal access doesn't mean anyone on any contrivance can go anywhere. Regulations protect our pristine environment so the abundance of wildlife and wild spaces continues for generations to come. Why ruin what is beautiful, popular, and busy? It's obscene to suggest this and as a lifelong Alaskan, I am ashamed of those that are willing to sacrifice what makes Alaska so different from so many other states. Big, wild, pristine, and populated by people that love and respect our bounty. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | David Ward | leefee4@aol.com | | Dear Rick- I'm opposed to the proposed regulation changes to the use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br><br>I have been a wildlife waterfowl biologist for the last 35 years in Alaska and know how important the State "Critical Habitat Areas" are for the fish and wildlife of this state. Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay are no exception. These areas receive far more human activity than most other "Critical Habitat Areas" in the state and deserve the same, if not more, protection from use jet skis. Jet skis are one of most disturbing types of watercraft to seabirds and seaducks because of their speed and often unpredictive movements. This is well documented! To allow jet boats in these "Critical Habitat Areas" would have measurable impacts to the perpetuation of wildlife within Kachemak and Fox River Flats. And this is an unnecessary change to the current regulation. Jet skis have other areas outside of these "Critical Habitat Areas" where they can be used by the public. According to the management plan for these "Critical Habitat Areas", the primary objective is to "perpetuate fish and wildlife and restrict all other uses not compatible with this primary purpose". Allowing use of "jet skis" in these areas would conflict with this goal. For this reason I'm against changes to the regulations to allow jet skis in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Bernie and Marion Simon | bmsimon@gci.net | | We were taken by surprise by the governor's action to lift the ban on jet skis in kachemak bay. In fact we were appalled by his action. It seems to be a pet peeve of the governor to pick a controversial issue and drive it to divide a community against the wishes of a majority.<br><br>We bought and built our place over a period of 45 years in Kasistna Bay. Pouring out more blood and sweat than most people do over several life times. Our friends have thoroughly enjoyed the wild life in the area, of special interest, if there is one, would be the bearded otter. We have never seen a boat or boats engage in wrecklessness activity in the Bay. The kayakers in the area would be deprived of the serenity they enjoy. We have seen what jet skis have done to areas like big lake. I ask the powers to be to act prudently on this topic for the sake of the wild lif in the area especially the otter, their new born and the whales. Thank you | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Debra Erosky | debraerosky@yahoo.com | | I am writing to state my opposition to repealing the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. I use Kachemak Bay for personal enjoyment. It is a beautiful bay. It is also a very busy bay. Lots of large ship traffic and fishing boats both personal and charter. The sea life is impacted by these vessels. I have seen dead otters that were obviously hit by boats. I don't see how adding more motor driven vehicles will help this.<br><br>Wildlife species are what tourists come to see and if mismanagement of wildlife continues, there will be nothing left to see. Lets keep the terrain both above and below the surface of the water undisturbed for the native species to flourish. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Lon Kelley | kelleyfa@mtaonline.net | 6301 N Bishop Drive<br>Wasilla, Alaska 99654<br>(907) 357-6867 | Rick,<br><br>As an Alaskan for sixteen years and a visitor to Kachemak Bay and Homer, I find it inconceivable anyone would even think about opening the Bay Area up to personal watercraft. The habitat needs to remain protected from the human race as much as possible. While many who use personal watercraft are responsible, many are not. Even responsible users are a threat to the ecosystem of the Bay. My vote is for keeping personal watercraft out of the area! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Rika Mouw | rikamouw@gmail.com | | To Commissioner Lang and Rick Green,<br>I am adamantly opposed to repealing the current PWC ban in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. As you know and have heard time and time again, the ban on these water craft was established through a long public process with an overwhelming conclusion by not only the public but by state staff itself. There were 3 separate occasions when the public and ADFG concluded that the ban is merited in this special marine critical habitat. The first time in 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Staff biologists and managers at the ADFG supported the ban. The State revisited the issue in 2011 and 2016, and again, Alaskans spoke-out to maintain the ban as did ADF&G. They reviewed all the scientific literature on the matter and they concluded the ban is appropriate and justified. Science matters and so does the public process and public will. My husband and I worked on this issue from the very beginning and we know how appreciated this ban is by a vast majority of residents, visitors and users of the bay.<br>Now, by Governor Dunleavy's direction, without a true public process and with the State currently undergoing updates to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, any changes to a PWC policy or rules should occur within the context of the management plan revisions. Outside of this process, it is just very bad government and unmerited. To answer to a small interest group outside of a true public process on an issue this important is truly offensive and creates even more distrust of government than there already is.<br>Please listen and please do not allow for a repeal to this much needed PWC bad in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Noah Gregoire | contact@noahgregoirefilms.com | Homer, AK | My name is Noah, I live in Homer Alaska. I have read and am in favor of the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jeanne Cunningham | trekjeanne . <trekjeanne@gmail.com> | 3732 Red Eagle Court<br>Antelope, CA 95843 | It has been brought to my attention that there is a proposal to repeal the jet ski ban in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I do not live in Alaska, but the repercussions of repealing this ban would be felt as far away as my home in Sacramento, CA. We are on the other end of the Pacific Flyway used annually by migratory birds. Lesser Sandhill Cranes, which nest around Kachemak Bay, migrate 3,000 miles each year to spend the winter in and around Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge in the Sacramento area. Jet skis are not allowed on the waterways which are set aside for wildlife. The disturbance, noise and pollution caused by these personal watercraft would have a serious impact on wildlife in any area.<br>Keeping the jet ski ban is essential to protect wildlife and the special qualities and uniqueness of Kachemak Bay. Virtually 99% of Alaska's coastline is open to jet skis. Surely this one bay, which has had the ban for 18 years while providing a haven for wildlife in the area, should be kept free of jet skis.<br>Thank you for taking the wildlife and serenity of Kachemak Bay into consideration. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Beverly Churchill | Beverly Churchill <beverlychurchill51@gmail.com> | | I support the reinactment of the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. This is a very important ecosystem. There is absolutely no justification for their recreational use and plenty of concerns of their disruption to this Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Ken Zafren | Ken Zafren <kenzafren@gmail.com> | 10181 Curvi St.<br>Anchorage, AK 99507 USA | Please do not allow jetskis and other high-speed recreational watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The ban, instituted with overwhelming public support, has been in place for 18 years to protect fish and wildlife. There is no reason to lift the ban now - or ever. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Ray Cammisa | Ray Cammisa <raybird68@hotmail.com> | 17615 Lacey Dr Eagle River Ak 99577 | Jet Skis have no place in environmentally sensitive areas such as Prince William Sound Blackstone Bay ( where they continually violate their permit covered only by Coast Guard Regulations by being above the Hight Water Tide Mark.<br>Kachemak Bay is one of those areas where Jet Skis harm the environment and the area is way to congested with traditional use watercraft in the area, including marine aquaculture. Keep the Ban In Place! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Riki Lebman | Riki Lebman <riki_lebman@hotmail.com> | 15740 Wind Song Dr, Anchorage, AK 99516 | My husband and I own a cabin in Quiet Cove, a part of the Critical Habitat area. We're very lucky to have beautiful wide views of the bay and the Herring Islands. Our cabin is situated on the point of land that separates Little Jakolof and Little Tutka Bays. Individual boats (skiffs, kayaks), larger personal crafts, and fishing vessels travel past our cabin as a means to get to other bays, stop to fish or slow troll, or stop to watch whales, otters, dolphins eagles and/or hunt ducks. It's peaceful, and or our tidal areas reflect such with abundance of sea stars, sea anemones, and mollusks.<br>Motorized traffic is slow in this area for several reasons: hard to see intertidal rocks; marine wildlife traffic in and between island and peninsula areas; and recreational use by motorized boats and the traffic of SUPs, kayakers, and even scuba/swimmers lack clear visibility.<br>I am concerned that allowing jet skis would be detrimental to all. This type of watercraft is designed and ridden for faster speeds (over 70 mph). Group riding would pose even greater dangers to wildlife, fishers, and slower recreationists. I believe short and long term effects would show increased safety issues and a loss of wildlife and tidal habitat that is currently used for breeding, rearing young, and feeding.<br>Because I foresee an overall loss of intrinsic scenic and habitat value, I am submitting my comments in opposition to lifting the ban against jet ski use in the Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Kurt Weichhand | Kurt Weichhand <slug99603@yahoo.com> | 5655 Scenic Place Homer, AK 99603 | Just a quick note to voice my opinion on lifting the jet ski ban on Kachemak Bay. As a property owner across the bay, I'm appalled that the ban is even considered being lifted in a critical habitat area. We recently built a cabin across the bay and enjoy watching the numerous birds otters, seals and whales that frolic offshore. I can't imagine our tranquil scene ruined by personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Richard Koskovich | Richard Koskovich <rk2kbay@yahoo.com> | P.O. Box 1282 Homer Alaska 99603 | I am NOT in favor of allowing jet skis on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Bob and Doreen Toller | Bob and Doreen Toller <banddtoller@me.com> | | Do not allow | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jay Cross | john w Cross <jaywc1956@gmail.com> | Big Lake | No way should jet skis be allowed in Katchemak Bay. I live on a lake in the Mat Valley and I can see the harm that they do to the nesting bird population. If the people that ran them had more respect for the wildlife maybe it would be different. I don't see that happening, however. Do not ignore the studies and the science. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Todd Miner | Miner, Todd <TODD.MINER@CUANSCHUTZ.EDU> | | I am writing to ask that the Administration listen to the experts in regard to habitat protection and that you NOT allow jet skis to be used in Kachemak Bay. As someone who lived in Alaska for over two decades and who comes back to visit every summer (bringing in much needed tourism dollars), I cherish the incredible rich and diverse environment of K-Bay. Jet skis will harm nesting birds, sea mammals, and critical fish nursery habitat. On top of the damage to the natural environment, jet skis will disrupt the peace and serenity of the area, impacting the enjoyment of the great majority of locals and visitors.<br><br>Please, listen to the experts and the majority of Alaskans and do not allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jolynne Howard | jhoward@alaska.net | 200 West 34th Avenue, #348 Anchorage, AK 99503 | Please add my name to list of people AGAINST allowing jet skis to return to Kachemak Bay.<br>I can see no good reason for a change in regulations to allow these nuisance watercraft in this scenic, pristine area.<br><br>What possible good can come of this?<br><br>Harassment of marine life?<br>Noise pollution?<br>Water pollution?<br><br>Thank you for having an open forum for considering this issue. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Gina Docherty | The Dochertys <docherty@alaska.net> | Anchorage | I am writing to express my opinion on allowing 'jet skis' in Kachemak Bay. What a stupid idea. Homer is a beautiful, scenic town. The bay is especially beautiful to look at, with all the mountains and islands surrounding it. Allowing jet skis to plow around & make noise will degrade the aesthetic appeal of this lovely place. Home is relaxing & comfortable. There is enough ocean traffic with all the commercial fisherman and private boats already. Jet skis would add nothing to this place except more pollution, chaos & noise. Whoever came up with this idea is out of their mind. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Susie Baxter | Susie Baxter <smbaxter12@gmail.com> | | I am writing regarding lifting the ban on jet skis in the Katchemak Bay. I think this is wrong. These areas are critical habit for water fowl, marine mammals and already threatened breeding grounds for our salmon, crab and halibut.<br>Jets skis are noisy. Unlike a boat, when airborne, the engines magnify their noise impact.<br>Jets skis are fast, up to 65mph and this is too fast for any marine mammal to escape contact.<br>There are other places jets skis are more welcome, just not the Katchemak Bay.<br>My question is, can we just have some sacred water ways that do not include fast flying water craft? Our bay is already busy with the increase in population with the fisherman.<br><br>Please consider NOT lifting the ban on jet skis in Katchemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Stan Leaphart | Stan Leaphart <leaphart@gci.net> | Fairbanks | Please lift the ban on jet skis in Katchemak Bay. Thank you. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Peter E. Cannava | Peter and Reneie <reniedr@gci.net> | | As a resident of the Kenai and one who spends lots of time camping out on K Bay I would like to go on record as strongly opposing the usage of Jet Skis on the Bay.<br>One of the main attractions of the Bay to those who use it frequently or tourists who use it occasionally is the peace and tranquility it affords us as we enjoy nature and the magnificent scenery. Can you imagine renting a cabin or spending a nite in a tent on the Bay and having to listen to a group of jet skiers motoring around your site all thru the nite till the beer is gone!<br>There is no relationship what so ever between a jet ski and a boat! That would be tantamount to relating an automobile with a dirt bike! We don't allow dirt bikes to recreate in front of our homes but allow automobiles for transportation.<br>Please understand the difference in these types of vehicles! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Kristiann Maclean | Kristiann <kristiannmaclean@gmail.com> | Anchorage, Alaska | Do not lift the ban on jetskis in Katchemak Bay until a scientific, peer-reviewed study shows doing so won't have negative impact on the many species that live in those waters. One cannot simply ignore the past science reviews and public outcry to meet the request of some constituents who happen to benefit financially (the jetski industry). Shame on this administration for doing so. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Rick Needs | Rick Needs <rickneeds@gmail.com> | | I agree that it is a special interest law. We have to much of those. Snowmachine restrictions ,4 wheeler and off road restrictions on given dates . We have to let the public have access and use the public land.If you have a cayak or skies you can do anything,but the rest are held back. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Curtis Page | Curtis Page <clpage99@gmail.com> | | I do not support opening kachemack bay to jet skis, I'm a Anchorage resident that kayaks the area, it's getting too much disturbance for the wildlife already with just supporting the current users fishing,kayak and hiking community. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Randy "Bj" Bjorgan | bjorgan@alaska.net | 3038 Donington Drive<br>Anchorage AK<br>99504-3847 | See message: Kachemak Bay Ban.msg in PWC14 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Dave Bisegger | Dave Bisegger <dbisegger@gmail.com> | Ninilchik, AK | I am writing this comment to voice my belief that personal water craft NOT be allowed to operate in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. This is an important topic for me in the fact that I spend much time in the area and I appreciate the natural uniqueness of the area. Few places offer the access to the ocean habitat like Kachemak Bay. For many people, that is one of the few places access is reality available. Where there is access there develops a reliance and with reliance comes the need for protection.<br><br>It is my belief that the bay is highly used by motor craft. For a vast majority of the boats that use the same areas as we shore users, those boats are in transit. There are the occasional sport fishing boats trolling near the end of the spit, but that is infrequent-most boats untie and go Boats are a means to move from point A to point B.<br><br>We all know that personal water craft are a far different user. We all know that the recreation sought from personal water craft are not for transportation, going from point A to point B, but the use of the craft itself is the end use. There typically is no destination. The use of the craft is the purpose of the craft. The goal is to bond with the machine, not the environment which the machine operates. This makes personal watercraft not aligned with the purpose of a Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I believe that it is clear that personal water craft are noisy and obtrusive. They remain in a relatively small area for extended periods of time which disrupt wildlife and disrupts those of us that use that wildlife as viewers and all the benefits we gain from the use of that wildlife. The enjoyment of a single watercraft user can and will deprive a very large number of wildlife viewers and those enjoying the serine nature of the bay. Allowing those craft in Kachemak Bay would have a large disproportionate negative affect on many.<br><br>Please strongly consider keeping the personal motor craft ban in place. They are not a benefit to the community. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Kate Nixon | kate nixon <nixilator@hotmail.com> | | No Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>No to special interests.<br>Nothing has changed since the 1974 legislation to remotely suggest that jet skis should be permitted in Katchemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Dan Anderson | Dan Anderson <paragondan58@gmail.com> | | To all reading this. I am totally offended that this idea of allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay even be considered. I have witnessed first hand in the Midwestern part of the United State the rally's, races, and general roaring around that jet skis offer. In an area as special as Kachemak Bay is no place to promote this activity. Kachemak Bay is a habitat sensitive area, why would one want to jeopardize this place. The quite slower moving activities currently taking place in the bay don't seam to disturb fish and wildlife living in this special area. No to jet skis | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jacob Sonneborn | Jacob Sonneborn <jacob@jsonneborn.com> | | Put add my name to the list of those opposed to allowing Jet Ski traffic in the K Bay CHA. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Phil Brna | Phil Brna <fisheyeak@gmail.com> | 5601 E. 98th Ave Anchorage, AK 99507 | I'll make this short and sweet. I am totally opposed to use of jet skis and lifting the ban in Kachemak Bay. As a 42 year recreational user of the bay and retired ADF&G habitat biologist, it is my opinion that jet skis are incompatible with other uses and wildlife habitat values in the Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Carrie Stull | oooies@gci.net | 2281 E. Sun Mountain Ave, Ste B<br>Wasilla, AK 99654 | I strongly support lifting the ban on personal water craft (PWC) use within Kachemak Bay. Today's PWCs are no danger to the environment or other users that choose to enjoy water travel within Kachemak Bay. Today's PWC meet strict environmental emission standards well above other vessels currently allowed within the bay and restricting the use of PWC is simply user discrimination. If there are sensitive areas within the bay then those areas should be restricted to all users and not simply to PWC.<br><br>As Alaskan's we should always protect the rights of the individuals that choose to utilize public lands and waters; how they choose to access those lands and waters is a personal choice. Without factual and well substantiated evidence that a particular vessel or other motorized vehicle causes permanent environmental damage, the use of such vessels or vehicles should always be regarded as a personal choice; to ban them for any other reason is simply user discrimination from those that simply don't like them, understand them, or don't want to see them.<br><br>For all these reasons, I strongly support lifting the ban on PWC users within Kachemak Bay and restricting all users from any environmentally sensitive areas. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to respond. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Russell Hood | Russell Hood <rhood72@hotmail.com> | | I passionately support the continuance of the ban in Kachemak Bay. Personal watercraft have no place in such a sensitive, fragile ecosystem. And the way Dunleavy has gone about trying to undo this ban is beyond reprehensible.<br><br>Let's keep the personal watercraft in Big Lake, not Homer. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Louis Mass | louis mass <lmass1951@gmail.com> | 8325 Sundi Dr, Anchorage, AK 99502 | I oppose modifying the long term personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>One of my earliest memories of Alaska dates back to a family trip across Kachemak Bay in the summer of 1962 or 63. I was dazzled by the deep blue waters and the clarity near the shore where one could see fish, crabs, starfish and the brilliance of a variety of underwater flora.<br><br>I've enjoyed subsequent kayak trips with my children in the bay and worry that this experience may be jeopardized for my grandchildren.<br><br>This huge state offers many other opportunities for using personal watercraft such as lakes, Resurrection Bay and etc. I urge you to reconsider any proposed changes (Including personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay) that would diminish this jewel of Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jacob Fraley | Ak Hunter <fraleyjake86@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | As a life long resident of The Kachemak Bay Area I 100% believe that personal watercraft should be allowed in the bay. I believe that there is no data that shows that the safe, responsible operation of "jet skis" would damage habitats or wildlife in Kachemak bay, and that the ban infringes on rights of users. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Charles Homestead | Korin <khomestead@gci.net> | | I agree with Will Rice. We should not turn jet skis loose on the Kachemak Bay wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Lori Coverdale | Lori Coverdale <loricoverdale@hotmail.com> | | Hi there, just wanted to put my opinion in. Please keep the ban in place. This is not about equal access, it is about a few people who choose to spend their money on large, loud and destructive toys. Very upsetting that a small group has so much sway with governor.<br>Again the ban should remain in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Amber McDonough | McDonough, Amber <amber.mcdonough@siemens.com> | | Congratulations on your new position with ADF&G; my husband and I also enjoyed listening to your radio show. Given the pending proposal to allow jet skis to operate in Kachemak Bay, I felt compelled to express my mixed emotions on this issue. We do not own our own personal watercraft, but we owned a house in Seldovia for 7 years and are familiar with the area.<br><br>On the one hand it is a great way to improve access to this wonderful recreational area to more people that can't afford or don't want the hassle of owning a larger marine vessel. I'm also a huge supporter of getting more people outside so that they appreciate, build a connection with, and seek to protect Alaska's natural resources.<br><br>On the other hand, I'm concerned about the negative aspects "easy access" can bring including wildlife harassment, litter, excessive noise, and the potential for expanded illegal activities it can create. It would seem there would be no budget allowance or incentive to increase enforcement patrols or respond to complaints so how would the administration seek to defray these concerns?<br><br>One idea would to provide motorized and non-motorized times or days (like they do in the Eklutna Lake Rec Area) to give periodic human and environmental breaks. This would allow ADF&G as well as the public to ease into the idea of this enhanced access more slowly and evaluate any repercussions (or lack thereof) at a more relaxed pace. Do you feel like this idea or perhaps others your department may be considering might be helpful? | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | David Derry, Julie Derry | | PO Box 2882<br>Kenai 99611<br><br>PO Box 6407<br>Halibut Cove<br>99603 | Well, just put another notch in the OPPOSED column for me and my wife Julie. We have lived on the Kenai Peninsula for 48 years, in Homer, Kenai, and Halibut Cove. You've heard all the pros & cons, so no need to rehash that. But at least consider the danger to the operator of the personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Boating on the bay over the years, the water can go from looking very flat/calm to darn rough and dangerous quickly. Most of these PWC owners/operators are going to be accustomed to boating in lakes, not tidal saltwater. The result, more rescue operations for the Coast Guard & locals, and the possibility of lives lost. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jalmer (Bud) Alto | Alto, Bud/ANC <Bud.Alto@jacobs.com> | | Jet Skis are not appropriate to be used in the pristine environment of Kachemak Bay. I live part time on a lake in the Mat-Su Borough and can first hand testify to the damage these machines cause to the land and wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Stan Olsen | stanley olsen <stan1olsen@yahoo.com> | | It has been recently, 2017, determined by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game that the use of jet skis was indeed detrimental to fish and wildlife due the noise and ability to operate fast and in shallow water. This was also their stance in 2000. Obviously nothing has changed except the governor and he should not be allowed to dictate what the scientists have determined. I strongly urge you to continue the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Additionally they are a nuisance in Prince William Sound for the same reasons. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Katie Hickey | Katie Hickey <katie@kt-creative.com> | Anchorage, AK | Please do NOT allow jet skis in kachemak bay.<br><br>Imagine kayaking along the coastline, quietly observing a playful otter or looking down through the deep at starfish below, or listening to the sound of a nearby whale breathing. Suddenly the buzz of jet skis breaks in. You have to brace for their wakes. The stillness is lost. Otters disappear. The whales long gone. This is not the Kachemak bay we want!<br><br>Their very presence would take away the Alaska experience for tourists and locals alike and be detrimental to the economy as well. Not to mention impacts on the wildlife!<br><br>We are not the Lower 48! This is Alaska. We need to protect it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Toni & Jack Francisco | Toni Francisco <prelimtryout@hotmail.com> | | Please put your thinking cap on and convince Gov. Dunleavy to not lift the jet ski ban. It will just end up having to be re-instituted. Think about the actions of any jet-skiers you have ever watched...it's all about them regardless of how their definite actions impact other people and animals. It is not good for the blood pressure of those impacted! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Karen Bendler | Karen Bendler <karenbendler@yahoo.com> | 310 E 11th Ave,<br>Unit 111<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99501 | I completely disagree with the plan to lift the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. This ban should remain in place. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Carole Guffey | Carole Guffey <kcfish243@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | I am opposed to opening Kachemak Bay to jet skis. Having personally witnessed jet ski activity in and around secluded anchoring sites, most jet skiers just like to make noise and waves and run around like idiots. Late at night they buzz around anchored vessels, insuring no sleep! The danger to aquatic life is part of the jet ski problem, even if you don't actually see one of them harass or hit an animal.<br><br>What's the deal? You have a 20-something "wannabe guide" who wants to start a business renting jet skis out of Homer? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Laurence Goldin | Laurence Goldin <elgie@gci.net> | 324 E Dowling Rd #4 Anchorage, AK 99518 | I am a resident of Anchorage that has enjoyed recreating on the waters of Kachemak Bay for decades. I am strongly opposed to the proposal to allow jet skis to be operated for recreation in the Bay. The proposal is preposterous and dangerous in the extreme, both to wildlife and to the people riding the jet skis.<br>Shame on you and the governor for the underhanded and contrived process you instituted that ostensibly was to gain public input into the question but clearly was manipulated to severely restrict public input, especially outside the immediate confines of Kachemak Bay.<br>Do not commit this travesty! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jeff and Carrie Keene | keene@mtaonline.net | PO Box 671047 Chugiak, Alaska 99567 | We are heartily opposed to lifting the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. This is a longstanding ban instituted in 2000 by Alaska Fish and Game. State biologists have repeatedly expressed support for the ban which protects the wildlife in the bay. Given the stress all wildlife is currently under with climate change, the least we can do is not harass and threaten them with speeding machinery, noise and noxious odors.<br><br>Please continue to protect Kachemak Bay from the hazards of jet skis. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Barry Santana | Barry <bwsantana@gmail.com> | Wasilla, Alaska | I would like to weigh-in on the Jet Ski issue in Kachemak Bay. The people have spoken in the past...we are against allowing jet skis to operate in Kachemak Bay, ADF&G biologists have also weighed-in with a formal NO based on science. Jet skis are disruptive to wildlife because by design they are erratic. I have watched jet ski operators consistently harass wildlife on the lake I live on in the Mat-Su Valley . Seymour lake is a large lake, yet a few jet ski operators can overtake he lake from all other craft (party barges, fishermen in small boats and kayaks, float planes) due to the erratic behavior their operators find the need to display.<br><br>Do NOT change the status of jet skis being prohibited in Kachemak Bay. It is in effect for a reason. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Bob Martin | Robert D. Martin <rdmartin@alaska.net> | Eagle River, Alaska | We've owned a cabin on Blodgett Lake (in the Mat-Su Borough) since the early 1970's.<br><br>When "personal water crafts" (PWC) became popular in the 1990's, we asked that users of these devices act responsibly and not destroy the waterfowl nesting sites along the lake's shorelines. Our repeated requests were ignored. Finally in 1997, a lake management plan was put into place that restricted the watercraft horsepower to 10 and the grebe and loon populations eventually returned.<br><br>There was, of course, a hue and cry raised by the PWC crowd. Their arguments pretty much boiled down to the belief that, because they had purchased a PWC, they had a right to use it wherever and whenever they wanted. The majority of the residents around Blodgett Lake disagreed and the restrictions became law.<br><br>I read now that PWC owners want to start using them on Kachemak Bay making essentially the same arguments that were made by others wanting access to Blodgett Lake. These arguments are specious and absurd. Local residents have a right to declare that they don't want the negative impact on the area's wildlife or have to listen to the noise PWC's create.<br><br>In my opinion, there should not be a one-to-one "vote" between the public at large and the Kachemak Bay residents. The locals should have much more input into this issue.<br><br>However, if you are counting the "for PWC access" and "against PWC access" letters, please put me solidly into the "against" column. These devices are incredibly destructive and there are plenty of other places for them to ride. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Allan Cannamore | Allan Cannamore <bigal737@gmail.com> | | Keep the ban in place. Thank you, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Mary Bogan | Chugach <pprmnt@chugach.net> | Anchorage | Please do not even consider lifting the ban of jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. It's detrimental to wildlife. There are plenty of other opportunities for jet skis elsewhere.<br><br>This is a ban that has repeatedly come before the public and overwhelmingly been seen as something that needs to remain in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jack Curtiss | John Curtiss <jlbnrc@gci.net> | 2979 Glacier Street Anchorage, AK. 99508 | I write to object strongly to the proposal to open Kachemak Bay to jet ski use. Jet skis simply are not compatible with other uses in the area and they are a danger to wildlife. I am a kayaker. More than once have I been nearly swamped by jet skis as their drivers cut and turn and rev around doing the aquatic equivalent of brodies. I won't deny that that may be fun. I don't suggest that jet skis don't have there place. But that place is definitely not in the middle of a critical habitat area. Such areas are managed for the benefit of the animals that live there first and for the respectful human visitors there second. Please do not support the use of jet skis in Kachemjak Bey. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Russell Black | Russ Black <blackruss99@gmail.com> | | First, I remember you with KJRB. Second, Jet skis absolutely do NOT belong near wild habitat ! Wild game harassment is illegal !! There are plenty of places in our great state that can provide area too ride a jet ski, without disturbing the pristine areas around Homer. I am a voter, and stand solidly against this idea to open the area too jet ski's!!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | John Sparaga | John Sparaga <john@clearsmilesalaska.com> | | I would like to register my firm adamance to NOT change the F&G ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay and nearby waters. Having been an active boater on Cook Inlet for the past 30 years, I am very familiar with the bays and inlets there, and have thoroughly enjoyed the sea life in abundence. Yes, boats are disruptive too, but boats allow many thousands of people (there are 1200 boats in Homer harbor alone) to enjoy Kachemak Bay. Also the very much fewer jet skis that would use the Bay would serve a very much smaller population, and their noisy, turbulent helter-skelter manner of use that we have all seen in the hands of the young, aggressive crowd (see Big Lake for comparison) far outwseighs that of boats in noise and undoubtedly trauma to the sea life. Further, boats generally travel in a destination oriented manner, straight and steady in deeper water. Jet skis can maneuver in less than a foot of water, further into the inlets and bays where most marine animals make their living. Despite the inequity in access by banning jet skis, we have to draw the line in safeguarding our world class resource somewhere. Jet skis shoulod be it.<br>Having listened to your radio show for many years, and appreciating your common sense approach to Alaska Wildlife, I think you can appreciate my position. Please relay that to the Governor for me. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jim Akers | jim akers <jdakers78@hotmail.com> | 3701 Doroshin 99516 | My faminly and I have lived in Alaska since 1981<br>over the years we have enjoyed spending time in Homer as well as on the Homer Spit.<br>I would like to extend my opposition to introducing such an invasive presence as jet skis in those pristine waters.<br>They would seriously disturb the above and below water serenity | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | David B. Irons | David B Irons <dbironsak@gmail.com> | | I have live in Alaska since 1982. I am a biologist, a fisher, a hunter, a boat owner and a user of Kachemak Bay on a regular basis.<br><br>I STRONGLY OPPOSE LIFTING THE BAN ON JET SKIS IN KACHEMAK BAY!<br><br>They are a very bad idea and hurt wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Rodney Erosky | Rodney Erosky <rerosky@yahoo.com> | Ninilchik, AK | I am writing to voice my opposition to rescinding the ban on personal water craft in Kachemak Bay. Studies in the past have determined that these craft could be detrimental to the bay's unique wildlife population, and I have seen no studies which would alter that conclusion. We fish in and around Kachemak bay all summer, and really enjoy the otters, whales, orcas, etc that we get to see.<br>I don't see how adding jet skis to this environment can do anything other than diminish the experience for the vast majority of bay users. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jamie Okonek-Parkhurst | Jamie Parkhurst <jamieparkhurst@alaskan.com> | | Don't let a small obnoxious group of loud impact users ruin such a unique area to letting jet skis being allowed in an area rich in wildlife that thousands enjoy. Another potential change that will ruin the experience for so many and ruin what tourist strive to come and see while visiting our great state. Hind site is 20-20. We are loosing so many pristine areas to destructive "sports". | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Chuck Donahue | chuck donahue <donahue347@yahoo.com> | | Rick, this jet ski issue has been a dead issue for many years now. I have been a resident of Alaska for over 45 years. I retired from the AF here after 11 of my 20 assigned to Elmendorf. I just recently retired from Delta Airlines as a pilot. My point is, I have lived most of my life in Anchorage, and consider Homer my second home. I have spent a ton of money taking my family to Homer over the years camping, and especially fishing with them and other family and friends from in and out of state. The few years that I remember jet skis on the water in K Bay I was appalled by the noise and speed of jet skis. In short, their presence ruined my experience on the Bay. Of course there are boats that run 40 knots or more in the Bay and are just as loud and obnoxious as jet skis. Thankfully they are few and far between and usually are going out towards Compass Rose area to fish. They usually don't frequent all the calmer Bays in K Bay Area.<br>I spend approximately $ 1000 per trip to Homer on a typical 2-3 weekend . With 6-7 trips and often with 4-5 people you can see the amount of $$ spent of as high as $7000 for the Summer! I spend a lot of this money at Otter Cove, the city of Homer, launch fees, gas, food, lures, bait, etc. If this proposal is greased through I won't be using K Bay as much I can guarantee you that. Might even sell my boat while I'm at it. Jet Skis are not compatible with AK I feel , let alone K Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Lamar Ballard | lamar <aquatech@ak.net> | | As a frequent visitor to Kachemak Bay, long time boater and outdoor enthusiast I am strongly opposed to the opening of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area to the use of jet skis.<br><br>As a former owner and user of jet skis, I am quite familiar with how they are operated.<br><br>In my experience, they are the marine equivalent of a motocross bike in which the rider seeks the thrill of high speed operations, tight radius turns, near shore operation, jumping waves, etc. The Jet ski ethos is the complete antithesis to the quiet enjoyment one expects to find in a Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I urge you to maintain the ban on jet skis in the Kachemak Bay CHA. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Andrew Peter | Andrew Peter <originaliowan@gmail.com> | | Until I hear scientific evidence that shows the economic gain is greater than the negetive unintended consequences, I will be against lifting the ban on personal watercraft in KBay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | wayne jones | Chris & Kathleen <wcjones@mtaonline.net> | palmer, ak | I strongly appose Gov. Dunleavy's proposal to open up Kachemak Bay to motorized personal water use. Katchemak Bay remains pristine because of this ban, and kowtowing to special interests now threatens it. Do the right thing, Jet Ski's and Waverunners have no place in Katchemak Bay. Stop the greed and madness | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | J. Korpi | Jacquelyn Korpi <jrkorpi@fastmail.com> | | I am writing in cautious support of permitting personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Please note, I am a resident of Anchorage who spends most recreational opportunities in the Big Lake area and visits the Homer area infrequently. I am familiar with the full spectrum of PWC behavior from polite and family-friendly to drunk and dangerous. Allowing PWC in Kachemak on a trial basis seems fair, especially if there is oversight with respect to the wildlife and other forms of recreation in the area. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Taner Kipfer | Taner Kipfer <taner.kipfer@gmail.com> | | I am writing to express my dissent towards opening Kachemak Bay to recreational watercraft use. The area is home to a wealth of biodiversity and sustainable fishing industry which would both be negatively impacted by the lift on this ban. The ban on high-speed recreational watercraft is part of what makes the Bay and it's surrounding land so special as compared to other areas. Wildlife is already under extreme attack by climate change and the plastic epidemic, let's not add fuel to the fire with more habitat disruption. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Emilie Otis | Emilie Otis <otisemilie@gmail.com> | 41364 Charlie Drive<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Our state is under severe financial strain and adding an activity that will cost more to regulate is not fiscally responsible. We cannot pay for the basics of health, education, transportation and safety for our residents. The additional cost of enforcement for a pleasure vehicle is NOT where we should be spending money. If we are not going to increase enforcement then they should not be allowed.<br>PWC are allowed almost everywhere in Alaska except Kachemak Bay. Leaving one place that does not allow PWC is reasonable.<br>In summary: The ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay should stay in place because:<br>1. The state cannot afford to enforce regulations<br>2. Current businesses operating in Kachemak Bay will be negatively impacted by the presence of PWC, including eco-tourism, kayaking tours, and lodges.<br>3. PWC are not compatible with the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat designations<br>4. The safety record for PWC is well documented and they are not safe<br>5. PWC impact on wildlife will be significant, including otters, whales, seals, sea lions, and birds<br>IF Fish and Game proceeds with the opening of Kachemak Bay to PWC they should all be 4 strokes. Users should have to take a class on safety and etiquette to other users of the bay and wildlife before they are able to use a PWC in Kachemak Bay. Users should pay the full cost of this class. Users should pay a license fee to cover the cost of enforcement associated with monitoring PWC on the Bay.<br>Please do not repeal the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Thomas Hamill | Tom Hamill <tom.hamill.ak@gmail.com> | Chugiak | if memory serves me well you are/were Rick Rydell on the radio at one time. I actual enjoyed listening to you and have an idea of your political leanings & I imagine this email will not be that popular with yo,u but I hope you will read with an open mind.<br><br>30 year Alaskan living in Chugiak, property in Homer, multiple excursions in that area over the years.<br><br>understanding that the area is already inundated with watercraft that are certified and monitored by laws, regulations and coast guard and used for livelihood's and pleasure in one form or another.<br><br>I am not a mechanic but I believe a jet ski engine works differently and creates much more pollution both in the water and in the air. let them use there craft in the other million miles of water around our state where they are already approved.<br><br>kachemak bay is too much of a valuable resource and a great destination for wildlife and vista viewing, to risk spoiling the experience for the many, to appease a few motor heads to destroy it with obnoxious smells, pollution, and noise.<br><br>next would be concessions renting them and then we will have cabo or the jersey shore in Alaska.<br><br>from an environmental, fishing, wildlife, economic etc. etc. perspective it is a bad idea to allow jet skis in Kachemak bay now or at anytime in the future. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Paul | Paul <paulaura@hotmail.com> | | NO personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. I demand you keep the ban against personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Gretchen Nelson | G Nelson <glnelson19@gmail.com> | 3039 Alder Cir<br>Anchorage | I am adamantly opposed to the proposed rule change to allow jet ski use in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area and am disturbed that Gov Dunleavy is allowing personal connections to direct government agency policy.<br>The ban on jet skis received overwhelming support when it was instituted and protects essential wildlife habitat that Alaskan residents and thousands of tourists enjoy. I expect you to direct Fish & Game to uphold the regulation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | David Agosti | daveyrocket@gci.net | 14251 Jarvi Drive<br>Anchorage, AK 99515 | See message: Notice of Proposed Change - Repeal of 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC14 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Tim Deal | Tim deal <deal@gci.net> | Anchorage | As a lifelong Alaskan I would like to way in on this issue. I am strongly against PWC operating in Kachemak Bay. Fisherman use the harbor for launching boats and heading out to the fishing grounds. In and out and away from the spit. I personally enjoy watching this activity, boats coming and going while sitting on the beach. I don't want to sit on the beach and watch and listen to jet skis doing donuts and other maneuvers along the shore and out in the bay. This will undoubtedly occur as these are toys and will be used as such. Don't turn a beautiful place into another Big Lake please! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Sarah Hobart | s h <slillianhobart@hotmail.com> | | As a resident of the Kenai Peninsula & a very frequent visitor to Homer, I was shocked to learn that Gov. Dunleavy supports lifting the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>This would change the heart of the bay for the worse! The bay is one of my favorite places in Alaska. It is a serene, beautiful setting where one can view birds, sea otters & whales all while taking in the mountains, glaciers & the pristine, peaceful beauty of the Bay.<br>Having jet skiers zooming all over will scar the beauty of the waters, harm the wildlife, which will then retreat to other places AND it will make the Bay a dangerous place. Jet skis, boats, kayakers & paddle board enthusiasts are sure to clash & accidents will happen.<br>There are plenty of places to jet ski in Alaska, please don't make Kachemak Bay one of them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Becky Long | Bee Long <woodyfiber17@gmail.com> | POB 1088, Talkeetna AK 99676 | See message: Proposed Repeal in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC14 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Steve Strait | SS <stevestrait@gci.net> | 2500 Douglas Drive Anchorage, AK 99517 | I support ADF&G's proposal to repeal the current ban on personal watercraft. Why are Jet Ski's currently banned and not the many tankers, tenders, fishing boats, speed boats, cabin cruisers, water taxis that operate in Kachemak Bay? Jet Ski's have long been unreasonably banned from this bay and the practice of targeting certain vessels sets an unwelcome precedent in balkanizing Alaska's waterways. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Kirk Garoutte | Kirk Garoutte <kirk@susitnaenergy.com> | | My Name is Kirk Garoutte. I am a 51 year resident of Alaska. I hunt, fish, and recreate all over the state. I buy all licences, permits , fishing stamps as well as pay for registrations of all vehicles required. I follow all rules and regulations and try to be a good neighbor and citizen.<br>The ban on using my boat of choice, in this case my personal WaterCraft, in Kachemak Bay, I feel is wrong. My boat causes no adverse effect to anyone or any fish, mammal or environment wherever I choose to use it. The rules that placed this ban into law decades ago lack any scientific proof of harm to anything. My boat is as clean as any and I feel using it where I deem appropriate should be left up to me as a person and Alaska resident enjoying Alaska.<br>Kachemak Bay is no different than any other Navigable waterway in the eyes of maritime law or the United States Coast Guard. This ban keeps me from traveling to Seldovia, port graham. and other places in the area on MY choice of vehicle using the waterway. I own an Airboat. it too is a choice that is totally legal to use as well as a 24 foot alumaweld jet boat, again legal to use in this area. I feel this ban on PWC use is outdated, placed into law with very questionable reasons, and unlawful. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Frank Gwartney | Frank Gwartney <frank.gwartney@gmail.com> | | I'm writing to retain the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. As an older 2nd generation Alaskan I think we must retain some areas to be enjoyed for their natural qualities and free from these noisy machines with their potential to disturb and threaten this dynamic and productive marine habitat. With so much of Alaska already open to jet skis, I strongly support retaining the ban in Kachemak Bay. Thank you | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Kory Hearn | Kory Hearn <koryhearn@icloud.com> | | I recently learned there is an effort to allow personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I encourage you to please support the repeal and allow PWCs in the bay.<br><br>My parents introduced me and my siblings to PWCs at a young age, and the best memories I have growing up in Alaska are riding our WaveRunners. Unfortunately, we have never been able to launch and ride in Kachemak Bay, and it's time that the ban is lifted.<br><br>I want to be able to take my own family in the bay on our WaveRunners to fish and enjoy nature. Please support the repeal as it will mean a lot to our family. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Paul | Paul <paulaura@hotmail.com> | | Keep the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats in place. NO personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Dal Smith | Connors world Smith <smiddiegm@gmail.com> | | I have been POed about the BAN of Personal Watercraft in the Homer area, ever since it happened, and I don't even own one of those contraptions.<br><br>It is unfair to say the least. And accomplishes nothing of value. It's simply another way to PREVENT access, like so many other rules and regulations. Our government should try to increase access and opportunities to enjoy Alaska's outdoors, yet on every hand it accomplishes the opposite. Example, any place one can park off the road or highway, some government agency, has blocked it with a ditch or a huge rock that needs machinery to move.<br><br>This wacko ban should be removed. ASAP | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Matt Blaine | Blaine, Matthew J (DOT) <matthew.blaine@alaska.gov> | Matt Blaine PO Box 1767 Homer, AK | I am a lifetime homer resident, my family homesteaded in Homer and I am all for getting rid of the restrictions on our liberties in K Bay. Count me as another voice against the environmental wackos. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Jeff Lebegue | Jeff Lebegue <jefflbc@xmission.com> | | The jackass in the governors office has declared that jet skis are a good thing in Kachemak Bay.<br>That is really stupid.<br><br>Keep the ban in place; it's there for good reasons. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Genevieve Klebba | G Klebba <gennklebba@gmail.com> | Soldotna, AK 99669 | See message: ADFG Proposal to lift ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Margaret Boone | Margaret Boone <mboone@acsalaska.net> | | I support allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Hans Arnett | Hans Arnett <hansarnett@gmail.com> | 11060 Hideaway Trail Anchorage, Alaska 99507 | I am a life-long Alaska resident and I absolutely oppose the proposed repeal of the ban on Jetskis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Anna Dugan | Anna Dugan <anna.burke@gmail.com> | Peterson Bay | See message: Comments on Notice of Proposed Changes on the Use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Paul Reichardt | Paul Reichardt <paulreichardtak@gmail.com> | | See message: Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay CHAs.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Bruce Babbitt | busybabbitt@yahoo.com | Homer | see message: FW: Jet Ski Ban.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Charles E. Barnwell | barnwellce@gmail.com | 410 Crestwood Circle Homer, AK. 99603 | I am strongly opposed to the proposal to lift the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay, and specifically the critical habitat zone. I think the critical habitat zone was designated for a reason--to protect habitat. Therefore, a jet ski ban in this place makes sense to me. Aside from that, I think we need to draw a line with regard to where jet skis are allowed. I believe this to be true for motorized sports in general. In my lifetime here in Alaska I have been to a number of places where there should be a ban on motorized sports. We don't need to play with these machines everywhere we choose disrupting the quiet, and sometimes endangering others. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Mike Haines | hainesmike04@gmail.com | | please do NOT make Kachemak Bay available for "jet skis". Kachemak Bay is a unique place that contributes to the environmental well-being of our great State. There are many other places in Alaska that are available to "jet skiers", Let's keep the Bay pristine. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Beverly Kirsch | gbk74@alaska.net> | Soldotna, AK | Please! No jet skis on Kachemak Bay! Humans already have a huge, negative, exploitative impact on the waters and animals of Cook Inlet: personal motorized water craft, commercial fishing boats, ferry boats, cruise ships, sonar, oil and gas industry... Enough! No more air, water and noise pollution! Make the right decision! No jet skis! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Vivian Finlay and Clyde Boyer | Clyde Boyer and Vivian Finlay <vivandclyde@gmail.com | | See message: Fwd: Personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay (5).msg in PWC15 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Cynthia Sisson, Kachemak Bay Birders | sissoncf@gmail.com | | See message: Fwd: Personal Watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | organization/individual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | David Mesiar | Dave Mesiar <dcmesiar@hotmail.com> | 15740 Wind Song Dr Anchorage, AK 99516 | See message: Fwd: PWC ban change in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | continuation of fwd email- check for duplicates_2/5 found duplicate didn't re-enter | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Mark Pfeffer | Mark Pfeffer <markpfeffer7@icloud.com> | Homer | I have ridden jet skis on lakes and in rivers. They are a blast to ride.<br><br>BUT they will be a total disaster in KBay: Harassing marine mammals, eroding shore line, safety issues around other marine craft.<br><br>Please do not repeal this ban.<br><br>For reference I (or my affiliated entities) own/control properties at the entrance to Jakaloff as well as on the bluff in Homer On ocean drive loop. (If you need tax payer ID's let me know) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Gina Poths | Gina Poths <akpwcrdr@yahoo.com> | Anchorage AK | See message: I support the repeal of the ban of PWC in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC15 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Julia Barrett | Julia Barrett <juliakilpin@gmail.com> | 54545 Winchester Ave. Homer, AK 99603 | As a 19 year resident of the Homer and Kachemak bay area, I am fully in support of personal water craft use on Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Julie Davis | Berkly Davis <dberkly@hotmail.com> | POB 114 Homer, AK 99603 | Please do not allow Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay. We have one of the few pristine, non polluted estuaries left on the planet. Our Bay has always been a place of peace & quiet for beach walkers. Who thinks a jet ski in a bay with shore birds, sea otters, seals and whales is a good idea? Not me! Please do not allow Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Dorla Harness | Dorla Harness <dorlaharness@gmail.com> | | See message: Jet Ski ban.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Laura Strand | Laura Strand <lstrand.mail@gmail.com> | | I disagree with allowing Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay. My main concern is, how is Fish and Game going to monitor the fishermen on the jet skis???? Are you going to have more staff and boats out on the water to make sure they are not harassing wildlife and that they are following the fishing regulation? What is the consequences for the jet skis if they are harassing wildlife, have you figured that out?<br><br>The charter companies are squeezed again for more no halibut days and now they have to deal with idiots on jet skis! The Homer harbor is such a busy harbor I can foresee accidents and injuries already! If there is an accident with a charter boat that could result in major loss of income and lawsuits.<br><br>If you and not going to have more boats and Fish and Game officials out on the water then no jet skis because it will not be monitored properly! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Kathy Hill | Kathy Hill <kathhill@alaska.net> | Homer | Please do not allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Judith Erikson | Judith K. Erikson <jerikson@pobox.alaska.net> | Fritz Creek Alaska | PLEASE....no jet skis in Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Scott Adams | Scott Adams <showmethefish@yahoo.com> | | Would like to see jet skis return to KBay, there was only 4 being used back in the 90's. If a minority can banned jet skis, like they have done, then what else will they banned in the future. Snow machines or ATV's, in our back country?<br>It's interesting that the ban was only on Jet Skis? Not boats that go into the shallows, that drop people off, so they can enjoy the south side of KBay.<br>In Homer, we have float planes that take off from Beluga Lake, early in the morning and return back in the early evening.<br>You can hear them for miles, while they fly low over some parts of town.<br>I remember when you could make a living fishing on the waters of KBay. Now KBay is a research area, Critical Habitat. All of us care about our Bay, we enjoy it, whether by boat, kayak, or aircraft.<br>I wonder which user group will be next to be Banned from KBay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Deborah Lee Townsend | dlt <dltorders@yahoo.com> | Homer, Alaska | No, please to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>We continue to hold this small area as a place for wildlife and their particular habitat to flourish. Science needs these areas to judge how best to sustain life on this planet.<br><br>Sincerely consider this in the final assessment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Yvonne Leutwyler | Yvonne Leutwyler <yvonneleutwyler@yahoo.com> | Homer, AK 99603 | This is my comment to the proposal of allowing jet skis (and similar small watercraft) in Kachemak Bay:<br><br>I am opposed to this.<br>Kachemak Bay is habitat to a diversity of intertidal organisms, as well as waterfowl, shorebirds, and mammals like sea otters and whales. In part because of this, Kachemak Bay has been a destination for people seeking natural beauty and recreating by non-motorized means (sea kayaking, stand-up-paddleboarding, pack rafting etc.). Kachemak Bay is an attraction that plays a big part in Homer's tourist economy.<br><br>Jet skis and similar small watercraft that can be driven at high speeds with a high noise level endanger wildlife, especially in environmentally fragile areas like intertidal zones. Additionally, jet skis are risky to drive with high potential for accidents and crashes, endangering the lives of the drivers, and others.<br><br>Kachemak Bay State Park does not have the manpower to enforce any violations, hence increasing the potential for habitat destruction, noise pollution, and accident risk.<br><br>There are other areas in Southcentral Alaska where jet skis are permitted. Kachemak Bay is NOT a place for them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Gloria Mumm | Gloria Mumm <glomumm@hotmail.com> | | I ask that you leave the ban in place for the use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I have many personal reasons for this request but it is not based on dislike for the machines. Rather, it is the behavior of the drivers who buzz about in shallow waters near shore caused noise pollution and forcing all others within auditory range to put up this disturbance. There are so many places that these machines can be used and I see no reason why some areas can't be kept undisturbed. All areas don't need to be open to all people for all uses. We should use some discretion and opening up Kachemak Bay to the use of jet skis would be a mistake, in my opinion. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Katie Hollingsworth | Theodore Schmitt <theodoretschmittconsultingllc@gmail.com> | | I am born and raised Alaskan and I believe Jet skis have a place on the bay as long as there are rules like every other motorized vehicle. Suggestions maybe for safety issues: speed limits in protected coves and populated areas, maybe a barrier area for use like the inside bay(spit inwards and directly across the bay and then maybe a boarder along the edge by halibut cove to get to the other vacation areas. I think everyone's biggest concern is the weather changing and people getting hurt but also an environmental concern. Those are the same people who are fishing and murdering thousands of fish and use a ton of fuel. I always find that ironic. The water on the inside bay is usually more calm that is just a suggestion have no experience regulating anything or even boating that much.<br><br>I just think it would be a fun for tourists and locals alike it could also bring some revenue to Homer. I just think the fines for abusing the rules though should be harsh to avoid any issues. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Beverly Kirsch | gbk74@alaska.net> | Soldotna, AK | STOP IT! Stop the constant desire to re-evaluate the need to do what's right. No more human disruption of the wildlife in and around Katchemak Bay is necessary. Much less human presence would be much better! That is a no-brainer. Do what's right for the good of the animal life. Do not add to the already excessive water, air and noise pollution in our corner of the world. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | George Kirsch. | George <gbk74@alaska.net> | Soldotna, AK | I believe that the proposal to allow jet skis on Kachemak bay is absolutely ridiculous. Who comes up with this stuff? No point in listing all the reasons why it is a FOOLISH proposal. If it isn't obvious to somebody already, it never will be. Just another proposal that would financially benefit the very few at the expense of the great majority, and of course the habitat / environment. If short term $$ for a few is the driving force, I would submit jetski presence might actually decrease tourism $$ (I for one would forego summer Homer visits to avoid seeing them, and I think many others would feel the same). Personal freedom issues? That works both ways. Question: What makes Homer special? Answer: Quality of life, scenery, environment, habitat, wildlife, fishing. Jetski use would detract from all of these. Period. Please try to do the right thing.<br><br>My name is George Kirsch. I live year round in Soldotna. I visit Homer frequently. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Reuben Hanke | Reuben Hanke <reuben@harrygaines.com> | PO Box 624 Kenai, Alaska. 99669 | Just wanted to drop you an email in support of lifting the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. There is simply no reason for this ban. These watercraft are no different than any other water craft. In fact, they probably have less impact on the environment than the larger vessels as hull displacement is drastically reduced with jet skis. This ban needs to be dropped along with a few other jet ski bans around the rest of the state. Thanks for looking into this. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Lacretia Ballance | Lacretia <lcballance@gmail.com> | | See message: Jetskiis and Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC15 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Lisa Poirier | Lisa Poirier <lpoirier@alaska.net> | | I would like to inform you of my opposition to lifting the ban on personal watercraft use in the Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay. This restriction is still valid and changing the restrictions on personal water craft creates a detriment to everyone including wildlife, other boaters, both personal and commercial, and has an overall negative impact on the habitat of the area.<br><br>It is especially disturbing how this is coming about. Rather than using the public process that would get input from residents, property owners, marine experts and habitat scientists instead it is coming from the Governor's office. The special interest groups that have the Governor's ear want to circumvent the process that was developed to get a wide range of input..<br><br>Personal watercraft continue to exist as more of a toy, or recreational vehicle for their owners rather than a practical method of transportation between points. Operators generally can be found running in circles at high speed creating wakes for jumping. Even those traveling straight line tend to travel at high speed (up to 65 mph), which creates a hazard for seabirds, marine mammals, marine organisms, marine habitats, and regular watercraft both powered and unpowered.<br><br>Please uphold the ban against personal water craft use in the Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Milli Martin | Milli Martin <millimom37@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 2652 Homer, Ak 99603 | I am adamantly opposed to Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay. Our bay is peaceful and needs to remain that way. As a volunteer at our Chamber Visitor Center I know many visitors come just to see the wildlife on the bay, such as the otters, sea birds and whales. The fact that the Bay is relatively quiet is a huge plus, and to have jet skis zooming about at high speeds will not be conducive to more tourists, therefore, I beg you, please do not lift the current ban on jet skiis for Kachemak Bay. They are not welcome there. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Kira Stuart | Kira Stuart <kira.stuart@gmail.com> | PO Box 172 Homer, AK 99603 | I am a life long Alaskan, born & raised on the shores of Kachemak Bay.<br>The use of the bay for recreation, sustenance, and employment is a part of the fabric of our community.<br><br>Critical Habitat Area- that says it all.<br><br>The Alaska Legislature created the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area (CHA) in 1974 "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." In 2001, ADFG underwent a robust public process and with the support of thousands of local and statewide voices, it banned jet skis by regulation in the CHA.<br>Jetskis and other personal watercraft are "thrillcraft" designed for recreation. Their inherent design, maneuverability, and high speeds make them very different from skiffs and boats. Where boats typically go from point A to point B, jetskis tend to congregate in small areas and shallow waters, jumping wakes and circling. ADFG staff has conducted an exhaustive review of the scientific literature surround jetski risks and impacts, and it concluded again in 2017 the ban on personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is appropriate and fully-supported by science. The memo reads:<br>"In summary, based on our review of information available since the PWC prohibition was adopted in 2001, we feel there is no new information that would warrant rescinding the prohibition, and in fact, the newer information highlights most of the concerns identified when the prohibition was adopted. A draft of this memo was circulated to affected staff in all department divisions (DWC, HAB, CF, SF) and this recommendation was widely supported."<br>Please respond rationally, respect the law and the work that has been done to draft it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Kelcy M. Joynt | Kelcy Joynt <joyntkm@gmail.com> | | Born and raised in Alaska, I am proud and privileged to know what it's like to live in some of the most unpopulated, beautiful, and abundant areas still left on the planet.<br><br>Hearing this news about Dunleavy wanting to lift the ban on Kachemak Bay without first giving the public a chance to weigh in is wildly wrong. Disrupting this habitat for short-term pleasures has long-term consequences and will ruin the critical habitat that has always made Alaska special. Don't let Dunleavy ruin this for future generations. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Lisa Moorehead | Lisa Moorehead <lisamoorehead907@gmail.com> | 5515 Wild Mountain Road Eagle River, AK 99577 | I wish to go on record opposing the proposed lifting of bans on the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The bay contains a great deal of important, and even critical, habitat for wildlife. The bay also already has quite a bit of traffic in it, most of which respects the wildlife that inhabit the bay. Most boat operators are knowledgeable about areas to avoid if they are to avoid disturbing nesting birds, pupping marine mammals, etc. But most personal watercraft users never have to get licensed or be trained as to proper clearances to give wildlife. Wildlife habituate to the slow moving boat traffic and its noise, particularly when boat operators are careful to keep their distance, but personal watercraft will be a new factor in the environment in terms of speed and decibels. Wildlife will be alarmed at the presence of personal watercraft and could risk injury to themselves and their offspring.<br><br>I have kayaked and boated in Kachemak Bay many times for the purpose of birding and seeing wildlife. Personal watercraft are incompatible with my way of enjoying the abundance of wildlife in Kachemak Bay, which happens to be the way the vast majority of tourists also wish to explore Kachemak Bay. They are not there to see jetskis; they are there to see marine mammals and birds and the peaceful beauty of this remarkable place. Please maintain the current bans on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Margaret Auth | Robert Auth <authrm@gci.net> | Anchorage | As a 38 year resident and a yearly visitor to Homer and Kachemak Bay, I am definitely opposed to the opening of the bay to high speed recreational watercraft. The reason I am opposed is that while boats try to have "no wake" effect due to the sensitive needs of both the fish/wildlife and residents, high speed personal watercraft are, by their very nature, very, very loud. One of the reasons my husband and I like to visit Homer is that Kachemak Bay is so serene.<br><br>I worry for the wildlife too. Jet Skis are notoriously difficult to control. I feel they are a menace and a danger to both people and wildlife. It is not uncommon to hear of deaths or injuries due to Jet Skis at a much higher rate than from boats. Also, Homer is a fishing town and the working fishing boats shouldn't be mixed with people jetting around at high speeds.<br><br>This is such a bad idea, one that was put forth by a very narrow interest group that will disproportionately impact far more people in a negative way just to placate the selfish desires of a few.<br><br>NO to opening Kachemak Bay to Jet Skis! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Gary Lyon | Gary & Terri Lyon <sealion@xyz.net> | 61770 Skyline Drive Homer, AK 99603 | I am a 41 year resident of Homer. I have spent much quality time on Kachemak Bay for each of those years. And I fully appreciate the bay's availability to all people. I am opposed to overturning the ban on JetSkiis. There so many other places on the road system that allow JetSkiis so Homer should be one place where they are not allowed.<br>Kachemak Bay is notably a place where many enjoy non-motorized water sports, some tourism businesses are built on this premise. It is also a wildlife sanctuary and is habitat for many vulnerable species.<br><br>I have sea kayaked in Prince William Sound for several years. This year we finished our 9 day trip at Blackstone Bay, a beautiful glacier filled fjord. We were there for three days. On each of those days several JetSki tours, usually eight or ten individuals, would come into Blackstone. They were the antithesis of our wilderness experience was all about. They were noisy and visually obnoxious. They had a dampening effect on our quiet, muscle powered adventure. The water taxi captain said that there is considerable opposition to them in Whittier, and for the reasons I gave.<br><br>In summary I am opposed to overturning the ban on JetSkiis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Helen Desjardin | Helen Desjardin <h_desjardin@yahoo.com> | | Unless you have them licensed and strict rules about staying their distance from the marine life, I'd be against it. And huge fines if they don't abide by the guidelines. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Jan Underwood | Jan Underwood <blogatrix@gmail.com> | | I am writing to express concern about the proposal that jetskis and other personal watercraft be permitted in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. The inherent design and intended use of thrillcraft makes them incompatible with the protection and preservation of habitat areas crucial to fish and wildlife. This has been demonstrated by rigorous and exhaustive recent studies. The current ban on jetskis in the bay has overwhelming public support, expressed repeatedly over many years. Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PWCs. Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is one area that should be left alone. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Karen Willmore | Karen Willmore <karenwillmore@gmail.com> | 9571 Midden Way Anchorage, Alaska 99507 | For the following reasons, I am very much for retaining the ban on jet skis for Kachemak Bay, a place I've loved and visited for over 40 years.<br>The results of studies showing the environmental value of not having jet skis are still valid. In September in one afternoon, we found 2 dead sea otters, one washed up on the Spit and the other on Bishop's Beach. The marine mammals and birds living in and around Kachemak are already stressed by a changing marine climate.<br>Jet skis are not similar boats; they are high-powered, noisy toys, not compatible with skiffs used for fishing, transportation, and sight-seeing and certainly not with kayaks and surfers<br>Almost all Alaskan waters are already open to jet skis. Shouldn't those of us who love quiet have a right to at least one major body of water? People from out-of-state I've met walking the beaches of Kachemak have all remarked how wonderful this natural environment is without all the noise of most places Outside. How many sandhill cranes will we see by Bishop's Beach or otters floating on their backs eating over by Gull Island with jet skis zooming around? And it won't be just a few as the industry starts advertising "Jet ski Kachemak Bay in Alaska."<br>Then there's the issue of enforcement and money to pay for it. For example. will jet skis be allowed in shallow water where they can easily ruin habitat? Will they be allowed to launch off Bishop's Beach and the Spit? How about China Poot Bay? Halibut Cove? Peterson Bay? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Cindy Mom, Owner, Seldovia Nature Tours, LLC | Cindy Mom <cynthialouisemom@gmail.com> | Seldovia, Alaska | See messsage: Keep the ban on PWC (jet skis) in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | individual/business | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Petr Afonin | peter afonin <peterafonin@gmail.com> | | See message: Lift the jetski ban.msg in PWC15 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Craig Matkin | Craig Matkin <comatkin@gmail.com> | 3430 Main St Ste B1 Homer, AK 99603 | I am a marine mammal biologist living in Homer Alaska. I have lived, hunted, fished and studies marine mammals here in Alaska for 45 years. From the point of view of the numerous humpback whales killer whales, harbor porpoise, and other marine mammals that use the critical habitat area, the reintroduction of high speed personal watercraft (jet skis and similar) is a big step away from the reasons the critical habitat was created. There is no question that these watercraft have the potential to disrupt feeding activity, cause unneeded stress, and other unnecessary harassment of marine mammals. Craft that move at such speeds are often not aware of animals in the vicinity and their potential impact. I strongly request that you do not lift this ban on high speed personal watercraft | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Zan Frederick | Zan <zan@Colorado.EDU> | PoBox 244685<br><br>Anchorage, AK 99524 | Greetings from Anchorage. I am a former commercial fisherman, a registered republican, and somebody who regularly recreates on Kachemak bay.<br><br>I am writing to express my opinion that the PWC ban in Kachemak bay should be upheld.<br><br>I salmon seined around Jet ski users in Prince William Sound and do not believe they should be allowed in Kachemak Bay. PWC users intentionally travel fast and erratically as part of the fun. This use is not compatible with the high concentration of boat operators, sport fishermen, and human powered travelers on Kachemak bay.<br><br>Please maintain the current ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Karyn DeCino | Karyn Noyes <karyn.noyes@gmail.com> | | Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed repeal of the prohibition of personal watercraft within the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.<br>I am opposed to lifting this restriction. As stated in the introduction of the Kachemak Bay Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas Management Plan, "the critical habitat areas were designated specifically to protect and preserve areas considered especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br>Personal watercraft have the ability to utilize shallow waters more extensively than other vessels and to disturb the wildlife that use these areas. Of particular concern are harbor seal haulouts, sea otter concentration areas, and seaduck concentration areas. The north side of Kachemak Bay and the nearshore areas between the Homer Spit and Anchor Point are known to be concentration and haulout areas.<br>There are many areas of Alaska where these watercraft are appropriate, but not in these Critical Habitat Areas.<br>Please do not lift the prohibition on personal watercraft in these Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Marya Pillifant | Marya Pillifant <littlehouseak@icloud.com> | 637 West 15th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99501 | I am writing to oppose allowing personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I have owned property on Hesketh Island since 1996 and spent much time on the waters edge listening to the songs of the many bird species, the whales and otters.<br>On a calm morning, the kind of morning that a jetski might hit the water, the noise generated would not only be bad for wildlife but also for humans and visitors to the bay and tourism.<br>Also, I think it would lead to accidents. Already a fair amount of boats hit the rocks around Hesketh, usually one or two per summer. I think jetskis might also make the same mistake.<br>The island is a wildlife sanctuary and this ecosystem would be disturbed significantly by the noise of personal watercraft.<br>Please do not repeal the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Peter Townsend | Peter Townsend <thefrozenchosen2@yahoo.com> | Homer, AK | I am writing in regards to the proposal to lift the ban on using jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Please note that I am strongly AGAINST any change in the current protections to this critical habitat area. This has been looked at in the past and scientists overwhelmingly agreed that the introduction of jet skis would have a negative impact on wildlife that rely on the resources of Kachemak Bay. Marine mammals, especially whales, are already under stress due to acidification, rising temperatures, and disruptions in their traditional food supplies. They do not need any additional stress factors such as the introduction of potentially irresponsible boaters aboard loud and excessively fast jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Monica O'Keefe | O'Keefe, Monica (DOT sponsored) <monicaokeefe@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | Please do not allow the use of jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I won't list all the reasons for this, but ADF&G staff have studied the issue, and feel that these machines are different from boats and should not be allowed into this area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Flash Films | Flash Films <mail@flashfilms.com.au> | | Keep the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay!<br>If you are concerned about access to the park, perhaps you could advocate for more funding to maintain the trails.<br>Some of the trails on maps don't even exist anymore. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Bill B | Bill B <bechtolresearch@hughes.net> | | See message: Oppose deleting regulation 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Don Fritz | Don Fritz <halibut58@yahoo.com> | | Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the proposed regulation change. I am writing in opposition to the proposed regulation change that would delete 5 AAC 95.310 - Personal watercraft use prohibited and allow personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay (note tha the statutes cited in this regulation, AS 16.05.580 and AS 16.05.590, should actually be AS 16.20.580 AS 16.20.590, at least to my untrained eye). While I would not be against a future regulation change that would allow personal watercraft west of a line from the tip of Homer Spit to Barabara Point or some point westward, I do not believe that the infrastructure currently exists that would allow for this regulation change to occur without deleteriously impacting current users of the Homer Small Boat Harbor and the Alaska State Park wasters on the south side of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Krysta Kurka | Krysta Kurka <krysta.kurka@gmail.com> | | This is a terrible idea, please do not let this happen. There is simply no need for jet skis in this fragile ecosystem. Keep Kachemak Bay safe, quiet, beautiful and jet ski free. If people feel the "need" to jet ski on their personal thrill crafts then they can take it somewhere it's already legal | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Mina Kumar | Mina Kumar <mina.kumar@gmail.com> | Homer | I grew up in Alaska and my family now owns a house in Homer at 37523 Greer Road. I have been visiting Homer and Sadie Cove, where my friends have property, for almost 20 years now and I have always enjoyed the beauty and abundance of wildlife in the Katchemak Bay, which is unparalleled.<br><br>I am writing in strong opposition to the lift on the jet ski ban, which is in line with the majority of Alaskans views on the matter as well as the views of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's biologists. These thrill-seeking recreational crafts do not belong on Katchemak Bay -- they create dangerous and noisy conditions for wildlife and humans in an area where we have worked extremely hard to preserve and create conditions which allow both to thrive for many years.<br><br>I do very much hope the Governor takes public opinion into account and upholds this ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Mark Worcester | worcester1@gci.net | 2247 Arctic Circle Anchorage, AK 99517 | Please do not change the regulations to allow motorized personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. That kind of watercraft is most disruptive of natural ecosystems, and unlike other motorized craft, is primarily used for purely recreational purposes, rather than for transportation. Please preserve the bay's unique wildlife resources and keep the noise and disruption of motorized craft to the minimum needed for traditional marine and airplane uses. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Joe Dugan | Joe Dugan <joseph.dugan@gmail.com> | 53197 Peterson Bay Rem SW | I bought property in Peterson Bay with an awareness that there are working boats that I can hear from my cabin. The sounds of fishing boats and skiffs is part of culture of K Bay. They aren't toys.<br><br>But jet skies aren't part of that culture. They are a recreational toy. The sounds from made by jet skies are different. People can speed into shallow waters and make more noise closer to home owners. Jet Skies are designed to thrill. You can jump them over waves and wakes. The sounds of the exposed exhaust during a jump is 8 - 10 decibels higher.<br><br>If you take a noisy toy and you move it closer to shore you will diminish the diminish the experience of the natural environment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Tanner "TANMAN" Thomas | Tanner Thomas <tannerthetanman@live.com> | Ketchikan | I am Tanner Thomas, born and raised and still a resident of Ketchikan Alaska. I am now a professional watercraft rider whom is brought around the world to ride jetskis for many different shows, events, and competitions. The most amazing place to me to always still being able to come home and ride. I beg you to please help us retain our water rights.<br>I email you in strong support of lifting the ban in Katchamak Bay Alaska. My lively hood and way of life is at stake. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Gene Gerken | Gene Gerken <yamahariderak@gmail.com> | | See message: Please repeal Admin Code 05AAC 95.310 and others..msg in PWC15 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Bill Kunkler | Bill Kunkler <jkunkler@gci.net> | | I would like to take this opportunity to add my concerns to the proposed changes to PWC use in Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. As a resident of the Homer area and a frequent boater on Kachemak Bay, I don't believe personal watercraft are compatible with current uses in the area. I am not a biologist and certainly not an expert in fish and wildlife habitat protection, so will not attempt to address any concerns regarding those aspects. I do live in the area and own two boats which I use frequently on Kachemak Bay. I fish regularly on the Bay and surrounding area and spend a considerable amount of time cruising and enjoying the beauty and peacefulness of Kachemak Bay State Park. I also spend time in Prince William Sound on a regular basis where PWC use is permitted. In my experience, PWC use is not compatible with traditional boating and fishing. If you are riding a PWC other boaters are not a problem at all. In fact, PWC users seem to love to run as close to other boats as possible to jump their wakes and bow waves. In PWS I have actually had to stop and wait for PWC's to move on because I was concerned about hitting one as they ran so close to me at high speed. It's all great fun if you are riding the PWC but not much fun if you're running the boat!<br><br>Given the effort that has been put into establishing the Kachemak Bay Water Trail for kayaks and small boats in Kachemak Bay and the traditional uses in the area such as fishing, I don't see PWC use as being compatible with these uses. There are many areas in the state where PWC use is permitted. It seems to me that no one is being harmed by having Kachemak Bay off limits to PWC's, and its nice for those of us who don't ride PWC's on a regular basis to have an area that is free of them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Richard W. Hughes | Richard W. Hughes <rwhughes@rothsteinlaw.com> | Santa Fe, New Mexico | See message: Proposed Rule Change re: Personal Watercraft Use in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Don & Cristina Smith | donfs . <doncristina@gmail.com> | 55195 Tracy Ave Homer, Alaska 99603 | As a 48 year resident of Alaska and a Homer property owner since 1984, I'm opposed to opening up Kachemak Bay to jet skis etc.<br><br>"The Alaska Legislature created the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area (CHA) in 1974 "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." In 2001, ADFG underwent a robust public process and with the support of thousands of local and statewide voices, it banned jet skis by regulation in the CHA."<br><br>I'm completely in agreement with ADFG's decision banning personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Kari Arno | arnocon@xyz.net | | I want the ban lifted for Kachemak Bay. It's time to allow all users to access the wonders that are out there for us to enjoy. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Jim Sterling | Jim Sterling <lynxconstruction@alaska.net> | | I am writing in favor of the PWC repeal for Kachemack Bay. More and more we see the bottling of Alaska often by the hands of one or few. This has to stop aand the ban lifted for the use of all Alaskans. I never understood why they are used in Whittier but not Homer. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Penny Cordes | Penny Cordes <pmcordes@gmail.com> | | As a frequent user of the waters of Kachemak Bay, I strongly object to the repeal of the prohibition of personal use watercraft (PUW). I see no evidence of a study or assessment of a change in the critical habitat designation that justifies the lifting of the prohibition. On the contrary, to be cautious in the face of climate change, critical habitat protections should be strengthened. The littoral zone - precisely where PUW operation would be heaviest - is particularly vulnerable to disruption by the wake and noise of personal use watercraft, as are marine mammals with young in the bay that may be subject to harassment.<br><br>Where is the fiscal note for increased enforcement of wildlife encroachment violations?<br><br>Personal watercraft users are few relative to the tens of thousands of visitors to the Homer shores who come for birding, fishing, camping, sightseeing, kayaking and boating. It's a faulty comparison of personal watercraft to boats used for personal and charter fishing. In fact, PUWs pose a potential hazard to the small boats and non-motorized crafts in the bay.<br><br>What are the boundaries of the proposed personal watercraft usage area? PUWs would be particularly disruptive to residents and recreational users if allowed around the islands and in the bays and coves across from Homer - Sadie Cove, Halibut Cove, Tutka Bay, Yukon Island, etc.<br><br>The prohibition of personal use watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area should not be lifted. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Jessie Nelson | Jessie Nelson <nukapointfish@gmail.com> | Homer AK | I have been a resident of Homer since 1966.<br>I support the Department's proposal to lift the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. The Bay is all navigable waters and the ban should never have been instituted in the first place. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Emil Beaver Nelson | Beaver Nelson <nukapoint43@gmail.com> | Homer | As a Homer resident since 1965 I support lifting the ban on personal watercraft in kachemak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | joe buesseler | joe buesseler <joebuesseler@gmail.com> | | Rick, if the decision is not based on the number of supporters vs the number of opposition, why ask for a yes or no toggle?<br><br>I vote NO REPEAL. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | darren keeler | darren keeler <darrenkeeler4@gmail.com> | | I vote to open k bay to the use of water craft . | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | H.K. | Harvey Kolberg <akgwh@icloud.com> | | I am in favor of allowing the use of personal watercraft in the above mentioned areas. We already have laws on the books that cover damaging habitat and harassing fish and wildlife. If there are "problem" people that can't seem to follow the rules, then handle that on an individual basis. It should be pretty easy to patrol that since virtually everyone has a cell phone camera / video recorder with them at all times and we're all quick to observe / report damage and non-compliance.<br><br>I'd guess the PWC users are a pretty small user group in a fairly large area. I say give them a chance to prove that they can handle themselves in a responsible manner. If that doesn't happen, we can always come back to what we have now. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Kathy Vanderwal Dubé | Kathy Dubé <kdube@watershedgeodynamics.com> | 52542 Canna Court<br>Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Comments on Notice of Proposed Changes on the Use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Gladys Sexton | Gladys Sexton <SextonLaw@msn.com> | | Don't repeal the law. It's a shame to distroy the bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Jim <jimpatton@gci.net> | Jim Patton | | Please add my name to the list of people who support equal access for our waterways. Kachemak Bay should be open to WaveRunners (Personal watercraft). The new 4 stroke machines are quiet and low pollution output! Don't punish responsible law abiding Alaskans because of a few bad riders! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Nina Faust | aknina51@gmail.com | P.O. Box 2994<br>Homer AK 99603 | Fw: ADF&G proposed PWC (jet ski) ban repeal in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Catherine Beebee and William Schaffer | poohdog664@gmail.com | 1849 Highland Dr. Homer,Ak | We are apposed to allowing Jet Skis on Kachemac Bay. We are very blessed to live in such a beautiful pristine area. People come from all over the world to visit out State park, see our marine wild life, check out our shore birds and fish. U of A also has a Semester on the bay program here, because its so full of life. We live in a very delicate balance with nature here. In the past several years we have had huge die offs of animals (otters and common murres 2016). We have a big marine mammal population, which fast and loud jet skis would harasses, harm and stress out. Please consider keeping Kachemac Bay one place in Alaska that does not stress out our already fragile environment. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Konrad Kaltenborn | kckinak@yahoo.com | | I firmly oppose personal watercraft use in K Bay, Homer. I go there yearly from Anchorage to kayak. I recommend visitors to go there who are from out town. These loud , irritating vehicles formally identified by the appropriate name of jet skis are not compatible with the wildlife experience and peaceful paddling trips that many from around the world value and seek when they visit Alaska. Please respect the majority of Alaskans who oppose the lisfting the ban of jetskis in K Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Tom Early | minerscourt@yahoo.com | Homer Alaska | I support keeping the jet ski ban on Kachemak Bay. The Bay is listed as a Critical Habitat Area and as such high speed, highly maneuverable, shallow water, and noisy craft should be excluded. Many seabirds, waterfowl and marine mammals use this bay for breeding, feeding, and resting. Due to the high tide ranges, Kachemak Bay has excellent food resources for marine wildlife. Mud flats on the north side and shallows on the south side harbor vast amounts of intertidal life. Noise levels from near shore use by jet skis are contrary to Kachemak Bay State Wilderness Park values.<br><br>Please do not allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Kachemak Bay Birders, Margaret Gavillot | gavpeg@msn.com | Homer | See message: Fw: Jet skis on Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | organization/individual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Gordy Vernon | gogovernon@yahoo.com> | Homer | Doug,<br>At times coming from my wife's cabin across the bay we see 50+ otters. Homer has chosen to make its money with wildlife - water taxis to see wilderness areas, bird-watching and otter viewing. More high-speed watercraft, more noise, more incursions into critical habitat is an affront to our livelihoods.<br>As there is no way to enforce a redrawing of the legal limits, keep the clearly defined boundaries - Anchor Point to Point Pogibshi.<br>Like Turnagain Pass, a clear line:<br>motor-heads to the right of the highway, solitude skiers to the left.<br>and jet skis from Kotzebue to Ketchikan, kayaks and other wilderness adventures everywhere but Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | different content sent to DVL and fwd'ed | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Katherine West | knvwest@gmail.com | | Please, no personal watercraft in Katchemak Bay. My friends and family do not come up to Alaska and make the trip to Homer to see people water skiing or zipping about the Bay on personal watercraft. They can stay home and view that! Why spend the money and time to come to Alaska if they are going to see the same activity they can look at in the lower 48; that is not why they want to come to Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Gabriela Husmann | gabrielahusmann@gmail.com | | I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed 2019-2020 changes to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.<br>I am strongly opposed to removing the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay because I believe it will ruin a magical and peaceful experience to thousands of visitors who come here annually to enjoy wilderness, solitude and wildlife viewing and not having their experience ruined by noisy and stinky jet boats.<br>It seems to me such a nobrainer, bowing to a few motor heads instead of being a steward and caring for a fragile environment and animals for visitors and school groups to enjoy.<br>Please listen to the people and not our corrupt government and heartless and selfish governor. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Lynda Reed | homerart@LIVE.COM | PO Box 1969 Homer, AK 99603 | I have lived in Homer for 30 years operating a retail store and collecting and paying sales tax. We have a family personal use boat in the Homer Harbor that we use in summer for sport fishing. We love the quiet Bay and are totally against the noise and disruption that jet skis produce. Please protect the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Steve Stauber | Steven Stauber <stevestauber@icloud.com> | Homer, Alaska | The inherent design and intended use of jetskis makes them incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, which is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br><br>Why do we have to keep fighting the same battle year after year because of a small number of special interest people wanting to tear around in the peaceful waters and have a thrill seeking experience and those business people who would sell them the machines to do this? Just because the machines are perhaps quieter than they were 10 years ago, the motivation of the people operating the machines has not changed. They want adrenalin and thrills. This is not the same as what people in skiffs, fishing or kayaking want. There are plenty of other places for them to go and jet ski.<br><br>I strongly oppose the use of jet skis on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Patty Shull | Pattymintpepper@kpunet.net <pattymintpepper@kpunet.net> | | I support legalizing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Susan clardy | susan clardy <clardysusan@gmail.com> | | No to jet skis in Kachemak Bay. They will not be allowed in State Park waters and this will lead to confusion as to where they are allowed. Also, right now they have all of Cook Inlet for use and they don't seem to bother. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Leon Hickok | Leon Hickok <hickok@alaska.net> | | I watched the people on jet skis more that once herrass the birds in Sadie Cove. They have done it before and they will do it again. Keep the Ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Doug Vincent-Lang | Vincent-Lang, Douglas S (DFG) <doug.vincent-lang@alaska.gov> | | I spoke with former deputy Commissioner Ken Taylor regarding jet skis. He is opposed to removing their ban in Kachemak Bay. He believes they will negatively impact fish and wildlife and will negatively impact the experience within the critical habitat area. He also told me that this is damage my reputation in Homer.<br><br>Please place this in the record<br><br>Doug Vincent-Lang<br>Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Patricia Jay | Patricia Jay <pmjhomer@gmail.com> | Box 1101<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I am registering a resounding no on the current proposal to allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay. I am available to discuss this issue. I request an acknowledgement to my comment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Janet Fink | Janet Fink <janetfink17@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | See message: Jet Skis Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Roberta Hickok | Robbie <rhickok@earthlink.net> | 12540 Turks Turn St<br>Anchorage, AK 99516 | As a 45 year summer resident of Sadie Cove, I am deeply disturbed that, with very little warning or consideration for the tax payers who support the preservation of Kachemak Bay, Governor Dunleavy wants to overturn the ban on jet skis.<br><br>Kachemak Bay is a special place; the water is clean and clear and supports fishing, birding, and a large recreational visitor population. The charm of the park is its quietness. One can occasionally see loons, Harlequin ducks and sea otters. Bald eagles might perch nearby, and summer song birds are the music of choice. The Bay is popular with both kayakers and paddle boarders; both are environmentally friendly and healthy recreational sports that provide both good exercise and individual pleasure.<br><br>Since virtually nothing has changed since the last time the jet ski issue was raised, it seems inconceivable that Governor Dunleavy would lift the jet ski ban for any logical reason. Boats go from point A to point B, jet skis go in circles, which makes them perfect for lakes instead of open tidal water. i question the motive of the governor, especially since he's tried to railroad this decision through without considering its environmental impact or the implications for the residents who live along Kachemak Bay. Please, if you have any conscience whatsoever, do your best to put a stop to this travesty | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | David Peach | David Peach <dpeach@mac.com> | 12741 Birch Road<br>Anchorage, AK 99516 | The ban on the use of "personal watercraft" (jetskis) in Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats should remain in place.<br><br>"Personal watercraft" (jetskis) use is detrimental to wildlife, birds, and habitat. The manner in which "personal watercraft" (jetskis) are driven is dangerous due to sudden turns and less awareness of people, kayaks and boats on the water.<br><br>"Personal watercraft" are noisy and detract from enjoyment of the intended quiet use of the State Park; they disturb people trying to appreciate wild areas, birds, otters and other wildlife.<br><br>The public comment period about this proposal is way too short. The introduction of the proposal during the holidays, the short notice and the short time allowed for public comments look like someone is trying to push the measure through without meeting requirements to give the public a voice in whether to continue the ban.<br><br>I, my family and friends, longtime and frequent visitors to Kachemak Bay feel very strongly about this issue.<br><br>Please extend the comment period and listen to concerned citizens who want to protect wildlife and sustain lower impact and quieter appreciation of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Gillian Brubaker | Gillian Brubaker <akmarnie@gci.net> | | I am a strong voter against allowing jet skies in Katchemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Marybeth Holleman | Marybeth Holleman <marybeth.holleman@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | Please do not repeal the ban on jetskis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. As well, please extend the public comment period to 90 days; a 30-day comment period, especially over the Christmas break, is simply not enough time for the public to make their voices heard.<br><br>Jetskis are banned from this critical habitat area for good reason, reasons which have not changed since the ban was instituted. Jetskis are thrillcraft, not a means of transportation as are boats and skiffs, and are absolutely incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. What's more, with their ability to travel in shallow water at high speed, they are much more damaging to the environment and wildlife, especially shore-nesting birds, than boats, skiffs, or kayaks. Staff biologists and managers at ADFG also support this jetski ban, and the public has twice spoken out to maintain this ban.<br><br>One has to wonder just why the state is even wasting government time and money on revisiting this, when clearly it is not wanted by the majority of Alaskans. One also has to wonder why there's only a 30-day comment period, and one over the Christmas break.<br><br>Please uphold the ban, and please give Alaskans a 90-day comment period. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | penny joseph | penny joseph <pennyjoseph62@gmail.com> | | Please keep jet skis out of Kachemak bay. My family and I are coming to Alaska to see the wildlife in the natural setting. Jet skis will harm the wild life and make Homer less special. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Ben Gray | Ben ben <adrenalinegypsie@yahoo.com> | #2 regal road Mccarthy Ak 99588 | Do not remove the ban for Jet Skis from Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Removing it will significantly harm both the tourist industry and the eco-system and reduce tax revenue for the state.<br><br>Honestly; it’s extremely embarrassing too even have to state these facts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Deb Purington | Deb Purington <debpurington@mac.com> | | I am in total agreement with the below statement and oppose use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The inherent design and intended use of jetskis makes them incompatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, which is “to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.” | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Lisa Green | Lisa Benavitch <lbenavitch@gmail.com> | | See message: Kachemak Bay Jet Ski Prohibition (Public Comments).msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Andy Klamser | Andy Klamser <klamser@acsalaska.net> | POB 4394 Homer, AK 99603 | I’d like to weigh in on ADF&G’s proposal to lift the ban on personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I’m a 40 year resident of Homer. Allowing personal watercraft/Jet Skis in the Bay will adversely affect many local businesses that rely on tourism. Many people come to the Bay to experience the beauty of the area and the marine wildlife. They are able to do this on tour boats and through kayaking.<br>The use of personal watercraft is not compatible with this. They are disruptive to wildlife and to people who are trying to quietly enjoy nature. Furthermore, the vast majority of personal watercraft users are simply blasting around on their machines because it’s fun. But their enjoyment comes at a cost to everyone else. There are a million lakes in Alaska, as well as many ocean areas where they can use their machines. Why is it necessary to impose your will on everyone just because you can?<br><br>I can assure you that the majority of people living in this area are strongly opposed to this. But I doubt that is going to make any difference at all to you, Mr. Vincent-Laing or Mike Dunleavy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Wilson Rice | W Rice <wrice@acsalaska.net> | Anchorage | See message: Kachemak Bay personal watercraft ban.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Colin Lindsay | Colin Lindsay <colinm.lindsay@gmail.com> | | I am strongly against lifting the pwc ban in Kachemak Bay. Please do not change the existing regulation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Lisa Armstrong | Lisa Armstrong <larmstrong@alaska.net> | | I am opposed to the repeal. I am born and raised here and have spent last 50 years in Kachemak Bay .The Bay is home to critical habitat. I am a power enthusiast but in this area I have seen first hand the detriment that pwcs have done. I’m not an elite ,my family worked hard, surveyed part of the bay for those that needed their corners set and property lines drawn. Our skiff is used only to commute to work ,get groceries, visit a neighbour. Consider the following....<br>This state has more waterways and coastline in the the USA. Plenty of other options for pwcs.<br>The Bay is a resting point for millions of migrating birds every spring and migrating whales. In the last 10 years there has been a drastic decline in shellfish. I haven’t seen a minke whale or blackfish for many years and it’s rare to see an orca. Pwcs that get close to shore will only exasperate the ecosystem. And most of all the other factor is loss of life.<br>The Bay is no place for a pwc. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Mauri Long | Mauri Long <maurilong13@gmail.com> | | Today it came to my attention that the administration is considering lifting the ban on Jetskis in Kachemak Bay critical habitat area. As a landowner, I believe I should have received notice of this effort, which I did not. I believe this is a violation of due process and public notice was insufficient should this ban be lifted. Failure to provide adequate public notice and notice to interested landowners will result in lengthy litigation against the State which The State can I'll afford.<br><br>Further, the scientific literature does not support lifting the ban. There has been no change from the most recent nor the original evaluation that concluded the ban was and is appropriate and necessary for the protection of birds and wildlife in the area. The scientific literature does not support lifting the ban.<br><br>There are many places in this state for Jetskis and other personal watercraft to engage in activities to use their equipment. Do not lift the van on personal watercraft and Jetskis in Kachemak Bay critical wildlife habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Jordan May | knikmarine <knikmarine@yahoo.com> | | See message: Katchemak Bay PWC Ban Doesn't Hold Water.msg in PWC16 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Skylar Phoenix | Skylar Phoenix <myeye99@gmail.com> | Homer AK 99603 | As a local resident of Homer I am opposed to ANY changes to the current regulations.<br>In my opinion, it is a small group with outside interests and people uninformed of the importance of keeping current regulations in place to protect our wildlife in Kachemak Bay.<br>I've watched as ATV and vehicles violate our current laws and regulations that are ALREADY in place that damage beaches in our area.<br>Do not change current regulations | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Patricia Cue | pcue@acsalaska.net | | See message: Letter RE: Proposed Changes on the Use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Homer Fish and Game Advisory Committee, Dave Lyon, Chair | Dave And Louise <davelouiseandgalen@gmail.com> | PO Box 47 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Letterhead 12-2018.msg in PWC16 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Rosemary Fitzpatrick | JOHN FITZPATRICK <homerfitz@yahoo.com> | Homer | The use of motorized personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, a Critical Habitat Area (that designation alone should be enough said), is unacceptable. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Robert C. Bundy | Robert Bundy <bundyrc@gci.net> | 1342 W. 12th Ave. Anchorage, AK 99501 | This is to convey my strong opposition to the repeal of 5 AAC 95.310, which would to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas (CHA).<br><br>I have spent countless hours on Katchemak Bay in the 50 years I have lived in Alaska. I have seen first hand - and often harvested- many of the species of fish and game resident there. I have also seen first hand the way personal watercraft such as jet skis are used on other Alaska waters. It is easy to see that jet skis are absolutely incompatible with preservation of the resources of the Critical Habitat Area, given the way they are used much, if not most, of the time. The purpose of the CHA is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." As I have observed, Jet skis congregate in small areas and often shallow waters, jumping wakes and circling; they are capable of high speeds and quick, often unpredictable maneuvers. Their riders, often very young and untrained people, seem to delight in pushing the edge of the performance limitations creating dangerous situations for other jet skiers and others in the area. And they are noisy. It is impossible to believe these uses are compatible with protection and nurturing the fish and wildlife in the CHA. Observation and harvesting of the fish and wildlife in the CHA are a valuable resource to all the people of Alaska, but especially to those who make their livings guiding or providing other services to the users of the CHA, and to those of us who simply get great pleasure from plying these magnificent waters. Over 99% of Alaska waters are open to personal watercraft. Can't we protect one small, but irreplaceable portion?<br>I urge you to follow the recommendations of the ADF&G staff biologists and managers who support the jet ski ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Bob Butera | Bob Butera <butera@gci.net> | | I am writing to strongly oppose removing the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Kachemak Bay is not only a critical habitat area, but one of a few accessible sanctuaries for peaceful enjoyment of our coastline. Personal watercraft have a vastly outsized impact, even one or two ruin the experience of a place for many. While some users are responsible, there are many others who use them as play-toys, and the downside of this to Kachemak Bay will be significant.<br><br>We regulate many things in the public sphere where the impact to others outweighs some small individual gain. That is the basis of all fish and game regulations, otherwise we would not have seasons, catch limits, restrictions on gear, etc. Using the argument "that it is not ADF&G's place to regulate" to justify this change is hollow. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Kathleen Metcalfe | Kathleen Metcalfe <teenyray@gmail.com> | 6624 Imlach Dr. Anchorage, AK 99502 | I am strongly opposed to removing the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The Critical Habituate designation was based on many issues facing the Bay. I remember when there was a thriving crab and Halibut businesses not to mention the reemergence of whale populations. The oyster farms are also at risk. These people have worked hard over the years to eek out a living and PWC are not the answer.<br><br>Kachemak Bay has a strong year round residential population. The introduction of PWC to this area will destroy the peaceful nature of the bay to those home owners. There is a large commercial and sport fishing presence as well. Can you imagine setting your seine net amongst a team of PWC users? How about the fish hatchery and personal use fishery in Little Tutka Bay?<br><br>I've been out in Prince William Sound and witnessed two groups of PWC users "tear it up" doing big loops in Blackstone Bay. Although I'm sure it gives them a lot of pleasure I'm not quite sure what the point is. Their wake and the noise disturbance while setting crab pots and fishing is more than an annoyance. I can't imagine trying to camp, Kayak or enjoy the quiet solitude of the area with them present.<br><br>The bay is just now starting to rebound and the introduction of Personal Watercraft will have an immediate and negative impact.<br><br>I would greatly appreciate your consideration on NOT lifting the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Chris Degernes | alaskatwin@gmail.com | PO Box 683 Cooper Landing, AK 99572 | See message: Notice of Proposed changes to 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Greg Sutter | Capt. Greg Sutter <1captgreg@gmail.com> | PO Box 2202 Homer, AK 99603 | I am opposed to Personal Watercraft (i.e. PWC) operations in the Fox River and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas. By definition, the areas in question are critical habitat areas and warrant the prohibition of PWC.<br>There are thousands of square miles of water within Alaska not designated as "critical habitat" were PWC can recreate. PWC operators have many options as to where to recreate and have plenty of choices as it is. Fox River and Kachemak Bay should remain off limits to them.<br>The benefits gained by a limited few users of PWC, do not outweigh the detriment caused to other user groups (many of whom depend on the Bay for a livelihood), the wildlife and the local surrounding communities that will bear the brunt of any potential, consequential negative economic impacts. What makes Kachemak Bay unique is the way it is currently maintained. Do not change it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Dale Petkash | Dale <dpetkash@aol.com> | | I am a registered Alaska voter and opposed to changing the restrictions on Kachemak bay regarding the use of PWC (jet skis). | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Betsy Webb | Betsywebb <bwebbalaska@gmail.com> | 40015 Waterman Road, Homer, Alaska 99603 | As a resident of Homer, a biologist, and and environmental conservationist, I am vehemently opposed to lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. There are so many pressures on marine wildlife here already - please let's not intentionally add one more! Our critical habitat area is a precious resource that deserves continued protection. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Glenn Ivanoff | Glenn <gandm.ivan@gmail.com> | | I oppose PWC (personal watercraft) on Kachemak Bay due to the inherent risks riders pose to other watercraft, wildlife, and increased of need from the Coast Guard.<br><br>I believe that the ADFG acted in the best interest of Alaska 18 years ago. As a lifelong, born and raised Alaskan who lived in other states and countries as a military member, have seen the carelessness of people on jet skis. Not all of the jet ski drivers way drive that way however, it's the few that ruin it for everyone.<br><br>Responsible skiffs have posed limited danger to the wildlife in the area. If the ban is lifted it will increase the traffic, noise, and disruption to the wildlife. I request that we keep the wise decision to keep the ban for PWC 18 years ago. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Blaine Sisson | Blaine Sisson <nossis4@gci.net> | | If you think the majority of ALASKANS are in favor of personal watercraft (pwc), then you are not listening to basic facts. I have seen pwcs disturbing whales in western Alaska. The average for people to live in Alaska is only 5 years (military personnel included) so the old timers like me who've lived here 50 years or more are rare and there weren't pwcs running around then. The silent majority like me refuse to understand political appointees decisions to lift bans on pwcs in Katchemak bay. Do you understand: personal watercraft disturb wild life. I go to Homer and kayak where most boats cannot in Bays that would expect shallow draft pwcs - I have heard how loud pwcs are and they would make Katchmak Bay a circus. Have you kayaked-many Alaskans are ocean kayakers. The pwc group lobbing for lifting the ban is analogous to snow machine groups wanting every millionth of Alaska acreage to use. Draw the line and keep this special Bay separate with no pwcs. The pwc people want every Bay in Alaska to exploit. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Matt Kalush | matt kalush <mjkalush@yahoo.com> | Soldotna AK | I would like my opinion to go on record. I have thought long and hard on this subject and feel it would be to risky to make this change. Therefore, I am against the prepossessed change to this regulation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Will Files | WillFiles <will@wfiles.us> | 59835 Tern Court Homer, AK 99603 | Please, do not repeal the current situation. The Personal Watercraft Club states that they are interested in “equal access”. How about the folks who want equal access to a relatively quiet experience in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. We don’t give equal access to everybody to do everything in our State. Hunting is restricted. Boats are restricted from getting near certain wildlife areas.<br><br>The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is a popular tourist (including Alaskans) destination for viewing and photographing wildlife. This is not a compatible use with personal watercraft.<br><br>There are at least two other areas open to personal watercraft in Seward and Prince William Sound, so it is important to retain the current status of NO use of personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Daniel Thompson | Dan Thompson <buckie@mtaonline.net> | Chugiak, Alaska | I strongly oppose the ADFG proposal to rescind the restrictions on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Please follow the 2017 guidance and literature review memo of former ADFG scientists, which concluded their use will adversely affect wildlife and the visitor/tourist and resident experience.<br><br>There is no legitimate reason to overturn the ban when the public is overwhelmingly against their use in this unique coastal location. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Stephen L. Hileman | Stephen Hileman <stephenlhileman@gmail.com> | | Please do not allow jetskis in Kachemak Bay. They have no place in such a pristine environment, and will ruin the experience of solitude and beauty that those of us who fish, hike, and camp there prize. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Leif Simcox | Leif Simcox <leds331@yahoo.com> | Anchorage, Alaska | I would like to go on record as opposing the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I have worked my entire adult life on the water in a variety of types of vessels. We all know that the primary use of Jet Skiis is to race around in circles causing maximum disruption. Sure, they could be used for fishing or transportation, but that's not the way it works out. Most other people who are on the water for work or recreation tend to proceed in an orderly fashion from one point to another while under way. In my opinion, a tanker pulling into Kachemak Bay at five or so knots, and then anchoring up, causes much less disruption to sea animals, tourists, and marine workers than a couple of Jet Skis racing randomly around at top speed.<br>I believe that this proposed change is just another example of Governor Dunleavy attempting to be a Mini-Me to Donald Trump and reverse as many environmental protections as possible, even when there is no economic advantage to doing so. This is similar to attempting to remove the environmental observers from cruise ships. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Steven Parkinson | Steve Parkinson <sdparkinson@gmail.com> | | I support lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. They should be treated the same as boats. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Ron Somerville | somerville@gci.net | 8126 Keegan St., Unit A Juneau, Ak 99801 | See message: Personal Watercraft in Ketchemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | | | 1 | Duplicate of earlier message sent to different emails | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Mike & Shirley Chihuly | Michael Chihuly <chihuly@ptialaska.net> | PO Box 39294 Ninilchik, Ak. 99639 | See message: personal watercraft Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Jenny Stroyeck | Jenny <wordfolk@xyz.net> | 65240 Diamond Ridge Rd. Homer, AK 99603 | The ban on personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay was formulated based on scientific review conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and public comment as a part of the management plan for Kachemak Bay State Park and the Critical Habitat Area. If the regulations are to be changed, then the same public process and scientific review should be followed.<br>This is clearly an attempt by the governor to pander to a small special interest group with political ties to his party. This sort of behavior only reinforces the validity of the impeachment petition underway.<br><br>We all know that the science is sound and that the critical habitat areas and use of Kachemak Bay will be negatively impacted by the use of even a few jet skis. The vast majority of Alaskan waters are open to PWC use, so there is no lack of recreational opportunities for the Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska. Those of us who live in the surrounding communities are already concerned about the negative impacts of so much boat traffic in the bay. Our recreational area is of much more value preserved as wild and quiet space, offering protection to many species of marine, terrestrial, and avian life. Please preserve the regulations banning PWC in Kachemak Bay as they are now. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Robert Thompson | Robert Thompson <robtheeskimo@yahoo.com> | Homer, AK. | I am writing to you to voice my support of the dropping the ban on personal watercraft in Katchemac bay. This regulation was conceived when an affluent woman complained to then governor Tony Knowles about how a jet ski disturbed her morning at her vacation house in Halibut Cove. This turned into ramming a regulation down the publics throat before we truly had time to grasp what was going on.<br>I still consider Tony Knowles an outsider and am still offended by his elitist actions.<br>If regulations limiting or prohibiting were then or are now necessary, the science and reasoning needs to be laid out so the general public can review and understand it. Also, the people in the area who will be most impacted need to be involved. Not just a vocal few who feel they should be everybody’s caretaker. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Carol Griswold | rainyday <c_griz@yahoo.com> | Seward, Alaska | See message: Proposed ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Joe Ray Skrha | Joseph Skrha <skrhalawoffice@alaska.net> | 110 North Willow Street; Suite 137 Kenai, AK 99611 USA | My name is Joseph Raymond Skrha and I am a resident of Kenai, AK and practice law throughout Alaska for the past 37 years. I am against any proposed changes to allow personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats or Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. For years I have seen whales frequent both of these areas. The reason we refer to Kachemak Bay as critical habitat area should be obvious. It is critical habitat and as such jet skis, and similar vehicles should not not be permitted in these areas at all. I live on the mouth of the Kenai River. Jet skis are not permitted in this area either. Whales, Seals, otters, eagles and other wildlife rely on Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay for their habitat. Jet skis would cause undue havoc to these animals. We who value these animals do not want to see these regulations changed especially for political reasons. I own two jet skis but would never use them in an area so critical as these to referenced areas. Lets put the wildlife first for a change. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Chris Reynolds | Chris Reynolds <chris@reynoldstherapy.com> | 17801 Steamboat Drive Anchorage AK 99516 | Please register my voice in opposition to the proposed regulation changes potentially allowing the use of personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. Personal watercraft are disruptive to the natural environment in ways that are not true of other forms of nautical transportation, making restrictions appropriate to protect the general public's interest. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Liliana Sotomayor | lilicowvet@gmail.com | 215 Fireweed Ave, Homer, AK | It is with great concern that I have learned about " 5 AAC 95.310 is proposed to be repealed. The purpose of this repeal is to remove the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas."<br><br>As fish stocks dwindle Homer's economy will further be dependent on tourism throughout the year. A wonderfully sustainable resource, which is natural beauty and the ability to observe wildlife in its natural habitat at close range and without much investment, will be severely hampered by the presence of personal watercraft.<br><br>Yes, equal access to all, I personally support this idea, but as technology progresses, new forms of access such as motorized vehicles, drones, etc., start to impinge on other people's right to access: wildlife viewing, ability to make a living off tourism, freedom from noise pollution, privacy. All for a few person's access to entertainment.<br><br>Please maintain the restriction on personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay for wildlife protection, maintenance of Homer's tourism industry and other people's right to resources that make Alaska the gem it is....still. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Josh Krohn | Josh Krohn <akfiddler@gmail.com> | | No, do not repeal the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay. Doing so caters to a very small number of residents in the state, and without a broader debate that can't happen in the timeframe you've given, can't possibly reflect the will of the majority. While some PWC operators may be respectful to others using the area around them, and truly use them as transportation from point A to B, a good portion of PWC operators only ride for the thrill, and disregard the safety or enjoyment of those they are operating around. If you need proof of this, consider Lake Tahoe, where you can't drive a boat across the lake without a PWC rider jumping your wake. Imagine you want to take a quiet paddle with your family in kayaks, and a group of PWC riders decides to use that area as their personal play area. No more peace and quiet, and I wouldn't allow my children to paddle near where people are riding jetskis. Given that PWC are allowed in nearly every other body of water in the state, why get bent out of shape about not being allowed in Kachemak Bay?<br>Your personal activism for this cause makes you unsuitable to coordinate this decision. While I have no illusions that you will take the honest and objective step to remove yourself, since you lobbied the governor for the privilege to pursue this personal crusade, I hope that you will at least take note of the different ways that people can enjoy the outdoors in Alaska. Some want to be able to appreciate it for what it is, others only see it as their personal playground and pay no attention to others around them, or the damage they may do.<br>I look forward to seeing the public records of this process so we can see where your objectivity has slipped, and judge you accordingly. My interests are keeping Kachemak Bay PWC free. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | shawn grimes | shawn grimes <sgrimes907@gmail.com> | | This ban needs to be repealed,<br>Bottom line is equal access for all. There is no difference between watercraft , watercraft is watrercraft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | John Orbistondo | juan p <nenana7@yahoo.com> | Juneau | I support the repeal of 5AAC 95.310 to allow the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. PWCs should be allowed in areas that allow skiffs and non-motorized vessels. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Dan Rainwater | dan rainwater <danrainh2o@gmail.com> | Homer | My name is Dan Rainwater, I live in Homer. I support pwc in the bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Jon Fuglestad | jtfuglestad@gmail.com | | I am in support of keeping the current ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay . The bay is special in its diversity of wildlife and deserves some extra protection . | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Ron Somerville | somerville@gci.net | 8126 Keegan St., Unit A Juneau, Ak 99801 | See message: RE: Personal Watercraft in Ketchemak Bay.msg in PWC16 | | | 1 | 3rd time- comments from R. Somerville, edits appear limited to spelling of "Kachemak" in text of letter | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Richard Derkevorkian | richard derkevorkian <rich_d999@hotmail.com> | | See message: RE: Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310.msg in PWC16 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Kathleen Johnston | Kathleen Johnston <kjjohnston.moss@gmail.com> | Alaska | I have listened to my co-worker and friend Gina Poths for over 20 years talk about riding her PWC in the ocean with her small group of friends who are extremely responsible and lovers of the outdoors. Not many people have the courage to go out in the open ocean on a small watercraft like they do. They have clean running 4 stroke engines just like other boats. They are careful and cautious abound wildlife. They don't spin brodies or act reckless. They want to explore and enjoy beautiful Kachemak Bay like thousands of others get to.<br><br>Please help her repeal the ban of personal watercraft from lovely Kachemak Bay, so that everyone has equal access to one of Alaska's most beautiful places. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Bonnie Mastolier | Bonnie Mastolier <bmastolier@yahoo.com> | | emailed scanned copy of form letter moved to hard copy folder to be counted there | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Dave Mastolier | Dave Mastolier <dmastolier@gmail.com> | | emailed scanned copy of form letter moved to hard copy folder to be counted there | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | John Dittrich | John Dittrich <jpd99663@gmail.com> | | I am a lifelong Alaskan and generally a quite conservative individual that does not normally support government bans or intervention in daily lives, HOWEVER in this instance I am strongly in favor of keeping the personal watercraft ban in place for K Bay.<br><br>I live in Anchorage but have always enjoyed K Bay and 15 years ago purchased a summer home in Seldovia. We frequent the waters of K Bay and do not want to see the fragile ecosystem nor overall pristine nature of the area disturbed by PWCs. There are virtually limitless bodies of water throughout Alaska - both fresh and saltwater - where riders can find ample opportunities to ride their PWCs. Please do not allow them to be used in Kachemak Bay by continuing to uphold the ban that has served the area well for years. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Angela D. Wisniewski | Angela Wisniewski <awisniewski10@gmail.com> | | See message: Untitled.msg in PWC16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Catheryn Uson | Catheryn Uson <catherynuson@icloud.com> | | What has worked for eighteen years is not suddenly wrong. The decision to protect wildlife still makes sense. Many people pay to come see those animals and birds. Watercraft are uniquely disturbing in their unpredictable movement and noise levels. K bay is vulnerable to a high level of disturbance because of its accessibility. I love my ski but it is not appropriate for Kechemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mike Folkerts | mandn <mandn@gci.net> | Juneau, Alaska | Thanks for all the work on shepherding this through; I can't comment through work as it would be "official". I'll be very pleased to see a long-standing prohibition on PWC use lifted in K-bay as it unfairly discriminates against a particular user group in favor of another user group. Kudos to you and the current administration! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Dave Eubank | Dave Eubank <eubus@gci.net> | | It's come to my attention that there is a ban on personal watercraft in the waters surrounding the town at the end of the road and last stronghold of the hippie generation. I'm opposed to this ban as much as I was opposed to the early migration of birkenstock&barefooted, glassy eyed HOMOROIDS who infested that village. This is not the Last Frontier; it's The New Frontier, glad I saw it when it truly was one. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Homer City Council, Deputy City Clerk | Krause, Bobbie Renee (GOV sponsored) <rkrause@ci.homer.ak.us> | City of Homer 491 E. Pioneer Avenue Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: City of Homer Resolution 19-091(A).msg in PWC17 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mandy Migura | mandy@broadconservation.com | | I saw the below notice in the recent mailing of the What's Up newsletter, and I am interested in commenting on the proposed repeal, however, I do not see any information about the proper procedure for submitting comments. I am against removing existing protections in the critical habitat area, and am concerned about new adverse effects to wildlife in the protected area should the ban be repealed. I appreciate additional information on where/how to submit formal public comments. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Jacquelyn Kraut | Jacquelyn Kraut <jackiekraut428@gmail.com> | | It has recently come to my attention that you and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game intend to overturn the ban on jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I find this appalling, not only because your constituents have time and again expressed support for the ban, and not only because scientists have confirmed the ban's import, but most importantly because of the vulnerable and precious nature of the animals and plant life that survive in Kachemak Bay. It seems the height of ignorance, selfishness, pettiness, and greed to endanger and disrupt these beings and ignore the science for what I can only assume is your personal financial gain.<br><br>I worked as a kayak guide in Kachemak Bay in the summers of 2017 and 2018. In my time there I learned a lot about how vulnerable the wildlife already is in this beautiful part of the globe. From oil spills to rising ocean temperatures, to pollution and overfishing, the natural resources and wildlife in the Bay has already been threatened and damaged. Do you really want your legacy to be the further endangerment and disruption of these precious species?<br><br>I urge you to listen to the science, to the people who have spoken time and again, and to your own conscience to reconsider. Do not overturn the ban on jetskis and personal watercraft use in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Kassandra Smith | Kassandra Smith <smith.kassie@gmail.com> | | I just wanted to state my extreme opposition to the proposed rollback on the ban on personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay area. This is EXTREMELY shortsighted and not to mention the timing of the comment period (less than 1 month and during the holiday season, no less) seems designed to let this rollback slide under the radar of most conservation-minded organizations.<br><br>There have been previous attempts to rollback the ban in 2011 and 2016 that both failed. Why? Because this area is of INCREDIBLE importance to not just marine life but birds that use it as well. There are a number of Important Bird Areas and marine mammal important areas in and around Kachemak Bay. If you look at the map the whole area is completely covered. So many whales, otters, and seabirds come to Kachemak Bay to birth and raise their young. Letting personal watercraft tear through such a delicate ecosystem would be incredibly detrimental to their survival.<br><br>Please do NOT roll back the ban. We need it to keep protecting this valuable area which, in turn, will help protect all the wildlife that continue to use it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Phil Barber | Phil Barber <phil.m.barber@gmail.com> | | see message: Comments on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Vanessa Farny | vanessa <v.parkergeisman@gmail.com> | Boston, MA. | I am writing to express my support for the jetski ban in Katchemak Bay.<br><br>Although I reside in the lower 48, I spent 4 weeks in the Bay exploring by sea kayak. It was an unparalleled experience, and one that would have been significantly impaired by the presence of jetskis. I did not keep track of what I spent on meals, groceries or kayak rentals - but it probably amounted to a few thousand dollars in the local economy. I hope that you understand the impact that allowing Jetski's will have not only on the local wildlife, but on the experience of those of us who visit for the opportunity to enjoy the quiet coves and islands. Jetski's will have a detrimental impact upon those of us who choose to spend our money on quieter forms of enjoyment and who come for the abundance of wildlife. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Erik and Sara Sundsten | Sara Sundsten <20spencerbear@gmail.com> | | Erik and Sara Sundsten support to repeal the ban on PWC.<br><br>Alaska's State Constitution makes it clear, Article 8, Section 3. Common Use;<br>".... waters are reserved to the people for common use"<br>Regulated use of PWC in Kachemak Bay allows the public to recreate on fairly safe nearshore waters that are accessible to many Alaskans who live in Alaska for the opportunities provided to them on public lands and waters. There is no justification for local residents to not share the public lands/waters near their place of residence with fellow Alaskans. | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Randall Fletcher | randy fletcher <rkf99711@hotmail.com> | | Yet again some small but noisy group is trying to impose their will on the rest of us.<br>Personal watercraft are a low cost alternative to larger less fuel efficient, and far less environmentally friendly larger boats.<br>They are used for fishing, and hunting both commercial and personal use. As well as recreational use.<br>Lets not let the personal prejudices of a few restrict the rest of us. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Kachemak Bay Birders, Lois Dupree | captlou3@gmail.com | Homer | See message: FW: Jet Ski.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | organization/individual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mary Frische | tiglax@mac.com | | Dear Mr. Lang<br>Please help us keep Kachemak Bay as a protected area for bird and marine mammals, and a quiet place for its human citizens<br>thank you Mary Frische | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Jim & Ruth Lavrakas | jlav@gci.net | PO Box 1459<br>Homer, AK 99603 | We are opposed to opening Kachemak Bay and the Critical Habitat Area enclosed within the Bay to Personal Watercraft (jet-skis).<br><br>We live in Homer and also own a summer home in Little Tutka Bay on the south shore of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Besides the fact that near shore use of these crafts is clearly detrimental to nesting birds and marine wildlife, these crafts are more like motocross bikes than traditional watercraft. They have no place in the environment of Kachemak Bay, and the state parks on the south shore.<br><br>As a personal anecdote, we had relatives visit our Little Tutka Bay cabin this past summer and every member was astonished and moved by the peace and serenity of the area. “We didn’t know a place like this existed”, they all told us.<br><br>That wouldn’t be the case if jet-skis are allowed in the Bay.<br><br>Thank you in advance for seriously considering to continue banning these crafts in Kachemak Bay. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Anne Marie Holen | amholen@me.com | Salida, Colorado | I have recently learned of the new effort to change the rules regarding use of personal water craft (jet-skis) in Kachemak Bay. I can’t believe we are having this debate all over again. The reasons for prohibiting jet skis in years past still apply, more than ever.<br><br>I lived in Alaska from 1977-2012, half of that time in Homer. Now I return to Homer every other year for an extended period. Besides visiting old friends and enjoying the views of the bay and mountains, I am drawn to Kachemak Bay again and again to go kayaking. Kayaking is quiet, it doesn’t throw up a wake, it doesn’t threaten wildlife, and it doesn’t impact other people who are enjoying themselves at cabins, beaches, and on other watercraft.<br><br>Once upon a time I worked in the City Manager’s office in Homer. I had a quote taped to my computer which read, “No place in the world these days stays special by accident.” Kachemak Bay is a very special place but it is not impervious to damage. Jet skis would inflict enormous damage. I urge you with all my heart to work to protect Kachemak Bay and keep the jet ski ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Steve Glasman | sglasman@gmail.com | Homer | As a 31 year Homer resident, you can put me down for NO JET SKIS in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Cook Inletkeeper, Bob Shavelson | bob@inletkeeper.org | 3734 Ben Walters Lane<br>Homer, AK 99603 | See message: FW: Request for Time Extension.msg in PWC17 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Eve Levi | Eve Levi<br><eve8765@gmail.com> | | I am writing to inform you of my strong opposition to the repeal of the Jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. It was put in place 20 years ago after extensive research, and nothing has changed!<br>◦ All other Alaskan marine waters are open to PWCs (jet ski type speed machines that go 60 to 80 miles an hour and are not like boats!)<br>◦ Kachemak Bay is a critical habitat and a giant nursery. The only place in Alaskan coastal waters where breeding seabirds, marine mammals such as whales, otters and seals, as well as kelp beds are protected from being harassed and threatened by PWCs, and people seeking a quiet experience in nature can get away from jet ski activity<br>◦ There is no plan nor funding to enforce, monitor or regulate Jet ski activity<br><br>As someone who has spent a lot of time in this area I can attest to its beauty and the necessity of ensuring its protection. There are few places like this in the world that still exist. Let’s not waste them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Ruth Dickerson | Ruth Dickerson<br><ruthedickerson@gmail.com> | Homer | Subject: I can't believe it!<br>Attempting to force noisy, polluting, environmentally hazardous personal watercraft upon us!!<br>As a 40 year resident of Homer who has volunteered countless hours to helping keep this a pristine, peaceful, healthy community AND one who loves to Kayak in Kachemak Bay; I beg you to not just ignore all the science facts presented previously AND to please listen to the opinions of the local people who are invested in this community that we treasure and love.<br><br>There are hundreds and hundreds of miles of coastline where jet skis can go do their thing - please respect the uniqueness of Kachemak Bay, it's rich marine life, and it's cultural richness.<br><br>Come, take a peaceful kayak tour and savor the beauty and let yourself become aware of what is worth preserving.<br>We will all be so very grateful | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Morgan Barrowcliff | Morgan Barrowcliff <morganbarrowcliff@gmail.com> | Po Box 10 Anchor Point, AK 99556 | I am in support of lifting the Personal Water Craft Ban in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Steve Adams | smokey3@gci.net | PO Box 81814 Fairbanks, Alaska 99708 | I urge you to make every effort possible to repeal the ludicrous restriction on Jet Boats on Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Sammy Crawford | Sammy Crawford <scrawfordak68@gmail.com> | Kenai | Please do not allow jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>Critical habitat is more important than speed. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Michael Schallock | Michael Schallock <mrschallock@gmail.com> | Homer Alaska | Hi, my name is Michael Schallock and I live in Homer. I'm writing to you to express my objection to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>This issue has been discussed and voted on several times in the past. The clear sentiment of the voters is that jet skis should not be allowed in Kachemak Bay. Nothing has changed.<br><br>Jet skis and their drivers are noisy, intrusive, and encourage thrill seeking and high speed operation. How is an otter or a group of water fowl or a school of salmon near the surface supposed to avoid a small rapidly maneuvering 65 mph water craft?<br><br>Sure there are skiffs and fishing boats in Kachemak Bay. I own a small skiff and I fish the bay regularly. My top speed is around 20-25 knots. I take care to be as non-intrusive as possible with regard to other boats, fishermen and near shore structures. I have observed jet skis in other waters. Their speeds and behavior are not at all in keeping with the current operations of water craft in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Please let the public and the residents of Kachemak Bay express their wishes regarding jet skis. And pay attention to what we say. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Bryce Donich | Bryce Donich <brycedonich22@gmail.com> | | Lift the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay, it's pointless and outdated. I grew up in Homer, AK and also spent summers in Seward AK. I see no reason to ban Jet skis in the bay. They are no different from a Jet skiff or Bristol bay boat and or any other watercraft for that matter. By lifting the ban it will benefit the tourism industry in Homer by allowing jet ski tours, rentals and many more businesses to open and attract more people to Homer. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Lee Post | Lee Post <boneman@xyz.net> | 4048 El Sarino Court, Homer Alaska | see message: Jet ski boats in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Deborah Limacher | deborah limacher <heavenlyridge@yahoo.com> | 66729 Diamond Ridge Road,Homer,Alaska99603 | Hello,My name is Deborah Nakada-Limacher.I have lived in Homer,Alaska since 1976 where I have made my living commercial fishing in Kachemak Bay and Cook Inlet.I have been actively opposed to jet ski usage in this Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area ever since they first proposed it.ADF&G did extensive research in 2001 and once again in 2017 to prove that there is no place for jet skis impact in the Bay.There is an obvious reason why this area was designated critical and there is absolutely no room for the wanton abuse that jet skis present.Governor Dunleavy has absolutely no scientific support,and is once again showing his abuse of power by lifting this ban.I implore you to reverse this decision to keep our bay's pristine environment as it should be..free of jet ski noise and thrill raft abuse out of this critical habitat that already has enough stress upon it due to climate change and ocean acidification.. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Amy Bollenbach | Amy Bollenbach <amybollenbach@gmail.com> | | It seems to me that the public should have more than 30 days to comment on the use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>My comments: *message was blank after this | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Thomas Ely | Thom Ely <akthome@yahoo.com> | | This is a really dumb proposal. Is the State of Alaska now working for the Personal Watercraft Industry? Allowing jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Wildlife Habitat should not be an issue that is debatable. The answer is no, now and forever. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Toby Wheeler | Toby Wheeler <tobywheelerji@yahoo.com> | Homer AK | Thank you for extending the comment period for public comment on the jet ski issue here in Kachemak Bay. I am a resident of Homer and spend a lot of time in the State Park and its waters. For the record, I am opposed to permitting jet skis to utilize the waters of the Critical Habitat areas located in Kachemak Bay. I will not comment further as I am aware that you wanted yay or nay.<br>So nay it is for me. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John Story | John Story <jstor2012@gmail.com> | | I think this proposal to allow jetskis into kachemak bay is ridiculous, insidious and shows you to be of low moral character. This is a critical habitat and a beautiful place that will only be cheapened by more watercraft, noise pollution and pushing back of the protections on these waters. We already have seismic blasting, do you really feel it necessary to add to that problem by hauling your fat ass around on a jet ski? This is simply a ploy to systematically break down the protections we have on the bay here and will only lead to catastrophic damages done. Where will we draw the line? When the oil rigs come into the bay? This proposal is ridiculous and as a Homer resident I strongly oppose it. Listen to the people. Do your job. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Les Brake | Les Brake <lbrake@mtaonline.net> | P.O. Box 221 Willow, Alaska 99688 | I am writing to let you know that I oppose the use of jet skis on Kachemak Bay. Although I live in Willow, I've been to Homer at least thirty times over the years, and I just don't think this is a good idea. That bay is busy as it is, and allowing jet skis would introduce another element of danger into the pool. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Ann Dixon | Ann Dixon <dixonannr@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay (10).msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Carol Miller | Carol Miller <skiffgarden@hotmail.com> | Halibut Cove | We have a home in Halibut Cove, just across the Bay from Homer. We are strongly opposed to allowing Personal Watercraft on Kachemak Bay. Our home happens to be on the water, and if jet skiers "play" there, it would be like someone playing in your front yard.<br><br>Firstly, it is a critical habitat and we feel that these jet skis would adversely impact our local Orca and Humpback whale populations. Not to mention the sea Otters and birds. Especially if they are allowed to approach Gull Island which is a rookery for many species of birds. The noise from these machines could wreak havoc with nesting. Even boats are restricted as to how near the island they may approach.<br><br>Second, We have many friends who are seine fisherman and I can only imagine what damage a clueless jet skier could cause to nets and gear. Also, the set-net sites could be destroyed by unknowing joy riders.<br><br>Lastly, we cross the bay about once a week, in our open skiff, and sport fish as well during the summer and fall. Jet skis, I feel, could affect our personal safety. And though I don't personally use a Kayak, I have many friends that do and I think that might be dangerous as well.<br><br>Please work to prevent allowing these disruptive machines on the Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Kipp and Shawna Halvorsen | shawna halvorsen <shawnaboz@yahoo.com> | | We do not want jet skis in the Kachmak Bay area. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Chuck Jay | Chuck Jay <cjay@jaybrant.com> | | NO jet skis in K Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Wendy Todd | Wendy Todd <wndtodd64@gmail.com> | | I would like to see the jet ski van lifted and them allowed again in the bay. Before the ban , my husband and I used them to go fishing for salmon and exploring the area to allow our access to recreation. When they were banned, we began spending summers outside of Alaska where we can use our jet skis.<br><br>Thank you for the work to lift the ban and again allow us the same access to the waters as others. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Amy Bollenbach | Amy Bollenbach <amybollenbach@gmail.com> | PO Box 3468, Homer AK 99603 | 1. Why was the public only given 30 days to comment around Christmas time? 90 days would be more convenient for the public.<br><br>2. Jet skis are not safe for wildlife, otters, fish, and whales, etc.<br><br>3. Jet skis will cause erosion on many properties.<br><br>4. It is totally incorrect when the jet ski industry says that a 14' jet ski and a 14' foot skiff have the same impact. Of course the jet ski has greater impact to frighten wildlife and erode the shoreline.<br><br>5. Jet skis will destroy much of the pleasant natural aspect of Kachemak Bay, including recreational fishing, shellfish operations, and small boat recreational activities.<br><br>6. 99% of all Alaskan waters are open to jet-ski use. Why should Kachemak Bay be included?<br><br>7. I and many people in Homer live overlooking Kachemak Bay. Jet skiis would definitely destroy the quiet aspect of many current beach activities such as looking out at the bay, recreational fishing, walking along the beach, and rowing small boats and kayaks. | 1 | | | continuation of prior messsage | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Steve Kirkland | Colton Layton <coltonlayton@gmail.com> | Ogden, UT | I had the great pleasure of visiting your state this past summer. I hiked in Girdwood, camped near Homer and kayaked beautiful Kachemak Bay. It was a wonderful vacation.<br>It is with distress that I have come to hear that the ban on jetskis in Kachemak Bay is under threat of repeal. I can only imagine how my own experience there would have been seriously tainted if jetskis were whining around while I explored the sea life. Suffice it to say that should the ban be lifted I will not seek to relive the magical time I spent on the water there, as much as I'd like to, and will take my tourism money somewhere more thoughtful of the environment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mike Shadley | Mike Shadley <anchorriverappliance@gmail.com> | | I personally feel that the water craft exemption on Kachemac Bay limits the access to Alaskan waters which are supposed to be freely accessed by all Alaskans. Laws are in place to protect the wildlife already. FREE THE SKI! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Rita Heidkamp | USA <srheid@usa.net> | | I understand ADF&G is considering the the repeal of ban of Personal Water Craft in Kachemak Bay (5 AAC 95.310z0. Thank you for looking into this matter. Per the Alaska Constitution, Alaska waters are for use by all Alaskans. We should not pick and choose which uses are allowed and which are not. We are all required to stay clear of the whales - regardless of our mode of transportation. None of us are allowed to operate a motor vehicle while under the influence. We have plenty of laws to regulate the "bad apples" - regardless of type of craft. It is time to let responsible PWC owners back in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat areas. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Scott Heidorn | Rita Heidkamp <srheid@gci.net> | | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed repeal of the ban of Personal Water Craft in Kachemak Bay/Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. The Alaska Constitution is clear that Alaska's resources are reserved for the people. We should not discriminate based on mode of transportation. I think the recent case of the Supreme Court allowing hovercraft use is evidence of that. I know the situations are different, but the principle is the same; All Alaskans should have access to the land and water resources.<br><br>Please repeal the PWC ban in the Kachemak Bay/Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John D "Jack" Frost | John Frost <jayfak@gmail.com> | 3823 West 100th Avenue Anchorage, AK 99515 | I am opposed to the repeal of the ban on use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. In fact, I am opposed to the use of personal watercraft (jet skis and like powered watercraft) on any of the public waters of the State of Alaska. Please understand that I am a 45 year resident of Alaska and I hunt, fish and fly. I am generally NOT a "lock up all access environmentalist". I am in favor of personal watercraft such as canoes, kayaks and even paddleboards.<br><br>However Motorized Personal Watercraft (jst-skiis) have several very undesirable qualities:<br>•They are disruptive of wildlife.<br>•The wakes they create cause increased shoreline erosion.<br>•They are disruptive of the peace and serenity of the wilderness for all other users.<br>•They provide enjoyment for only the individaul rider while interefering with the enjoyment of Alaska's wild lands and waters for all other users.<br>•They are a potential safety hazzard because the riders use them in an unpredictable way with out looking out for other boats or aircraft.<br>•The wake they create may be dangerous for non-motorized personal watercraft such as canoes, kayaks and paddleboards<br><br>I feel certain that you have heard all of this before. But I wanted to add my opinion. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Brita Mjos | Brita Mjos <britarm@hotmail.com> | | See message: Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area Comments.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Brian Okonek, President Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition | AQRC President <president@alaskaquietrights.org> | P.O. Box 202592 Anchorage, AK 99676 | See message: Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area Jet ski proposal.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | Organization | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Philip Brudie | Philip Brudie <plbrudie@yahoo.com> | P O Box 111 Homer Ak 99603 | I am a long time resident of the Kachemak Bay drainage. I am writing to register my support of keeping the ban on jet skis in effect. I'd be happy to discuss my reasons but understand you are wanting yes or no's. I'm a solid no | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Rod McLay | ROD <AK49HOTROD@hotmail.com> | Homer | I just wanted to put in my request that the Jet Ski ban be lifted for Kachemak Bay. This ban is unfairly targeting a very small group of recreational users that do not pollute or destroy the ecosystem anymore than your average skiff can. Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Robert Archibald Chair, Kachemak Bay State Park Citizens Advisory Board | Robert Archibald <robert.e.archibald@gmail.com> | | See message: Kachemak Bay Personal Water Craft Regulation Repeal.msg in PWC17 | 14 | | | Organization | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Lori Stephens | happydog15 <happydog15@earthlink.net> | Homer | As a Homer resident and longtime Alaskan, the issue of personal watercraft being allowed at Kachemak Bay is a vitally important one to me. Over and over again, a majority of Alaskans have voiced their opposition. And now it looks like the governor is set on ignoring this.<br><br>Government officials are the SERVANTS of the constituents of Alaska. Yet they are behaving like dictators to benefit themselves and/or the minority with greedy interests.<br><br>Please do what the law, and perhaps your conscience, tells you to do and reject this unethical move by the Dunleavy administration.<br><br>It matters and the silent majority is watching. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Jim E. Gallagher | Jim Gallagher <jimmy.g@acsalaska.net> | | Please repeal the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay waters,,,,,,for obvious reasons.<br><br>All of my long time Alaskan family and friends support a repeal but most will not take the time to tell you Sir. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Steve Friend | steve friend <sjfriend011@yahoo.com> | Anchor Point | My name is Steve, I live in Anchor Point and have a boat in Homer harbor.<br><br>As someone who has lived outside where PWCs are in wide use I can say u totally agree with maintaining the PWC ban in Kachemak bay. Yes they are fun (don't own but have ridden) but it's nice to have an area where they are not allowed. Both for quiet and safety.<br><br>People claim they are no different then regular boat but with speed, maneuverable and designs, they are built for play. You just have to go to any lake or river outside to see what people do on those machines, wake jumping, racing and many other things.<br><br>The people asking for the repeal also say that some people in regular boats harass wildlife, which is true, but the PWCs are just another problem as they have such quick response and maneuverability. And there is not enough patrols to do much about current harassment and the PWCs will be near impossible to monitor.<br><br>The people asking to lift the ban have the whole rest of the state to play. Let's keep Kachemak bay a place where wildlife and people are free from the effects of PWC use.<br><br>Please remember all the other votes and assessments that have supported the current ban over the proceeding years and keep the ban in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Karen Gordon | K.M. Gordon <kgordon@mosquitonet.com> | | This is Karen Gordon from Fairbanks, a member of the Laundry House Gang. I'm writing to ask that whatever influence you can exert to repeal the restriction on personal watercraft (PWCs) in Kachemak Bay be employed.<br><br>No scientific data establishes the notion that PWCs are anymore of a detriment to the critical marine habitat of Kachemak Bay than the 5,000-plus residents living in the watershed, other marine vessels, the commercial fisheries fleet, the local recreational charter fleet, or the Bradley Lake hydro facility at the Kachemak Bay head waters.<br><br>Some would have us believe that the entire Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is so tender that it cannot abide whatever negative effects operation of PWCs would cause while motorized boats, barges, and ferries can ply these waters in vastly larger numbers with environmental impunity, so they get a pass. What folly is this? How can a PWC be as or more harmful than a ferry? If the habitat in Kachemak Bay is so critical, why did the State ban the smallest and fewest in number of watercraft types and not the larger ones?<br><br>This restriction must be repealed because it is illogical, smacks of a personal vendetta against PWCs, and totally selects a class of user that results in failure to provide for Constitutionally-mandated maximal use. Clearly this is a discriminatory closure not based on facts or logic.<br><br>Can't we also thank John Sturgeon for assuring freedom to operate on navigable waters without restriction to watercraft type? And finally, Article 8, Section 1 of the Constitution says: "It is the policy of the State to make its resources available for maximum use consistent with the public interest."<br><br>Thanks much for your efforts to repeal this silly restriction. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Susan Downes-Borko | Sue Downes-Borko <campserenity@myfairpoint.net> | Seward, AK | Alaskans have strongly supported keeping Jetskis out of Kachemak Bay in the past. With 99% of Alaskan waters open to PW, Kachemak Bay needs to stay closed to them. There is just too much at stake here, and Jetskis are incompatible with the Legislature's own description for the area.<br>Allowing for public comment and the democratic process itself are not being respected if a Governor is allowed to pre-determine a decision based on who is greasing the wheels. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Sandy Powell | Sandy Powell <sandypowell@mindspring.com> | | I support the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay that has been in place since 2001. The Kachemak Bay is a critical habitat area for birds, marine life, and wildlife and jet skis have a much higher impact on the shallow waters of the bay. The Bay can be accessed by other watercraft that do not have such harsh impacts on the habitat. Additionally, there are plenty of alternative waters for jet skis throughout the state of Alaska.<br><br>Please keep the jet ski ban intact. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Doug Inglis | Doug Inglis <doug.inglis64@gmail.com> | Homer | I am a member of the Snomads ORRV Club in Homer Alaska, a 355 Member Organization dedicated to ensuring responsible access to the Alaskan Backcountry, and over/through the waters. I am also a Homer area resident and am writing in support of the repeal on the administrative codes (05AAC95.310, 11AAC20.115 and 11AAC20.215) on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. Finally, an administration that is not prejudiced and understands access.<br><br>Any conservation concerns are already addressed in regulations that apply to all boats which includes personal watercraft, airboats etc. Separate regulations do not need to be addressed regarding each individual type of watercraft.<br><br>Because no one can find valid current scientific studies regarding boats especially personal watercraft on the impact to fish, wildlife and other biological resources the members of Cook Inlet Keeper have just decided to label personal watercraft as thrill craft portraying the owners/operators as some kind of renegade.<br><br>This is simply an equal access issue where all Alaskans have the right to use their vessel in the state's waters, especially an area that encompasses more than 200,000 acres and includes the Alaska Marine Highway. The state simply doesn't have the right to ban anyone from traveling on the Alaska Marine Highway. Bob Shavelson of Cook Inlet Keeper makes it sound like he and other business and property owners in the Kenai peninsula area own the bay, they don't, it belongs to all the people and the Dunleavy administration understands that and that is why I believe the ban will be repealed.<br><br>Thank you, Rick Green, for stepping up to the plate and taking this first very important step to right a wrong done long ago by administrations who didn't believe in equal access. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Dennis C. Lees | Dennis Lees <dennislees@cox.net> | 1075 Urania Ave. Leucadia, CA 92024 | See message: Maintain the current ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Wendy Wayne | Wendy Wayne <lewistownmontana@yahoo.com> | Homer | I am opposed to the rule change for personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. I'm a Homer resident. I enjoy sharing the bay with fellow Alaskans.<br><br>Part of what makes Alaska great is that we take care of our lands, our fish and wildlife. Personal watercraft are not a good fit for the unique character of Kachemak Bay. Its abundant fish and wildlife make it uniquely vulnerable to personal watercraft that are specifically designed for tight steering and joy riding. It is important to restrict personal watercraft not because jet skis are so bad but because Kachemak Bay is so good. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Kammi Matson | Kammi Matson <ikammi@gmail.com> | | I oppose the use of jet skis in kachemak bay.<br>Opening it up to jet skiing just because people don't want their "rights infringed on" is not a good enough reason. I have lived in Homer for the past 20 years, and love recreating on the bay. However, I know that jet skis will be a real danger to the tourists who use them not understanding the dangers of these waters, as well as the animals that will undoubtedly be harassed (either intentionally to accidentally) by people on them.<br><br>Please don't allow them in Kachemay Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Dotti Harness-Foster | Dotti Harness-Foster <dottiharness@hotmail.com> | PO Box 123, Homer, AK 99603 | Please do NOT overturn the JetSki ban in Kachemak Bay.<br>Kachemak is open to ALL, already. Residents and visitors come to enjoy Kachemak Bay and its' unique qualities identified in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | K. Murphy | K. Murphy <shuyakland@yahoo.com> | | Vote No on Jet skis in KBay or be held personally responsible for the change. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Grace Lee | Grace Lee <grace.talice.lee@gmail.com> | | I'm writing in sincere hopes that there will be NO JETSKIS allowed in Kachemak Bay. Where the rest of the world gives in to capitalist greed, let Kachemak Bay be preserved in its wildness and beauty. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mindy Hunter | Mindy Hunter <erik.mindy@gmail.com> | | My family enjoys the bay regularly, via sailboat, water taxi or ferry. We help keep it clean by picking up trash on beaches and minimizing our own impact. Our Bay is our most treasured resource, and designated as a critical habitat area. Please do not open our bay to loud, speeding, fuel guzzling jetskis, that will add to congestion around our harbor, terrorize wildlife and disrupt the peace. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Michael Mumm | akmikejm@yahoo.com | Homer, ak | No! Do not repeal the existing ban. Do not allow PWC in Kachemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Frederick Dickerson | Frederick Dickerson <fredkbay@gmail.com> | | As a life long Homer resident I am against personal watercraft in Kachemack bay and the hunting of sea otters from them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Marcia Kuszmaul<br><br>Owner<br>Juneberry Lodge<br>President<br>Homer Bed & Breakfast Association | marcia kuszmaul <mkuszmaul@hotmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | See message: OPPOSITION TO THE REPEAL ON 05AAC.95.310, 11AAC20.115 AND 11AAC20.215.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | Organization/business/individual | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Andy Zajac | Andrew R Zajac <zajac@mtaonline.net> | Eagle River, AK | I would like to go on record urging you to lift the ban on personal water craft in Kachemak Bay. I strongly feel that the public has a right to access public lands and waters. I believe you are familiar with other reasons for lifting the ban so I feel there is no need to repeat them. Thank you. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Patrick McDonnell | Pat McDonnell <pmcd49@hotmail.com> | PO Box 1794<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I have been a resident of Homer for 20 years and I am contacting you today to support the REPEAL of the admin codes banning the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The waters of Alaska in general and K Bay in particular should be open for the use and enjoyment of ALL Alaskans, not a select few who promote an agenda that is not supported by science. This is simply an equal access issue where all Alaskans have the right to use their vessels in the state's waters. Thank you for supporting the repeal of the ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Janice A Burke | jan burke <janbur1@comcast.net> | 1003<br>Cottonwood<br>Circle<br>Golden, CO<br>80401 | I visited Alaska last summer for the first time. I visited multiple areas of the state and the time I spent on and near the Kachemac Bay were by far the most impressive time that I spent. I have talked to many others about the wildlife I saw in the Bay and the unique aspect that the elimination of Jet Ski's provided to create the wonderfully rich natural sea life environment and quiet. The approach of banning this type of activity has a research base which many others have conveyed to you. As I see it people come to Alaska to view nature in its natural state. As over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to PVC's it make sense that the tourist industry would be hurt dropping the ban as people can get that type of experience many places in Alaska.<br><br>Please maintain the ban on PVC's in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Joe and Laurie Gentle | Laurie Gentle <gentlelaurie@gmail.com> | | My husband and I live in Homer and feel that allowing jet skis in the area would irreparably harm the natural water and landscape of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Realizing that jet skis are allowed in nearly every other body of water, please know this is not necessary and not wanted.<br><br>Do you know how much we treasure our land and water?<br><br>EVERY Homer fourth grader is trained in our lands, forests and waters, and importantly to protect these natural assets for future generations.<br><br>WE ACTUALLY TRAIN OUR OWN FUTURE CONSERVATIONISTS!!!<br><br>Please understand that we do not want jet skis and similar any where near Kachemak Bay. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Michelle Waclawski | Michelle Waclawski <waclawskim@gmail.com> | | I wanted to express my "no" vote to removing the JetSki ban on Kachemak Bay. The noise, speed, increased water and boat ramp traffic, as well as additional pollution are not things to take lightly in a critical habitat area. JetSkis don't seem to fit the intention of setting aside this area for preservation. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Bill Quantick | Bill <abxwilliam@aol.com> | P.O.Box 3001<br>Palmer Alaska<br>99645 | PWC are no threat to Alaska Waters and this ban on them is a waste of money and time. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John Guest | Johnathon Guest <johnathon.j.guest@gmail.com> | | I am reaching out to you to inform you, as an Alaskan resident, I object to the ban of personal watercraft in the Kachemak bay. I believe that these waterways should be open to use for individuals by any means that the individual has to utilize the water and surrounding areas. As access to the features that Alaska has to offer is already difficult please do not make more legislation that is going to hinder the use and benefit of Alaskans natural resources for its residents. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mack Wood | mack wood <mwood93@hotmail.com> | | I would like to go on the record in support of repealing the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. There are no horsepower limits, engine type specifications, or noise limits for any of the other thousands of vessels allowed to utilize the entire region east of the Pogi Point to Anchor Point line, I don't see how it is fair to restrict use of one subset of vessel. Kayaking and sight seeing companies located on the south shore of the bay are complaining that it MAY impact their business, but what about all of the economic development that it might spur in the creation of new tourism attractions? | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Amy Fetterhoff | Rich Amy Fetterhoff <homerpioneerinn@gmail.com> | Pioneer Inn - PO Box 1430<br>244 W. Pioneer Ave.<br>Homer, Alaska<br>99603 | I have lived in Homer since 1991, own and operate a small Inn with my 29th tourist season just around the corner, and I have raised three sons who all reside in Alaska. I have no intention of moving from Homer. Please hear me, that I've lived on Kachemak Bay a very long time and I have no problem allowing personal watercraft use in this area. I urge you to repeal 5 AAC 95.310. Thank you. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Matt & Sue Rowley<br><br>MATSU Events LLC | Matt Rowley <matt@matsuevents.com> | P.O. Box 277 Willow, AK 99688 | As owners of the Mat-Su Outdoorsman Show, we would like to express our support to the effort to lift the ban of personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay. We see no evidence to suggest that the use of PWCs in the bay is detrimental to coastal lands, waters, or wildlife. These waters are publicly owned, and should be available to all Alaskans for responsible public recreation. | | 2 | | business/individuals | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Gregory Mccullough | Gregory Mccullough <mcculloughgreg68@gmail.com> | | The decision to ban PWCs from Kachemak Bay was totally political, there was no scientific basis. The ban is unfair to the public sector. I ask your consideration in repealing this travesty. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Mark Gordon | Mark Gordon <cwboyuppus@aol.com> | Homer,Ak | The use of personal watercraft in the bay would help cut the fuel usage for people wanting to make a quick trip to China Poot for instance. I currently use a 22 for with twin 70 two strokes. A PWC would cut the fuel use in half for me and for other that think this a better option.<br>I would have the requirements for the PWC in Kachemak Bay to be four stoke engines since that are a "cleaner" option. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | GARY BRANDENBURG <gvbranden@msn.com> | | scanned copy AOC Form letter - moved to hard copy comments to be entered there | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Ryan Cain | ryan cain <907yamaha@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I fully support lifting the ban on pwc in kachemak bay and providing equal access to all user groups not just catering to the loud minority. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Keith Mantey, GM<br>Gwin's Lodge | Keith Mantey <manteyk@verizon.net> | 14865 Sterling Hwy (Milepost 52)<br>PO Box 769<br>Cooper Landing AK 99572-0769 | Please repeal the ban on PWC on the Kenai Peninsula. I don't see why they are banned on Kenai Lake what less the bay. I really don't think they would cause any harm... any more so than boats that are already on the lake. Seems very weak; no real reason other than selfishness. THEY are legally boats and that's just plain crazy that they are not legal. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Juliussen, Gabe J. | Juliussen, Gabe J. <GJJuliussen@Marathonpetroleum.com> | | I'm a lifelong Kenai resident and a property owner in Homer. I recently heard there's an effort to reverse an earlier ruling that prohibits the use of PWC's in Kachemak Bay. I've never agreed with this ruling and I'm in support reversing it. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | Sean Eastham <gunbit@acsalaska.net> | | scanned copy AOC Form letter - moved to hard copy comments to be entered there | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Leanna Stern | Leanna Stern <leannajo1126@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Re: Ban on Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | continuation of 12/10/2019 email chain, entered and counted here. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Petr Bucinsky | Petr Bucinsky <violins@gci.net> | | I'm writing to ask you to repeal the personal watercraft ban in Homer.<br>I was one if the original members who was against the ban and gathered over 2000 signatures on a petition against it.<br>This is not about emotion, but about equal access in public waters.<br>There were no studies done and watercraft produce less emissions and wake than most boats in Homer.<br>Conservation concerns are already addressed by current regulations which apply to all boats in Alaska.<br>Lache makes bay belongs to all Alaskans, not just a few locals who want to ban jet skis because they just don't like them.<br>I know you will do the right thing and help repeal this bogus ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Leif Hagen | Leif Hagen <lufe18@gmail.com> | | Thank you!<br>Leif Hagen<br><br>On Dec 19, 2019, at 3:00 PM, Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov> wrote:<br><br>Dear interested parties,<br><br>Attached please find the Public Notice, Supplemental Public Notice and Public Notice Additional Information related to proposed changes to 5 AAC 95.310.<br><br>Thank you,<br><br>Rick Green<br>Special Assistant to the Commissioner<br>Alaska Department of Fish and Game<br>907-267-2228<br><Public Notice 5AAC 95.310.pdf><br><Supplimental Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310.pdf><br><5 AAC 95.310 Public Notice Addtional Information signed.pdf> | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | City Clerk, City of Homer | Jacobsen, Melissa (GOV sponsored) <mjacobsen@ci.homer.ak.us> | | See message: RE: Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310 (8).msg in PWC17 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Jeff Fair | Jeff Fair <fairwinds@briloon.org> | PO Box 2947 Palmer, AK 99645 | See message: RE: Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310 (7).msg in PWC17 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Scot P | Scot P <akbearak@yahoo.com> | | Hey Rick,<br>Thank you. PWC's should be allowed in K-Bay, but in the future when you send a mass email, could you bcc everyone so your not giving everyone all the email addresses?<br>Thanks,<br>-Scot<br>Sent from my iPhone<br><br>On Dec 19, 2019, at 2:59 PM, Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov> wrote:<br>Dear interested parties,<br><br>Attached please find the Public Notice, Supplemental Public Notice and Public Notice Additional Information related to proposed changes to 5 AAC 95.310.<br><br>Thank you,<br><br>Rick Green<br>Special Assistant to the Commissioner<br>Alaska Department of Fish and Game<br>907-267-2228<br><Public Notice 5AAC 95.310.pdf><br><Supplimental Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310.pdf><br><5 AAC 95.310 Public Notice Addtional Information signed.pdf> | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Rhema Smith | Rhema Smith <akarea83@gmail.com> | Po box 15224 fritz creek AK 99603 | See message: RE: Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310 (14).msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Bruce Turkington | bruceturkington@yahoo.com | Bruce Turkington | Thank you for the update. I support the State repealing the ban on PWC for Kachemak Bay.. I was never in support of the band when it was first put on.. At that time there was a petition signed by a large amount of Peninsula residents that was not recognized because the proponents of the ban said it confused people that had signed it. This was not correct. We absolutely knew what we were signing. The petition that was given weight at the time was signed by far less people , plus it contained a lot of non residents of the Kenai Peninsula and out State people.<br>Thank you<br>Bruce Turkington<br>PO Box 1181<br>Homer, Alaska 99603<br>Resident of Homer, Alaska since 1951<br><br>Sent from my iPad<br><br>On Dec 19, 2019, at 2:59 PM, Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov> wrote:<br>Dear interested parties,<br><br>Attached please find the Public Notice, Supplemental Public Notice and Public Notice Additional Information related to proposed changes to 5 AAC 95.310.<br><br>Thank you,<br><br>Rick Green<br>Special Assistant to the Commissioner<br>Alaska Department of Fish and Game<br>907-267-2228<br><Public Notice 5AAC 95.310.pdf><br><Supplimental Public Notice 5 AAC 95.310.pdf> | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Bill Wiebe | William Wiebe <homerwiebe@yahoo.com> | | The effects of jet skis in Kachemak Bay was thoroughly discussed in 2001 and people were overwhelmingly opposed. the Governor, for reasons that are not well thought out, has forced ADFG to revisit this topic yet again, wasting time, money, and everybody's attention.<br><br>There are some really good alternatives to use personal watercraft in the 90 plus percent of the waters of Alaska without a ban, many of them on or near the road system. Kachemak Bay has a slower pace that attracts a different type of tourists and it's kind of dumb to drive them away. The ban has been popular for many years.<br><br>ADFG and the Governor should pick their fights, and rather than fighting this one, why not promote jet ski usage in Whitier, Valdez, Juneau, or some other place acceptable to the tourist industry. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Parker Hannifin Wayne Ring | Wayne Ring <wring@parker.com> | 2700 Greenscreek Cir Anchorage, Alaska 99516 | Repeal the PWC Ban in Katchemak May. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Rob Lund | Rob Lund <summersong@alaska.net> | Homer | As a partner of some 35 years in one of Homer's primary accounting and consulting businesses, I can see nothing but harm coming from appealing the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. A substantial portion of Homer's income comes from tourists—they eat in the restaurants, drink in the bars, rent rooms in the B & B's and, especially, take charters on Kachemak Bay to fish and look at the wildlife, the otters, whales, sea birds, seals, and to enjoy the scenery and the mostly undisturbed serenity of mountains and ocean. What they specifically do not come to do is to watch and listen to personal watercraft. Insofar as these watercraft intrude on our tourists enjoyment of nature, our tourists will no longer be ours—they will go elsewhere where they can experience coastal Alaska free of intrusion by jet skis. They have no place on Kachemak Bay. It is hardly a valid argument that jet ski enthusiasts need Kachemak Bay for recreation—almost all of coastal is available for their activities, including Prince William Sound and most of the water surrounding the Kenai Peninsula.<br><br>Please do not repeal the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John Harris | John Harris <jharris1@kenai.city> | | I am very much for repealing the current ban on PWCs in the Kachemak Bay. I am quite certain that you have been inundated with various opinions, so I will spare you any further correspondence. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John and Linda Thies | John Thies <chefjdt@yahoo.com> | Anchorage, AK | Please support the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | John Sturgeon | John Sturgeon <frontiertradellc@aol.com> | 4450 Shoshoni Ave. Anchorage, Alaska 99516 | I would like to pass on my support for the ADF&G's proposal to lift the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats. All other watercraft's are allowed so I don't see the harm in allowing jet ski's. Thanks you for taking this issue on and for putting some common sense back into the management of State lands. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | JoAl Hintz | JoAl Hintz <joal.hintz@gmail.com> | | Repeal the ban of personal watercraft from the 220,000 acres of kachemak bay. This ban was put in place erroneously almost 20 years ago with the stroke of a pen .Common sense says thousands of users hav been kept from these waters by a small wealthy minority.Any concerns about conservation are currently addressed in regulations that apply to all boats/watercraft including personal watercraft.Apply common sense in this case for all ALASKANS! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Bill Iverson Alaska Outdoor Council, President | Bill Iverson - AOC <president@alaskaoutdoorcouncil.com> | | Please Repeal the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. This ban is just another case of nimby, not in my back yard, and violates all fare practices. | | 1 | | organization | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Clint Connelley | Clint Connelley <Clint.Connelley@Kinross.com> | | There is no sound reason to ban one type of watercraft in this region. It should be repealed so Alaskans can utilize this Bay with what ever watercraft they have.<br><br>Modern PWC's are very clean and quite compared to older ones. They pose less environmental risk than nearly any boat.<br><br>Limits to small groups of Alaskan's with little to no basis is bad business. Politicians need to heed the voters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Richard Benson | Richard Benson <akrab@gci.net> | Eagle River, AK | Please repeal the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemack Bay ! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Vernona Killingsworth | vernona killingsworth <aksunny1941@yahoo.com> | 821 Dogwood Street Anchorage, AK 99501 | See message: Support Repeal for lifting the pwc ban in Kbay.msg in PWC17 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Kenni Geary | Kenni Geary <kengear13@gmail.com> | | I am in complete support of the repeal on the three administrative codes that ban pwc from Kachemak Bay. A pwc is a boat and the ban should never have been put in place to begin with. Kachemak Bay is for all Alaskans, not just those that live nearby. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Mary Post | Mary Post <merryrain51@gmail.com> | 4048 El Sarino Ct Homer, AK 99603 | See message: WHAT?!!!!.msg in PWC17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Gregg and Julia Graham | Gregg Graham <gregg@mtaonline.net> | | We are writing you in regards to the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>We feel this ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay is unfair to the people of Kachemak Bay and all Alaskans. People that live there and rely on PWC for their means of transportation are being targeted unfairly just because "they sit on and not in a boat".<br><br>We ask that you NOT support the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay. | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ron Turner | Ron Turner <69returner@gmail.com> | Seldovia | See message: Comment on proposal to repeal ban of jet skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Mark Luttrell | Mark Luttrell <prufrock@arctic.net> | Seward | I strongly oppose repealing regulations* on personal watercraft (PWC) in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Alaskans fought a lengthy and heated battle in 2001 to remove PWCs. All the objections to PWCs except one (2-cycle v 4-cycle engines) remain. They pose a threat to marine wildlife (arguably the beneficiaries of a "Critical Habitat Area") by their speed, group travel, shallow water access and maneuverability.<br><br>Most humans dislike them. The only people who like them are the riders. They buzz other vessels like kayaks who expect a peaceful experience on the water. The buzz camps. Their presence degrades a visitor's experience. Visitor-based entities based in Homer rightly object to lifting the ban.<br><br>Compare the number of members of the Personal Watercraft Club of Alaska who would benefit from the repeal of the ban to the number who stand to be negatively affected. What is it, 1:10,000?<br><br>Ninety-nine percent of the state is open to thrill craft. Kachemak Bay - home to the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area, Kachemak Bay State Park, and Kachemak Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve - should remain closed. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Fairbanks F&G Advisory Committee | Kirk Schwalm <kirkschwalm@gmail.com> | | See message: FAC Kachemak Comments.msg in PWC18 | | 1 | | organization | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Jean Aspen | jaspen@gci.net | | Please pass my letter on to the right people. I wish to weigh in on the decision to open critical habituate areas of Kachemak Bay to “personal watercraft.”<br><br>Although the Kachemak Bay is currently crowded with watercraft in the summer, we all know that more human presence does impact wildlife and fish habitate. While it is argued that we already allow larger vessels, and should therefore condone jet skis, this is a bogus train of thought contrived by a special interest group. The argument of discrimination also carries no merit: folk with jet skis are not prohibited from using the bay, just from using their toys on it. Jet skis are noisy, intrusive and a danger to boats. More than that, they will carry their intrusion up the Fox river and into other places where boats normally do not go.<br><br>Disruption of wildlife and fish are only part of the problem with these toys. Many people seek emersion in the natural world for spiritual and emotional restoration. To be infringed upon everywhere by noisy, speeding toys is an affront to these more peaceful users of the public good. We need accessible places where those seeking to experience quiet and natural beauty are not traumatized by others. Homer is known as a peaceful and welcoming community. I believe that allowing this intrusion will degrade the common good and polarize our community. I therefore soundly oppose the repeal of our critical habitat protections. This move would NOT serve the greater good. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Lisa Krebs | lckrebs@gmail.com | PO Box 1971 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: FW: Proposed changes on the use of personal watercraft .msg in PWC18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Eric P. Fuglestad | efuglestad@acsalaska.net | 2223 Tulik Drive Anchorage, AK 99517 | I am against the proposed subject regulatory change. Having observed the changing environment of Kachemak Bay for some 55 years, I am concerned that increased water traffic will have a detrimental effect on the marine environment.<br><br>The increased development on the south shore of Kachemak Bay has led to a corresponding rise in water borne traffic. While the reduced surface and subsurface wildlife is certainly attributed to many factors, the volume of water traffic certainly has not helped. One must realize that this increased activity has been transportation in support of economic growth. This growth includes summer residences, commercial fisheries, fishing charters, bird watching, and providing access to the Kachemak Bay State Park, to name but a few. This economic development is in conformance with the State's mandate from the people to foster growth.<br><br>The use of personal watercraft is purely for recreational purposes and does not support as great of sustainable growth as mentioned above. I do not feel that this is compatible with purposes of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br><br>I respectfully submit these thoughts for your deliberation. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ginger Drais | Ginger Drais <virgidr@hotmail.com> | | It is inconceivable to me that the ADFG is attempting to repeal the ban on jetskis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. This is clearly greed related and has nothing to do with preserving one of the few nearly pristine coastal estuaries left on our planet. What are this governor and his cronies thinking of?<br>Jetskis are designed for speed and thrill seeking. Due to their design there is literally no place they can't go. They are extremely dangerous, offensively noisy and in no way compatible with the cherished values of living in co-existence with the natural world. Due to lax or absent laws governing our waterways, jetskis already have complete access to 99% of Alaskan lakes, rivers, and ocean. Isn't this enough?<br>Governor Dunleavy will not overrule the people. It is simply not going to be possible. NO to jetskis/personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay!!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Mary Williams | Mary Williams <mwroses@outlook.com> | | I am against allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Alyssa Guanlao | Alyssa Guanlao <guanlaoalyssa@gmail.com> | | I support personal watercraft usage in kachemak bay. It isn't any worse for the environment or surrounding areas than the boats and ferries that transport people and goods back and forth on a daily basis.<br><br>The people in the surrounding areas are good stewards of their lands and opening up more efficient modes of transportation offers flexibility to the people. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Jan Durrington | Jan Durrington <cozycubsrental@gmail.com> | | I vote to repeal the ban for the PWC's. I've been riding in the ocean up here in Alaska for 30 years. We love to explore everything that Alaska has to offer. We just want equal access to do the same as all the other boaters in Homer. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | True North Kayak Adventures, Alison O'Hara | Alison O'Hara <alaskaselkie@gmail.com> | | Jet Ski Ban Comment in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Eileen mullen | Eileen mullen <eileenmullen907@gmail.com> | | I am appalled that the governor wants to ruin kachemak bay. Please tell him I vote<br>no on his idea. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | dye | Dye <jmdye@gci.net> | | Email title: Jetski Proposal Kachemak Body of email: NO | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Janice Peyton | Janice Peyton <janpeyton73@gmail.com> | | I am against allowing JetSkis on Kachemak Bay. I support the current ban on JetSkis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Peggy Ellen Kleinleder | PeggyEllen Kleinleder <peggy.ellen.k@gmail.com> | PO Box 367 Homer, AK 99603 | I am opposed to permittiing Jetski use in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.<br>I am concerned about the noise impact on other users and on wildlife. I am concerned about potential collisions between jetskis and other boaters and between jetskis and wildlife.<br>The State is currently undergoing revisions to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan, and I request that any changes to jetski policy or rules occur within the context of the management plan revisions.<br>Governor Dunleavy's actions now ignore our democratic process. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Marylou Burton | Richard and Marylou Burton <burtons@mosquitonet.com> | PO Box 810 Homer, AK | The short answer, which according to your KBBI interview is all you're interested in, is NO. I am AGAINST allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>But - just in case you're even remotely interested in the reasons behind my vote, here are some:<br><br>1. You say that Kachemak Bay belongs to all Alaskans. No one disputes that. But I don't recollect any poll of all Alaskans about whether or not jet skis should be allowed ion Kachemak Bay. Instead, a certain small group is dictating a change to a policy that has been in effect for 20 or more years. No public hearings, no input from any interested groups, just this bogus quick "yes-no" vote from people who happened to hear that this was coming down.<br><br>2. Many lakes in Alaska (which also belong to all Alaskans) do NOT allow jet-skis, and with good reason. They are fast, they are loud, they are - in the wrong hands - dangerous, and they are totally unregulated. To compare them fo the many skiffs that ply our local waters is totally bogus. People use their skiffs in Kachemak Bay primarily to fish and/or to get from Homer across the Bay. They do not do wheelies through a pack of otters or birds just for the hell of it (and if don't think that THAT is going to happen, you are kidding yourself).<br><br>It was clear from your interview with Kathleen Gustafson that you - and, I presume, your boss - have already made up your mind on this issue. Why am I not surprised? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Tania Trejo | Tania T <alaskawildflower@icloud.com> | | I am a 20 year resident of Homer. I've heard some talk lately around town about people trying to stop the current ban on jet skis in our bay. I really really hope they stay banned. I'm sure you have heard all of the arguments against allowing them here, mine are the same. If you want to hear more from me and why I feel like they should not be allowed in our bay you can email me back. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Scott Miller | Scott Miller <scottysusan@gmail.com> | | As a Homer resident who enjoys non motorized recreation on the bay I am strongly opposed to lifting the jet ski ban.<br>There are plenty of places for folks to play with those and fewer places to be free of them all the time.<br>Please leave the rest of us some space. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Sandy Rollins | Sandy Rollins <sandyrollins@acsalaska.net> | P O Box 1091 Homer, AK 99603 | See message: Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ed Schmitt | edward schmitt <schmitt.edward@gmail.com> | Soldotna | Please do not allow jet skis in Katchamak Bay, I kayak there a lot and would probably stop if jet skis are allowed. They are an annoyance and instead of feeling like I am in a special place in nature, I feel like I am suddenly transported to an amusement park whenever a pack of them arrive. I am sorry they are allowed in Blackstone and Resurrection Bays. Having someone buzzing around an otherwise peaceful camp really spoils the evening. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Cindy Bolognani | mckenna@acsalaska.net | Homer | My opinion about the jet ski issue:<br>No! No, jet skis on Kachemak Bay! Please! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Carolyn Maslow | Lyn <davelyn@gci.net> | Homer | I am opposed to allowing jet skis on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Mako Haggerty | mako haggerty <mako@xyz.net> | | I adamantly oppose the lifting of the ban on jet-skis in Kachemak Bay.<br>There has been a lot invested developing the type of experience most folks expect when they come to Kachemak Bay, and jet-skis would be contrary to all our hard work.<br>At the very least extend the comment period and hold public hearings.<br>Please make this an open public process. | 1 | | | individual | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Allen Tigert | Allen Tigert <allen@symbiotes.com> | Anchor Point, AK | I oppose allowing jet ski operation in any critical habitat areas of Katchemak bay. Jetskis concentrate their activities in shallow water areas, repeatedly going over the same areas and cause extreme disturbance to marine life underneath the surface in those areas. They also are noisy as hell, and have the power to ruin the sound environment for sealife, wildlife, and people expecting a quiet semi-wilderness environment when they are out on the water in kayaks, small watercraft, or tour boats. They have plenty of areas already where they are allowed. Please don't degrade the environment in the bay by allowing them to recreate in more areas of the bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | John C. Davis | John Davis <jcdavis@gci.net> | 48590 KSRM Court…Kenai. AK… 99611 | See message: Kachemak Bay (PWC) Repeal.msg in PWC18 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Carla Stanley | Carla Stanley <4rdog24@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Kachemak Bay critical Habitat area and jet skis..msg in PWC18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ann Agosti-Hackett | Ann Hackett <homeraha@gmail.com> | PO Box 15344 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | I am totally opposed to reversing the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Jet skis are noisy, polluting, and offensive. They will harm the aesthetic tourism values of the area, incuding guided kayak tours, scenic wildlife boat tours, and fishing charters. They will harm the marine mammals and birds which give live and raise young in the bay. They will interfere with commercial, personal use, subsistence, and sport fishing, and become entangled in nets and lines.<br>Jet skis have long been opposed in Kachemak Bay for very good reason. Keep the ban in place! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Katy Rice | Katherine Rice <katy@zizania.org> | | I am writing to express my strong opposition to opening Kachemak Bay to personal watercraft. This would affect not only the safety of other boaters (fishermen, kayakers, and others), but also has the potential to significantly and negatively impact the wildlife and habitats in the bay's critical habitat area. Repealing the current prohibition would damage the environment and culture of Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Scott Bothwell | Scott Bothwell <arcticloons@alaska.net> | 1021 Pasque St. Fairbanks, Ak. | I am in favor of repealing the ban on personal water craft in Kachemak Bay. As a member of the Parks CAB trails committee in the interior I have experience in balancing access among user groups. A similar experience we recently had was with property owners trying to retain their trail access but eliminating 4wheeler access for the public on that trail across State land. We all need to be responsible access users and responsible property owners. Please find ways to maintain access to all people as best you can. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Jim House | James House <jimhouse72@gmail.com> | | My name is Jim House and I'm a full time Homer resident and spend an average of 330 days on the water as a charter fisherman, water taxi operator and also various duties on larger boats in and around Kachemak Bay & Cook Inlet.<br>I attended the Dec. 11 meeting but was unable to voice my opinion on the matter which is to say that I am in favor of keeping the existing ban on Personal Water Craft in place. I do not believe it to be in the best interest of KBay and its wildlife to allow such craft. The much smaller area (as in square miles) in my opinion would not easily absorb the high speed nature of PWC as compared to boats. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Stephen Korenek | Steve and Becky Korenek <snowbirds68@hotmail.com> | | I support repeal of the ban on PWC use on the publicly owned lands and waters of Katchemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Steve Glasman | Steve Glasman <sglasman@gmail.com> | | If you are truly asking. NO JET SKIS PLEASE in Kachemak bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Cathryn Simon | Cathryn Simon <2ndflowers@gmail.com> | 12143 Cange St. Anchorage, AK 99516 | The ADFG attempt to repeal the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay is a travesty. First of all, all the scientific studies done have indicated that jet ski use is incompatible with the purpose of the the Critical Habitat Area which is to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Secondly, the public has weighed in repeatedly on this topic and the overwhelming majority have indicated that they do not want jet skis in Kachemak Bay. Thirdly, internal ADFG email has shown that the Governors office decided to repeal the jet ski ban BEFORE it even opened the public comment period. This is a clear case of special interests and corrupt government trying to undermine democratic process. Any changes to the Kachemak Bay CHA management plan should occur within the context of the management plan revisions. The public notice regarding repealing jet ski use should be rescinded immediately. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Gordy Vernon | robert vernon <gogovernon@yahoo.com> | Box 3 Homer AK 99603 | Keep jet skis out of Kachemak Bay. The Kachemak Bay State Park and Kenai Wilderness are to preserve what Alaska used to be. The boundaries between these and the open seas is very watery. There is one park ranger to handle all the park's business and violations.<br>It is ludicrous to think they would enforce jet ski violations, when a jet skis go three times the speed of a park ranger.<br>Most jet ski accidents are caused by a teen, often on a borrowed machine. Otter viewing and bird watching, the two most consistent businesses for water taxis would shrink, harbor traffic would grow, and the circus would be on.<br><br>Parks are for relaxation Jet skis would make a day on Kachemak Bay something akin to taking in nature at a motocross event.<br><br>Keep the existing boundary between Point Pogibsi and Anchor Point (a line easy to identify with enough room to allow minor transgressions some drift, and enough water in between to keep frictions from heating up). | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Shirley Fedora. | Shirley Fedora <hapevaft2@hotmail.com> | | I have been a resident of Homer for 25 years now. I'm opposed to Jet skis in our bay. Why do we have to have this issue come up every couple of years? We have done the research in the past-It causes hazards/trauma to our wildlife, noise pollution, and a danger to themselves and others (with no ranger/officers for safety patrolling) Please don't allow this! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Douglas Koester | Douglas Koester <dougkoester1618@gmail.com> | | My vote is NO. I am not emotional. I like jet skis, People will die. People will suffer (accidents, noise, etc.). Animals will stress. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Brenda Dolma | Dolma Family <dolma@ptialaska.net> | | Kachemak Bay is a designated Critical Habitat. Jet Ski's do not support the protection of an already stressed habitat. Kachemak Bay is one of the few places where quiet water activities provide a quality of life to both residents and visitors.<br><br>There are many places throughout Alaska where Jet Ski's are allowed.<br><br>We need to keep the ban. NO to Jet ski's | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Doug Rohn | Douglas Rohn <lymfatic@me.com> | | I'm writing to express my strong opposition to removing the long standing jet ski ban on Kachemak Bay. As you know, the ban has been in place since 2001 and has the strong support of people of Alaska. ADFG's own research and reviews show the value of preventing jet ski activity in the essential environment of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area whose purpose is "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose."<br><br>It appears that the only reason this proposal is occurring arises from the access certain special interest groups have to Governor Dunleavy. In my civics and government education, I learned the government is supposed to work for the people, in this case those of Alaska. So how is this good government when the Governor is ignoring ADFG's own science and the will of the people? And if there should be a change, why not consider revision of the management plan that is currently being reviewed instead of opening a new public comment period?<br><br>Lastly, do jet skis really need to operate on Kachemak Bay? They have access to over 99% of Alaskan waters already. What makes the Bay so great a place for this kind of recreation in light of the sensitivity of the habitat?<br><br>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I trust that ADFG will do the right thing and not undo nearly 20 years of scientifically based decision making for Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Brenda Hays | captain B <reelpossibility@gmail.com> | | see message: Personal Water Craft in Kachemak Bay Just say YES!!.msg | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | randy brinckman | randy brinckman <randybrinckman@yahoo.com> | | Dear Mr Green, I am stunned beyond belief that we are even considering damn personal watercraft on our pristine waters!!! This is absolute insanity. Our waters in summer are already covered in boats the last thing this last untouched area needs is jet skis. We didn't move from Missouri to see Homer turn into Lake of the Ozarks. Please keep our beautiful area beautiful. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Michael Fefelov | Mike Fef <mike.fef@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | I support lifting the ban of personal water crafts in Kachemak Bay. I think Jet skis and other small water craft should be allowed.<br><br>I grew up in Homer and always disliked the ban. Let me know if you need any information from me to verify my vote. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Capt. Ron Ward | Capt. Ron Ward <captron@ak.net> | | I'm writing in support or repealing the Ban on personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay!<br>In my view it's indefensible. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Greta Mahowald | greta mahowald <howal@hotmail.com> | 3755 Forest Glen Dr<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to express my concern about the continued effort to overturn 5AAC 95.310, ban on personal watercraft in Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. I strongly oppose watercraft in Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Habitat Areas. I am concerned about the noise impact on wildlife and other people. I am also concerned about safety. I have worked as a sea kayak guide and have recreated on Kachemak Bay and hypothermia is a real and potentially deadly possibility. Please contact me if you have any questions or responses to my concerns. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Roberta Collier | Roberta Collier <robertajcollier@gmail.com> | PO BOX 123<br>Seldovia, AK 99663 | I am writing to express my support of repealing the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I would like to see them legalized for personal use.<br><br>I have been an Alaska resident my whole life and a resident of Kachemak Bay since 2015 and feel that they pose no great risk to our area, when they are used r**esponsibly**.<br><br>It is for this reason I express my support in repealing the ban of jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Theresa Rodgers | theresa rodgers <huskyhills@gmail.com> | | I support repealing the ban the personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Is is one of the safest areas around in which to use PWC and the waters need to be available for all to use, even those of us without large fishing boats. Next, is someone going to tell me I cannot take my paddle board out there? | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | George Rhyneer | George Rhyneer <valiant@mtaonline.net> | Little Jakalof Bay | Do not rescind the ban on personal watercraft on Kachemack Bay. Personal watercraft are pleasantly used by people who want to run around on the water fast and to jump waves. Skiffs in Kachemack Bay are used by people to get to someplace. Lakes are perfect for personal watercraft. The Bay is not. It is dangerous on the bay. Personal watercraft are noisy and disruptive. Skiffs and fishing boats are not. Let us continue to the enjoy the peace and quiet of our place in Little Jakalof Bay and make it place that people like to visit for a respite from the noise of civilization. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Cathy Suozzo | Cathy Suozzo <crgamj@hotmail.com> | Alaska | It should be legal because it opens up economic opportunity to communities on the southern Kenai peninsula! It also allows for rescue groups to use faster, more efficient equipment to save people! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Patrick E. Quinn | Patrick Quinn <icepat@gci.net> | | I support allowing Personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay.<br>I support changing the regulations so that Personal Watercraft are allowed in Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Travis Smith | Travis Smith <trav907@gmail.com> | | I'd like to submit a public comment regarding the repeal of the ban of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I'd like to see fair and equal access to all navigatable waters within Alaska - as protected by our state constitution. If the ban is to remain, I would suggest repealing the ban while studies are done that are based on science, from neutral third parties using State dollars... not special interest groups including Patagonia. I'm a strong advocate of conservation, but banning PWC and allowing all the other boats/watercraft to operate in Kachemak bay is unfair and biased. Kachemak Bay is a public waterway & everyone deserves equal access.<br><br>Please repeal this ban to provide equal access to every user group. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Stan Walker | stan walker <stanowalker@mtaonline.net> | PO Box 3410 Palmer, AK 99645 | As a member of the Alaskan public I oppose removal of the PWC restriction from the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I understand the argument that access to Alaska's natural areas should be enjoyed equally by all user groups in areas where no user group's chosen mode of access is likely to degrade the resources, which is a valid argument for the fact that other power craft are allowed to be used to traverse the area. I doubt that most motor craft used to traverse the area to reach and use the adjacent state lands spend time churning the nearshore area the way PWC users are liable to do. Knowledgeable trained biologists were involved in creating the Critical Habitat Area, as well as instituting the ban and continue to recommend that the ban put in place should be allowed to stand. I understand that Fish and Game has an interest in maintaining equitable access by the public to their resources, but protecting the fish and wildlife resources is a primary responsibility of the department. PWC owners have plenty of water to use outside the Critical Habitat Area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Chandra Shaw | Chandra Shaw <shawbulldogs@hotmail.com> | | I am sending this email to make it known that I, Chandra Shaw, SUPPORT the REPEAL of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, and wish to see them legalized for personal use. I am a resident of Kachemak Bay and feel that they pose no great risk to our area, when they are used responsibly. It is for this reason I express my support in repealing the ban of jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Greg Svendsen | Greg Svendsen <gsvendsen@gci.net> | | I support the repeal of this Ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | percy houts | percy houts <houtsp@gmail.com> | | Lift the ban on PWC use in<br>Kachemak Bay. Be fair to all Alaskans. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Stephen Bartelli | Bartelli <bartelli@mtaonline.net> | Wasilla Ak | I would like to take a moment to voice my support for a full repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. This old law restricts access unnecessarily for a single user group while allowing access to other similar watercraft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Levi Schumacher | Levi Schumacher <levi@schu.net> | | My name is Levi Schumacher. I am a lifelong resident of the valley area in Alaska. I'd like to announce my support for the repeal of the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. I believe all Alaskans should have access to this land, and personal watercrafts are far more environmentally friendly than large boats. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Steve Adams | smokey3@gci.net | 1672 Farmers Loop Road. Fairbanks, Alaska 99709 | Repeal the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. There is no valid reason for the ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Charles Anderson | charles anderson <canderson@goldenfuelsystems.com> | Homer | PWC/ Jetski ban repeal..msg in PWC18 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Richard White | Richard White <nottakid2003@yahoo.com> | | Please count me in as a supporter of the repeal of the ban against PWC in Kachemak Bay | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Wayne C Grieme | Wayne C Grieme <waynec1941@gmail.com> | PO Box 58081 Fairbanks, AK 99711 | Please repeal the ban on PWC's on Kachemak Bay. This is a ridiculous ban. We go to the Kenai Peninsula every summer to visit our son in Kenai and daughter in Anchor Point. We also enjoy boating and fishing on Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Robert Porter | Rob Porter <rob.porter20@gmail.com> | Po Box 15055 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | I am writing this brief email in support of repealing the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay. I have been a lifelong Alaskan and was born and raised in this town of Homer. I fully support repealing the PWC ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | George Rauscher | George <gdr@mtaonline.net> | | When local Alaska residents in the Homer area convinced then Governor Tony Knowles to close the entire Kachemak Bay waters to the use of "boats you seat on as opposed to in" there was no evidence to suggest PWC were anymore detrimental to the coastal public waters than numerous other allowed activities. It was a political decision based on sketchy scientific data at best.<br>Alaska's State Constitution makes it clear, Article 8, Section 3. Common Use;<br>".... waters are reserved to the people for common use"<br>Regulated use of PWC in Kachemak Bay allows the public to recreate on fairly safe nearshore waters that are accessible to many Alaskans who live in Alaska for the opportunities provided to them on public lands and waters. There is no justification for local residents to not share the public lands/waters near their place of residence with fellow Alaskans. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Duane Christensen | dudeinak@alaska.net | Anchor Point | In consideration of the current ban on usage of PWC on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>My name is Duane Christensen, I have been a resident of Alaska since 1950 and in particular living in Anchor Point since 1989.<br><br>I was involved in the opposition to the ban when it was initially proposed. During that time, the supporters of the proposed ban never presented any factual data supporting their contentions; namely that PWC are polluters of the water and noise due to the 2-stroke engines, and presented a danger to wildlife. They used 20-30 year old data on the engines, of which virtually none were in use. At the time all brands met or exceeded EPA standards, yet that information was ignored. The worst part of that process tho, in my opinion, was the state government support for the ban, namely the head of the park service. I can understand individuals being driven by their own agenda or ideology, as long as it does not directly impact my rights without clear factual data supporting their thinking. In this case, the government took action in banning PWC irrespective of the factual data and denied other citizens their right to use/own PWC for recreation or utilization, simply because a few malcontents didn't 'like' PWC's.<br><br>Of course there was no mention of the hundreds of charter boats, pleasure boats, tug operations, tankers, c-130's doing touch-and-go's, aircraft of all sorts zipping back and forth; just PWC's. My family has been denied the opportunity to use PWC simply because a few folks didn't like them. This is the definition of an authoritarian, out-of-control government our founding fathers warned us of.<br><br>It is way past time for this atrocity to be rectified. The bottom line on this issue is this: are there any real, factual data supporting the contention that PWC presents a greater danger or threat to the health of the Bay or to the wildlife than other currently allowed activity? The answer is simple. No. Then eliminate the ban. Today. This ban is ludicrous, irresponsible and unnecessary. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Bette Seaman | Bette Seaman <betteseaman@gci.net> | | See message: Re: Repeal of personal watercraft vehicles in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg | | | 1 | continuation of earlier comment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ira Edwards | Ira Edwards <rooster.skier@gmail.com> | | I am writing to support repealing of the PWC ban as listed in 5 AAC 95.310<br><br>I am paralyzed and in a wheelchair since a work accident in 2010. As such, I have limited torso control. Using a PWC will allow me to be able to remain more upright and once again explore the bay as I used to while paddling a kayak. I am grateful that you are exploring this regulation change and I would love to answer any question you might have for me as a recreational user with a disability. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Richard Schroeder | Akrico1 <akrico1@gmail.com> | | I am writing in appeal for strongest recommendation to repeal the ban of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.<br>It is difficult to fathom that a relatively low horsepower personal watercraft can have any more significant impact on the environment than the numerous amount of much larger and powerful propeller and impeller driven craft actively use the waterways in question.<br>As a 52yr Alaskan resident, I strongly urge the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to have the ban repealed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Mary Willden | Mary Willden <mairmeeak@gmail.com> | | I am sending this email to make it known that I, Mary Willden, support the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, and wish to see them legalized for personal use. I have been a Kachemak Bay resident for (amount of time) and feel that they pose no great risk to our area, when they are used responsibly. It is for this reason I express my support in repealing the ban of jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Brian Willden | The Willdens <thewilldens@gmail.com> | | I am sending this email to make it known that I, Brian Willden, support the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, and wish to see them legalized for personal use. I have been a Kachemak Bay resident for (amount of time) and feel that they pose no great risk to our area, when they are used responsibly. It is for this reason I express my support in repealing the ban of jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Colton Collier | Colton Collier <colton@ccollier.com> | PO BOX 123 Seldovia, AK 99663 | I am sending this email to make it known that I, Colton Collier, support the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay, and wish to see them legalized for personal use. I have been a Kachemak Bay resident for over 30 years and feel that they pose no great risk to our area, when they are used responsibly. It is for this reason I express my support in repealing the ban of jet skis and other personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Ricky Carns | ricky carns <rickycarns@yahoo.com> | 3000 E Naomi Ave Wasilla AK | Alaska's State Constitution makes it clear, Article 8, Section 3. Common Use;<br>".... waters are reserved to the people for common use"<br>Regulated use of PWC in Kachemak Bay allows the public to recreate on fairly safe nearshore waters that are accessible to many Alaskans who live in Alaska for the opportunities provided to them on public lands and waters. There is no justification for local residents to not share the public lands/waters near their place of residence with fellow Alaskans.<br>Emails of support to repeal the PWC ban sent to rick.green@alaska.gov are important to assure ADF&G that lifting the ban is the preference among beneficial uses. You can help protect everyone's right to access publicly owned lands and waters throughout Alaska by emailing your support today. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Brian Steele. | Brian <2sagedevelopment@gmail.com> | | To whom it may concern, I would like to voice my support for repealing the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. It is my belief that navigable waters should be open to the public. ALL the public, and targeted groups should not be banned from using a public resource without due process and extremely persuasive factual evidence of detrimental harm being done. Please contact me if you need any additional information. Sincerely, Brian Steele. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Marvin Ebnet | Marvin Ebnet <mae1@acsalaska.net> | 9400 spring hill drive anchorage ak 99507 | I wish to voice my support to repeal the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. There is no evidence that this is at all detrimental but does single out unfairly one segment of watercraft and watercraft user. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Tom Martin | Tom and Danita Martin (Anchorage, AK) <yooperak@aol.com> | | Let's get this done with, repeal the watercraft ban now, many sportsman use these crafts for hunting and fishing access, come on Rick, use your magic! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Heather Lewis | Heather Lewis <heatherlewis0001@gmail.com> | Homer | I just wanted to voice my voice FOR opening up Kachemak Bay to jet skis. It would be a welcome change! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Tara Schmidt | Tara Schmidt <tcschmidt@alaska.edu> | Homer, AK 99603 | I'm a lifelong Alaskan who votes. I am adamantly opposed to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay waters. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Jennifer Hawkins | jennifer hawkins <jennanneshannonmary@gmail.com> | | Do not lift the ban on Jetskis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Allison Galbraith | Allison Galbraith <ak.nanooks@gmail.com> | | I would like to register my opposition to allowing jet skis in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | S. T. Roufa | sharon roufa <sharonybaloney@gmail.com> | 233 E. Bunnell Ave. Homer, AK 99603 | I oppose this quick and dirty move to repeal a sensible ban on personal watercraft in the critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay. These craft are used very differently than other vessels and are not a good fit for an area that includes a water trail, world class fishing, and marine wildlife. And even if special interest user groups had valid reasons to change the management plan to include pwc's, they need to do it properly, using the revision process that includes experts in the protection and preservation of fish and wildlife within the critical habitat area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Jackie Forster | Jackie Forster <jaxforster@gmail.com> | PO Box 3579 Homer, AK 99603 | Personal Watercraft ('jetskis') have no place in Kackemak Bay.<br><br>Existing watercraft uses (fishing, sightseeing, transportation, wildlife viewing) are inclusive and leave room for mutual, shared enjoyment of Kachemak Bay resources, whereas Jetskis are, by their nature and intended use, incompatible with existing uses.<br><br>Jetskis are not compatible with existing Kachemak Bay use patterns due to the fact that while high speed joyriding is fun and exciting for the operator, this intended usage places others in the area, particularly the kayakers who support numerous small local businesses, at substantial physical risk.<br><br>In addition to the clear safety issues posed by introducing jetskis to coastal areas heavily utilized by kayakers, the noise, physical presence, and traditional use patterns expected of PWCs impact the product and brand of local businesses that depend on clients seeking out the seclusion, quiet, and exposure to wildlife that are the trademarks of Kachemak Bay tour operators and lodging concerns.<br><br>Jetskis are cool machines that their owners have every right to enjoy. So are dirtbikes. So are roller skates and bicycles, and kayaks. However, there are good reasons that dirtbikes are not allowed on bike paths or in roller skating rinks- the same reasons that Jetskis have no place in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Robert Townsend | Andrea Miller <shadedwonders@yahoo.com> | Halibut Cove | I've lived in Alaska for 51 years and in Halibut Cove since 1993. The prohibition against personal watercrafts, or Jet Ski's should absolutely stand. They are not a good fit for Kachemak Bay and will negatively impact the environment, the wildlife, and the marine animals -- from whales to sea otters to all the sea birds. Also, Jet skis do not fulfill the same function as a small skiff. Don't kid yourself; they are primarily designed for thrills, not as a means of transportation. The chaos at Big Lake should not be the model for Kachemak Bay. My vote is "no". | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Sammy Walker | Sammy Walker <smamaw64@gmail.com> | | I am expressing my dismay at the jet ski ban repeal. I was born and raised in homer, and I am disheartened to see the water that I have subsistence and commercially fished turned into a chaotic and dangerous environment, all so lower 48 tourists can get their fun and then go home. Some of us actually live here and rely on Kachemak bay, and we feel strongly against this repeal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Larry | h82luz@gmail.com | | See message: Dunleavy Administration Doing Awesome! K-Bay.msg in PWC19 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Tessa Tibbetts | Tessa Tibbetts <tessamarietibbetts.23@gmail.com> | | It would be great to have jet skis allowed in the bay, living in Seldovia there isn't much to do and this would be so fun! It wouldn't hurt to the bay at all. I live in Seldovia Alaska :) | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Calem Collier | Calem <calemcollier@hotmail.com> | Seldovia | I am in support of lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak bay. Lifelong Alaskan and always wanted a jet ski! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Thomas Byers | Thom Byers <oasisofsnow@yahoo.com> | | See message: Jet ski ban in homer is unjust.msg | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Mark Boydston | Mark Boydston <mayboy9942@gmail.com> | 36995 Ansel St N Soldotna, AK 99669 | I support ADFG continuing the ban on jet ski operation in the Kachemak Bay CHA based on ADFG recent research and also to reduce additional stress on the Kachemak Bay marine ecosystem from climate change | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Linda Wagner | Linda Wagner <ladybear77@hotmail.com> | | I am against allowing Jet Ski s on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Doug Dodd | doug <dugdodd@yahoo.com> | Homer | The Fish and Game plan to allow 'personal watercraft' in Kachemak Bay is a bad idea. Please count me as a No on this issue. Jet skis should not be allowed in the bay. Period. As an Alaskan and a Homer resident, I have many reasons for this opinion, but I doubt you care to hear them.<br><br>If you do, I can be contacted by email or by phone. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Mike Illg | Michael Illg <alaskacreations52@gmail.com> | 934 Larkspur Ct Homer, AK 99603 | As an Alaska resident who lives close to Kachemak Bay, I am emailing you to express my opposition to lifting the jet ski ban in Kachemak Bay. My primary concern is safety. Kachemak Bay already does not have adequate emergency response on the water for current boaters, kayakers and paddle boarders and by adding yet a other segment of people to create yet additional risks is short sighted and will be an additional cost and stress to the existing and inadequate emergency response services we already have. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | John Bushell | John Bushell <jb@alaskajohnnyb.com> | Alaska | Thank you for taking comments.<br><br>I am opposed to jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>NO | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Métis Riley | M <bymetis@gmail.com> | | As a lifelong Alaskan, I appreciate and respect the fact that we all recreate and enjoy the outdoors in different ways. However, I grew up near Big Lake in the MatSu Valley and distinctly remember the noise and chaos from jet skis. In fact, the noise and disruption on the lake is so great that any other use is negatively impacted by the jet skis.<br><br>Please do not let one unnecessary group ruin Kachemak Bay for everyone else. One of the reasons my husband and I bought property in Homer is the peace and quiet that the Matsu Valley just does not offer. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Kelly Lockwood | Kelly Lockwood <kellylfish@gmail.com> | | A firm no from this 20 year Homer resident who has lived across the bay as well. Jet skis are not appropriate for this bay. Thank you for considering changing your own views. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Kathryn Carssow | Kathryn Carssow <kcarssow@live.com> | | NO! Jet ski use negatively impacts wildlife and is incompatible with current uses of Kachemak Bay. Rushing this decision outside a thoughtful and reasonable public process is disrespectful of Alaskans. It is the Govenor's disregard for what Alaskans hold dear that is fueling his recall. No, no, no! Listen to us Dunleavy administration! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Shirley Forquer | Shirley Forquer <forqhoak@xyz.net> | Homer | I am totally against opening Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area to personal water craft. I vote NO. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Suzanne Torian | Kachemak Shellfish Growers <info@alaskaoyster.com> | P.O. Box 3162 Homer, Alaska 99603 | Do not lift the jetski ban in Kachemak Bay. The decision to have a ban is correct, to undo it is just plain stupid and wrong. Humans are not the only living beings on this planet. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Deborah Anderson | Deborah Anderson <paragondeb@gmail.com> | | I am against any decision to OVERTURN the current ban on “JetSki’s “ in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>We have enough user groups and crafts to look out for we do not need to add fast, small JetSki’s into the mix. They have plenty of lakes they can use. With the tide system and probably of problems, fatalities would be certain!<br><br>This is not something to be taken lightly, if one crashes with a boat, think of the resources that would be needed to rescue and clean-up. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Robert Glen | Robert Glen <bglen.ak@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I am a frequent user of Kachemak Bay for fishing and recreation. The Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area was founded on good scientific principles and has for the most part succeeded in keeping the bay relatively safe for users and wildlife. The science behind the original decision has not changed.<br><br>I have ridden jet skis and they are great fun. Almost all waters in Alaska are open to jet skis now. Those few areas closed are done for good reason and are no hardship on jet skiers. They are fast, maneuverable, thrilling toys but are incompatible with the wildlife rich area of Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I am strongly opposed to the proposed regulation change and will vote against any politicians who support the change. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Pat Murray | P Murray <mrpm@alaska.net> | Kasilof | Please Don’t change the rules for Jet skiing in Katchemak Bay!<br>There is no need for that. Listen to the people that live there and nearby. This would be of no benefit to any of the critters or sealife.<br>Don’t let commercial interest rule over the residents wishes. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Ken Landfield | Ken Landfield <keng2013@gmail.com> | | This is a no vote for jetskis on Kachemak Bay. A critical habitat area should not be a place where wildlife will be negatively impacted without an excellent reason. The only reason I can think of that might override the need to protect a designated critical habitat area would be for rescue purposes, if indeed such craft can be used that way, in which case a waiver might be issued for HPD, HVFD, or the USCG. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Gerald Frederick | Jerry Frederick <fishtree_2@yahoo.com> | PO Box 795 Homer | My name is Gerald Frederick & I am a 48 year resident of Kachemak bay & I wish to go on record strongly opposing the repeal of the jetski ban on the bay. I spend a lot of time on the water, working across the bay, & I witness enough bad behavior with the existing boat traffic, especially in the summer months. Personal watercraft would only make matters worse. I would like to remind your office that the bay is designated a critical habitat area, & given the numbers of wildlife occupying these waters, from whales to otters to the rafts of birdlife, jetskis pose a real risk to all who dwell in this, their native habitat. The decision from your office to repeal the ban seems to be politically motivated rather than biologically informed; why is this? Having spent most of my life living in Homer, I can concur that the majority of local residents are not in favor of the repeal of this ban. Please take this in to account when making your decisions | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Deborah Smith | Debbie Smith <ton@xyz.net> | 41589 Spruce Knoll St. Homer, AK 99603 | My name is Deborah Smith and I have lived in Homer since 1972. After listening to you on KBBI it is clear that you only want to hear a yes or no on the ban of Jet Skis. I do NOT want jet skis allowed in Kachemak Bay. Hope you got that in your count. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Joan Frederick | dkrajdp <dkrajdp@aol.com> | Homer | I do not want personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I come from the midwest, where jet skis have ruined many lakes thru shore erosion and destruction of spawning beds. The impeller method of propulsion has detrimental impact on shoreline and vegetation since they can run in shallow water, and the spit in Homer does not need any more erosion.<br><br>In addition, I question where and how would these personnal watercraft launch? The existing harbor in Homer is at capacity, and it would be dangerous to introduce small craft into the busy flow of power boats coming and going. Launching from the outer bay side by driving on the beaches would result in further destruction of the shoreline and habitat, and could only be accomplished on high tide. And the whole thrill of driving personal watercraft is "riding the waves" which only occurs within the wave areas near the shore, in the most shallow water, thereby increasing erosion.<br><br>I suppose someone would need to build a dedicated harbor for these personnal craft on the inner side of the spit. Or set up a launch business similar to Anchor Point beach, and we all know that shoreline has been destroyed.<br><br>And that brings up bird habitat on the inner side of the spit. Migrating birds are already challenged by the existing water traffic. I can't see a way that personal watercraft use could improve or mitigate that impact.<br><br>Finally, search and recovery organizations would need to be increased. Most drivers of personal watercraft are in it for the thrills. The original name for these craft was wave runners. Their use results in increased accidents and dangers to others, especially in casual or new users.<br><br>I hope that no personal watercraft will be allowed in Kachemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Warren Bumgarner | Lead Dog <wbbumgarner@gmail.com> | | I am writing you in support of the repeal to personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay.<br>More of this kind of action is needed. The Dunleavy administration understands the Kachemak Bay belongs to all the people. Fair and equal access is a right all Alaskans have. The state simply does not have the right to separate then ban watercraft of a individual type and allow other individual types to operate when they all operate under the same regulations.<br><br>Take a look at the attitudes and the reasoning that caused these administrative codes to come to being in the first place and I think most would agree its time for the codes to go. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Colter Demers | Colter Demers <colterdemers@yahoo.com> | | Jet skies should not be banned from Kachemak Bay in Homer, AK. I was born and raised in Homer and I feel that they are quieter and better for the environment then any prop skiff. The access provided is comparable with backcountry snowmachining and I feel that the ban was placed for personal gain by Mako Haggerty and his water taxi service and kayaking rental businesses. Do not ban jet skies, thank you Colter Demers. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Daisy Berbeco | Daisy Wheeler <magmadaisy@gmail.com> | Seldovia AK 99663 | I am a waterfront property owner in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area and I am strongly opposed to lifting the ban on personal watercraft under 16' because it goes against my interests.<br><br>Please regard this as a NO vote on lifting the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Karen Northrop | Karen Northrop <kanorthrop@gmail.com> | Homer | I want to voice my opinion that allowing PWS or Jet Ski type watercraft in Kachemak Bay is not appropriate for the bay and the wildlife that call it home. I am against Fish and Game's proposal to repeal the existing ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | John. Jensen. | John Jensen <norwejohn@gci.net> | 12900 Patrick Rd Anchorage 99516 | We should not be considering removing the jetski ban in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. The science says no. Reasonable people say no. It is not unreasonable to have a ban there because here are other open places to use. Those places may not be as convenient for some people but there are other values at play here and we should continue to value and protect critical habitats | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | John Wiles | Jack Wiles <wilesmichaud@msn.com> | PO Box 639 Homer AK 99603 | See message: Kachemak Bay Jet Ski Ban .msg in PWC19 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Chuck and Kelly Wirschem | Chuck Wirschem <alaskaskytrekking@gmail.com> | Bear Cove | We have been property owners in Bear Cove since 1978. We are vehemently opposed to jet ski usage in K-Bay.<br><br>We cannot imagine a more offensive intrusion to our peace and quiet. It would be a total invasion of the cultural experience. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | JaDee Moncur | JaDee Moncur <jmoncur@ssa-tsgi.com> | 2220 E. 88th Avenue Anchorage, AK 99507 | I am all for PWC having equal access in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat. Not having access there is one of the reasons that I have not purchased a PWC. I was thinking about it until I did some research and found out that one of the areas that I wanted to explore was off limits. I am glad this rule change is being proposed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Mike Folkerts | Folkerts, Michael R CIV <Michael.R.Folkerts@uscg.mil> | | I am in favor of the PWC ban repeal for K-Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Terry Yager | Terry Yager <terry@kachemakgroup.com> | Homer | I'm currently an owner of two Jet Skis or PWC's.<br>I am totally against Jet Skis being allowed on Kachemak Bay. My Jet Skis are used at our lake property located in the upper Kenai Peninsula area. The lake does have some birds native to Alaska but not the sea otters, whales and many other marine animals that would been harmed by the quickness and speed of a Jet Ski.<br>As a businessman that has lived in Homer for years and has been directly involved in the tourist business, I cannot began to tell you how many times I have heard kayakers, paddle boarders or tour boat operators talking about how great it is to paddle up close to a sea otter and her pup eating a clam on her belly.<br>The commercial usage of the oyster growers and the other types of user groups that depend on the calm waters of this one of a kind Kachemak Bay critical habitat area cannot survive without the normal usage of what Mother Nature has provided. What kind of rules and regulations would be necessary to not destroy what the Kachemak Bay and the Kenai Peninsula can never replace if this law was repealed.<br>Please do not allow what nature has provided us in the lower Peninsula, that very few people every get to enjoy.<br>Let the Jet Ski community enjoy their PWC's on areas that are not as fragile as our marine ecosystem, that we are so very fortunate to have in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Korey Cronquist, Team CC | Korey Cronquist <korey@teamcc.com> | Eagle River/ Wasilla | Please accept my comment in support to lift the PWC BAN in Kachemak Bay for all user groups to enjoy the waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Brandon Young | Brandon Young <brandon.comanche@gmail.com> | | As a transplant from Minnesota, I grew up riding jetskis. They're awesome. I have two little boys who would love them. But, I have to say no to them in our bay. Too much other stuff going on- boats, animals, camping. If they are allowed, I'd love a restriction to outside the smaller bays. Tutka, Jakalof, Sadie would all be ruined with them buzzing all times of the day and night. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Cal Schmidt | Cal and Deb <cndsalso@gmail.com> | Homer, AK | Allowing jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area - please don't do it for all the reasons they were disallowed in the first place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Willy Dunne | Willy Dunne <wdunne907@gmail.com> | | Hello Mr. Green,<br><br>I understand questions regarding the proposed changes to Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area regulations relating to use of Personal Water Craft should be directed to you.<br><br>Can you tell me what scientific literature and or studies the proposed rule change is based on? | | | 1 | shows response sent 12/12/2019 from R. Green | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Andy L. Pevehouse | Andy L. Pevehouse <alpevehouse@gilmanlawak.com> | 130 South Willow Street, Suite 3 Kenai, Alaska 99611 | I oppose opening K-Bay to personal watercraft. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Alex Fefelov | Alex Fefelov <intrepidllc@gmail.com> | | Hello, i would like to see the pwc ban lifted from kbay, there are many reasons, from how it got into place to begin with to pwc are less invasive then many smelly boats i see in the bay, neither here nor there now. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Carol Comfort | Carol Comfort <78chickens@gmail.com> | | I am a Homer/Anchor Point resident of 30+ years, having moved here from the Puget Sound area. I return to Gig Harbor WA each summer and put up with an extreme irritation to every living creature, the JetSki.<br><br>Suffice it to say, living near Kachemak Bay remains a more peaceful environment thanks to our personal watercraft ban. Please allow the public process to overturn the ban be fair and equitable for all. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Pat Irwin | Pat Irwin <pat49below@gmail.com> | 939 Ocean Drive Loop Homer | Jetskis are toys and have no business in a Critical Habitat Area. I vote NO on allowing them in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Carol G. Harding | Carol G. Harding <carolgharding1@gmail.com> | PO Box 2154, Homer, Alaska 99603 | See message: NO NO NO to jet skis (personal watercraft) in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC19 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Marion Kinter | Marion Kinter <kinterm@outlook.com> | PO Box 443 3830 Calamari Ct Homer, AK 99603 | Please make note of my input on this debate as NO on reversing the current (in place for the last 20 years) JetSki ban in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Gerard Garland | Gerard Garland <garlandg@outlook.com> | Homer | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to allow jetskis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>That idea is just as bad today as it was in 2001.<br><br>Before approving jetskis in Kachemak Bay please review all the reasons from that time that led to their prohibition.<br><br>Let's be clear. No one is prohibited from using and enjoying Kachemak Bay. They just have to leave their jetskis behind. Quite simple, really.<br><br>Having endured the assault from those things on Lena Cove during our years living in Juneau it grieves me to think we could be subjected to that same activity again. Noisy, nonsensical zipping here and there, going around and around in circles of ever-diminishing radius. Ride 'em cowboy! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Michael Forbes | Michael Forbes <siskinak@mac.com> | Homer, AK | Personal Watercraft ('jetskis') have no place in Kackemak Bay.<br><br>Existing watercraft uses (fishing, sightseeing, transportation, wildlife viewing) are inclusive and leave room for mutual, shared enjoyment of Kachemak Bay resources, whereas Jetskis are, by their nature and intended use, incompatible with existing uses.<br><br>Jetskis are not compatible with existing Kachemak Bay use patterns due to the fact that while high speed joyriding is fun and exciting for the operator, this intended usage places others in the area, particularly the kayakers who support numerous small local businesses, at substantial physical risk.<br><br>In addition to the clear safety issues posed by introducing jetskis to coastal areas heavily utilized by kayakers, the noise, physical presence, and traditional use patterns expected of PWCs impact the product and brand of local businesses that depend on clients seeking out the seclusion, quiet, and exposure to wildlife that are the trademarks of Kachemak Bay tour operators and lodging concerns.<br><br>Jetskis are cool machines that their owners have every right to enjoy. So are dirtbikes. So are roller skates and bicycles, and kayaks. However, there are good reasons that dirtbikes are not allowed on bike paths or in roller skating rinks- the same reasons that Jetskis have no place in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | John Sanborn | John Sanborn <jws38stu@hotmail.com> | 347 Porcupine Ct. Unit 13 Soldotna, AK 99669 | It makes me sad when we turn against laws that were designed to make each of us respect the Earth. Our planet which sustains a large variety of life deserves our respect and help in preserving it. Your desire to repeal the ban on jet skis, etc. makes no sense whatsoever. The area was set up to preserve the marine life and allow fishing to flourish, but your repeal would undermine that. Please do not repeal the ban but rather promote it, tell everyone we respect the land we and other life call home. Thank you for your time and for doing what is right for the Earth and all of her inhabitants. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Susan Vogt | Susan and Pete Vogt <bias@alaska.net> | 269 Bias Dr Fairbanks AK | The Alaska Legislature created the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area (CHA) in 1974 "to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Your reversal of the watercraft ban is the direct opposite!! Stop catering to special interests. No to lifting the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | **Paul J. Allan** | Paul Allan <pallan99@gmail.com> | 457 Mountain View Dr. Homer, AK 99603 | Since you indicated input on this issue was either a yes or no vote, I will state that I am AGAINST allowing personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I could give many reasons including the protection of the habitat and animal life, but you have indicated you really don't see my reasons as having any meaning or impact. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Kathryn Carovano | Kathryn Carovano <kcarovano@alaska.net> | | I am writing to express my opposition to the change in regulations that would allow jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. There is solid science and loads of public input opposing their use. Their benefit is solely recreational, and for only a small user group. On the other hand, they will have an impact on the habitat as well as anyone in the area who has to listen to their noise. There are plenty of other places in AK where they can play. They do not need access to Kachemak Bay. Thank you for you consideration, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Angie and Tom Hamill | Angie Hamill <angie.hamill.ak@gmail.com> | | Both my husband and I are against allowing jetskis in Kachemak Bay. They represent the opposite of how you protect a critical habitat area. The are loud, unsafe, can cause pollution in the water. Their noise and speed can have a negative impact on the special wildlife of the area. The thought of jetskis in Kachemak Bay makes me feel physically sick. I beg you to maintain the common sense of keeping Kachemak Bay free of jetskis. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Robert Fimon | Robert Fimon <akmoxie@yahoo.com> | | A big NO for allowing thos access. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Kim Smith | Kim Smith <krsmith1002@gmail.com> | P.O. Box 3235 Homer, Alaska 99603 | I am a 42 year resident of Homer and a very frequent user of Kachemak Bay. Sitting here on the east coast, two days before open heart surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, I see that you and Governor Dunleavy think it's a great idea to open the waters of the Bay to personal watercraft.<br><br>I thought my heart ached already. My goal in recovering from having my ribs cracked open and my aorta fixed is to find the strength to paddle in the quiet and serenity of that glorious wilderness of Kachemak Bay. To spend another five days at Bill Bell and Mary Lou Kelsey's quiet cabin in Little Tutka , listening to the loons and seeing the magical blue herons appear. Paddling, mushrooming and picking blueberries in an environment that offers the opportunity to just be, to listen and observe.<br><br>This magical Bay has sustained many, with varied activities. I too, utilized the Bay in my early years with commercial fishing. I now sport fish and it never matters if I don't catch anything because the quiet, the birds, and the lapping waves provide plenty.<br><br>It is unthinkable that you would deny the voices of the majority who have strongly stated their desire to continue with a ban on these noisy, dangerous watercraft. Kachemak Bay is a rare jewel in a world filled with noise and hustle. It is a place we've protected and spoken for; for many, many years.<br><br>I beseech you to rethink your decision. This is not the place for jet skis. It is just wrong.<br><br>I thank you for listening to my thoughts. I will go in to surgery praying that the quiet, the birds and the waves will be waiting for me next summer. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Van Hawkins | Van Hawkins <vansaccount@gmail.com> | | I am against the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft for Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.I want the the ban on personal watercraft to remain in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Mary Griswold | Mary Griswold <mgrt@xyz.net> | Homer | Please do not repeal the personal watercraft ban in Kachemak Bay. Jet skis are too nimble and too fast to be compatible with wildlife, especially since Kachemak Bay has become a hangout for whales. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | David Martindell | David Martindell <davidmartindell@gmail.com> | Homer | Opposed to it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Scott Jouppi | sisusuomi <hotjouppi@gmail.com> | | Our family owns or owned kayaks, recreational salt water fishing boat, river boats and jet skis, so our knowledge of this topic isn't foreign to us.<br>We are against lifting the current ban on jet skis in the critical areas of Kachemak Bay. There's plenty of water for recreational jet skiers to utilize outside of this area.<br>We use the Kenai area for fishing from kayaks not our power boat and we're always leery of jet ski users from a personal safety issue. If the ban gets lifted I hope that there is an oversight written into the change IF accidents, alcohol/drugs are found on the jet ski users and/or habitat destruction is observed. Your average jet skier isn't too terrible but the few out there that consume alcohol and/or drugs while using the PWC can lead to more Big Lake like deaths and injuries. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Nancy Lord | Nancy Lord <njlord250@gmail.com> | | I am a long-time resident of Homer, Alaska and strenuously oppose changing regulations to allow jet skis and similar personal watercraft to operate within Kachemak Bay. Such use is NOT compatible with the critical habitat status of the bay. Skiffs are used for fishing and transportation here. Jet skis are recreational. They go fast and are disruptive to other users and wildlife. You may not know that an estimated 6000 sea otters live in the bay. We are also home to many migratory and resident sea- and shorebirds. It is not appropriate for jet skis to zoom around (or into) these resting and feeding animals. Importantly, there are many other places for jet skiers to recreate, and only one Kachemak Bay, which is already under plenty of stress by human use. NO NO NO to opening the critical habitat area to a use that is so clearly not in keeping with its purpose. The earlier justifications for not allowing jet skis to operate in the bay are still applicable--even more so today. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Dan Presley | Dan Presley <danpresley57@gmail.com> | 59218 East End Road, Homer Ak | Rick, i am in favor of allowing pwc oin katchemsk bay. As a young man, it was not outlawed, and it was a lot of fun. I see no reason for the ban except some homerites that wanted to stop progress.<br>Please lift the ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Bruce Service | Bruce Service <bruce328@earthlink.net> | 11250 Snowline Drive<br>Anchorage | Repeal of the prohibition of the use of jet skis and other personal watercraft in the CHA is an ill advised step.<br><br>Nothing good can come from this.<br><br>The use of these craft in the CHA is in direct opposition to the purpose that the area was set aside in the first place.<br><br>Even a small group of users can have an outsized impact as these craft are notoriously loud, obnoxious and will negatively impact the appeal of the area. Even “considerate” users will detract from the integrity of the area and result in nuisance/harassment events to resident and migratory fish and wildlife.<br><br>This is a bad idea and the motivation behind the decision to repeal the prohibition is questionable. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Lewis Hinnant | Yarrow Hinnant <trailhealer@gmail.com> | PO Box 15402<br>Fritz Creek, AK 99603 | I am writing in regard to the recent reconsideration of the ban on personal watercraft in the waters of Kachemak Bay. I am strongly opposed to this reconsideration. This issue was settled years ago, both in terms of scientific evidence and public interest. Any proposal that seeks to lift this ban is undemocratic and hostile to those of us who live near Kachemak Bay. I can see Kachemak Bay from my home, and like many other locals (a majority, which has already been demonstrated clearly) I don’t want the intrusion, noise pollution and damage to wildlife that personal watercraft would inevitably bring.<br><br>If you can’t see the difference between a skiff and a jet ski, maybe you should resign from your position, and stop describing yourself as a boat man. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Robert | Robert <rddecino@hotmail.com> | | No | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Kelsey Diane Haas | Kelsey Diane Haas <haaskd@tcd.ie> | | I oppose the use of personal watercraft (jet skis) on Kachemak Bay. The existing ban should remain unchanged. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Katlyn Oberholtzer | Katlyn Oberholtzer <katehaas15@gmail.com> | | I oppose the use of personal watercraft (jet skis) on Kachemak Bay. The existing ban should remain unchanged | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Buck Kunz | Buck Kunz <buckkunz@gmail.com> | | I would strongly support the usage of Jet Ski's in Kachemak Bay. I am the owner of Mike's Welding located in Sterling, Ak, and we are heavily involved in the marine industry. We also have a cabin in Seldovia and recreate there often. With the advances of four stroke engines, i don't see any negative affect that allowing jet skis would have. The positives would be a huge boost in tourism to the homer, seldovia, halibut cove communities. You would be bringing in a new user group of adventurers to the area. Boats can cost upwards to $50,000 for a sea worthy boat, and a person can easily get set up and do some of the wonderful kachemak bay activities on a jet ski for under $15,000. It is time to lift the ban! The watercraft technology is definitely here. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Benn Levine | bennlevine@gci.net | Homer, Alaska | See message: Proposed changes to ADG&F regulations on the use of Personal Watercraft in Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas.msg in PWC19 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Dale Banks | Dale Banks <dale@loopylupine.com> | PO Box 2888 Homer, Alaska 99603 | I am opposed to the repeal of the ban on personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas. I heard you discussing the issue on the radio and you mentioned that it is a matter of providing access to these areas. That argument is wrongheaded since PWC are not used for access typically, they are used for thrill riding. The ban in these two areas has been supported repeatedly by the public and by ADF&G managers and biologists. I do not appreciate the manner in which this proposed change is occurring outside of the management plan process, apparently to satisfy the interests of a small percent of Alaskans with an interest in PWC.<br>Please respond to the following questions.<br>•What evidence do you have that supports the claim that allowing PWC use in these areas will "increase access for Alaskans to the property that we all own equally" as you stated on the radio?<br>•What evidence are you citing to show that PWC are compatible with the purpose of protecting and preserving the critical habitat area?<br>•Why have you put this proposal forward outside of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area Management Plan review process?<br>•You have asked commenters to simply "toggle yes or no" yet indicated that the numbers are just "some legalities that we have to go through." If the comments are tallied and support not repealing the ban, will you support the public process and recommend to the Commissioner that the ban not be repealed? If not, why? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Hugh and Janet Gellert | Hugh Gellert <hgellert@ak.net> | Kasitsna Bay | We own a house on Kasitsna Bay across Kachemak Bay south of Homer. We are strongly opposed to allowing the use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay as outlined further below.<br><br>As state government studies have shown Kachemak Bay is one of the richest marine environments in the world supporting over 231species of birds, 450 species of marine invertebrates and 100 species of fish including all five species of Pacific salmon.Most of Kachemak Bay is designated a Critical Habitat Area. This is a significant reason why the state government has previously opposed the use of jet skis. Nothing has changed,<br><br>Mr. Green, you were quoted in the “Homer News”: We already allow watercraft into the critical habitat area. And we And we don’t see personal watercraft as being any more damaging to fish and wildlife perpetuation than a 16-foot boat”<br><br>This statement can only charitably be described as naive. Jet skis in Alaska are used are used for the thrills of tight turns at high speed near shore. They are mostly used for high speed marine recreation in relatively small areas. Larger slower vessels are used in Kachemak Bay in point to pint transportation and to go to fishing grounds. We don’t see jet skis being used to go to fishing areas or to and from Homer Harbor. High speed. tightly turning jet skis are also a hazard to kayaking. another significant tourist and resident recreation activity. The use of jet skis will take money away from kayak tour operators.<br><br>The use of jet skis in Kachemak Bay is like the use of racing dirt bikes in nice residential subdivisions. The bikes are not allowed because they are noisy and endanger other users. If you think jet skis in Kachemak Bay are such a good idea you and your fellow-thinking state officials should press for the use of dirt bikes in your neighborhoods.<br><br>We urge you to withdraw this repeated attempt to open up Kachemak Bay to a noxious use. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Ken Lares | ken lares <kenlares@hotmail.com> | | I would like to enthusiastically share my support for removing the ban on pwc's in Kachemak Bay. Banning any user group without sound logic or in a biased fashion is a precedent we should all seek to avoid and reverse when possible. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Aaron Glidden | Aaron Glidden <aaronglidden@yahoo.com> | | I live in Homer, and have for nearly all of my life. I am in favor of repealing the ban on PWC. I think they will be a boon to the tourism industry. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | James Lunny | James Lunny <jimlunny@gmail.com> | | I am against raising the 20 year ban of skis on Kachemak Bay. I am angry that the Governor cares so little about the feelings of Alaskans that he is taking this action outside the management and planning process and rushing through this action to damage this critical area simply to please a small group of people. This is not an issue of equal access. It is an issue of wildlife protection and respect for stakeholders in the many resources of the bay. The Governor is only giving more weight to his bullying reputation. It is time for him to start listening to Alaskans as he so recently promised he was going to start doing. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Ed Reese | ED REESE <odenhal@sbcglobal.net> | Soldotna | See messsage: PWC use in Kachemak Bay 5AAC 95.310.msg in PWC19 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Dave Lewis | Dave And Lyn <davelyn@gci.net> | | I'm against PWC on K-Bay. I know you don't want reasons but, safety is a big one especially with people who don't know the bay, tides, day breeze and wildlife. You also have many business who rely on the wilderness aspect of K-Bay and they bring loads of $$$$ that could dry up with the buzz of PWC and just how it looks. There are more but that's enough, your interview made it sound like a done deal if that is so you will all have to live with what happens. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Larry Mentzel | Larry Mentzel <h82luz@gmail.com> | | See message: PWCA - K-Bay.msg in PWC19 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Josh Wisniewski | merganseranthro@gmail.com> | Seldovia | See message: RE: Governor Repeal of Personal Water Craft Ban on Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC19 | | | 1 | additional comment sent to Rep. Vance | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Doug Dodd | doug dodd <dugdodd@yahoo.com> | | Noise, overuse of the resource, danger to other users, harassment of marine life, pollution and degradation of the natural serenity of the bay. Some places should be reserved. Imagine the spring shorebird festivities, and the disruption even two or three of these motorized shit-boxes would wreak. That specific enough for ya'? 👍<br>Sent from my iPhone<br>On Dec 12, 2019, at 3:01 PM, Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov> wrote:<br><br>Mr. Dodd,<br><br>This is a public comment period so if you want to explain your reasons, please feel free and they will be entered into the record.<br><br>Thank you<br><br>Rick Green<br>Alaska Department of Fish and Game | | | | follow-up not recounted | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Jack Wiles | Jack Wiles <wilesmichaud@msn.com> | | See message: Re:Kachemak Bay Jet Ski Ban.msg in PWC19 | | | | follow-up not recounted | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Zane Henning | Zane Henning <zane.henning@truappenergy.com> | | Yes, I support the repeal.<br><br>On Wed, Dec 11, 2019, 8:08 AM Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov> wrote:<br>Zane,<br>Thank you. Is this a supportive comment of repealing the prohibition on PWC in Kachemak Bay, then?<br>Rick<br><br>From: Zane Henning <zane.henning@truappenergy.com><br>Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 4:55 PM<br>To: Green, Rick E (DFG) <rick.green@alaska.gov><br>Subject: Thank you<br><br>Rick,<br>Appreciate your common sense and fairness within ADF&G.<br>Best regards,<br>Zane Henning<br>Summer Seldovia resident | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Barb and Norrie Johnson | Barbara B Johnson <barbaraj1@mac.com> | | I'm writing to oppose repeal of the personal watercraft ban in areas of Kachemak Bay. My husband and I have spent our summers in Alaska since the 1980s and lived in Homer since November, 2017. We have enjoyed going to the spit for many years to watch the sea otters and their pups. In recent years we have not seen as many, but we have seen an increase in human activity and water sports around the spit. If personal watercraft are allowed in the areas proposed, they will disturb this important wildlife nursery, as well as their habitat and feeding grounds. They need these areas, and forcing them into deeper waters as their food sources are churned and chopped by personal watercraft will obviously put their future survival in peril. Please continue the personal watercraft ban to insure the survival of otters, shorebirds and other important species that need the habitat that Kachemak Bay's near shore waters provide. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Bette Seaman | Bette Seaman <betteseaman@gci.net> | Homer Alaska | Dear Mr. Green,<br>I have 2 questions on this proposed repeal:<br>1. Is there a fiscal note attached for increased enforcement and harbor modifications that might be needed for any significant increase in traffic, particularly during holidays?<br>2. Has Fish and Game conducted studies that indicate that vehicles that have the ability to move very quickly in near shore areas will not be harmful to marine life? In particular newborn seals on Fox River Flats? | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Richard Derkevorkian | Richard Derkevorkian <derkevrs@gmail.com> | Kenai Alaska | I am a second generation Alaskan and have lived in Kenai for 32 years. My son is a 3rd generation Alaskan and I want him to be able to access the waterways of Alaska by any form that's available. The personal watercraft ban I'm Kachemak Bay makes ABSOLUTELY zero sense. Bob Shavelson with Inletkeeper can take his 30' fiberglass boat out and pump the bildge and commode straight into the inlet but doesn't like the idea of a clean 500lb 4 stroke jet ski accessing the same water. The Voice of a few Homer Liberal elites with the backing of groups like Patagonia should not be able to limit all Alaskans from having the right to access that water. I just recently traveled to the Naples beach In<br>Florida. Right on the white sand beach In downtown Naples were hundreds of Yamaha Pwcs for rent. This is a beautiful beach and it was having absolutely zero impact on the thousands of people enjoying the beach.<br><br>Allowing pwcs In the bay would open up the bay to thousands of people that can't afford an expensive charter or 100,000$ boat.<br><br>Please remove this ridiculous ban that is limiting Alaskans rights | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Aaron Pfeil | Aaron <tinman4x@gmail.com> | | Let them ride!<br><br>PWC's have really evolved over the years and are now a viable platform for sport fishing.<br>Please vote to repeal the prohibition. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Larry Kropp | Larry Kropp <lakropp@mac.com> | | I would like to comment on the proposal to allow PWC's in Homer.<br><br>I think it's a great idea. The previous law was discriminatory towards those who can't afford bigger boats but still want to participate in on-water activities.<br><br>PWC's use far less fuel and for that reason alone are far friendlier to the environment. Smaller boats are better.<br><br>The original law was passed not because the people involved didn't like small boats… they didn't like the people who ride them. They don't fit the profile of a modern liberal, and although many agree with that approach, it's not fair. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Elaine Taddei-Nelson | E Taddei <egt753@hotmail.com> | Seldovia, Alaska | I am against the use of jet skis on Kachemak Bay. I own property there and feel that our wildlife are more important than having jet skis on the water. Please do not vote on repealing the ban. We need it and our wildlife need it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Russell Mumm | RUSSELL <russellmumm@hotmail.com> | PO Box 1192<br>Homer. AK 99603 | I would prefer that personal watercraft remain prohibited in critical habitat areas of Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Paul Eneboe MD | pleneboe@gmail.com | Homer Alaska | Please do not change the regulations to allow jet skis in the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. Jet skis should continue to be baned for both enviromental and easthetic reasons | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Tammy Hopkins | taxito32@gmail.com | | I have just sent a letter of protest to rick green on the opening up of Kachemac bay to jet skis. NoNoNo. This bay cannot handle personal watercraft, the traffic around the homer harbor has increased to an almost intolerable level in the 2 peak months. I can't imagine throwing these int the mix with kayakers and paddle boards. The most important, is what it will do the the wildlife. There is so much boat traffic as it is, I just don't see it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Eric Knudtson | epknudtson@gmail.com | 46560 East End Rd<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I would like to submit my support for maintaining the regulatory ban prohibiting personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. We've already previously banned these vehicles for good reasons based on the determination by both DNR and ADFG with a lengthy public process. I believe that jet skis are incompatible with the values protecting these lands and waters and harmful to wildlife and the environment. I am a kayaker and hiker who lives in Homer and frequently uses the bay. In addition to the adverse effects personal watercraft have on wildlife and the environment, I believe that jet ski use is incompatible with non-motorized recreationist use. Natural sounds and quiet are also resources of our public lands that deserve protection by managers and would be further compromised by allowing jet skis.<br><br>Thank you for this opportunity to voice my continuing support of the current regulatory bans prohibiting the use of personal watercraft in this unique, beautiful, and quiet area. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Rebecca Snow | rebeccansnow@gmail.com | PO Box 3149<br>Homer, AK 99603 | Please do what you can to stand up against opening legislation that would allow jet skis on Kachemak Bay. Jetskis would be harmful to wildlife and ruin the beautiful and peaceful beaches here! They could even affect tourism, as many tourists who come here would not appreciate them.<br><br>As a new member of the community, I teach creative writing for the college here and am also a mental health professional. I moved to Alaska a year ago to finish my second novel, fell in love with the incredible scenery and the town of Homer, and decided to stay.<br><br>The noise and disruption of jet skis would really do harm to the setting here in the summer, and we need to protect our wildlife in the sea more than ever. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Grant Fairbanks | Debbie Fairbanks <debbiefbanks@yahoo.com> | | The impetus for you action are well known by the public by now.The few jet ski users should not be over ridden by the thousands of present users whom enjoy the quiet areas of these waters as we now enjoy.As a fish and game employee your duties are to protect and preserve our fish and game.Your duties are not to promote jet ski use.The backlash from your actions will follow you in your short stay at the department.Please read the charter of the department and its mission statement. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Kirby and Toni Maury | Toni Maury <tonimaury@gmail.com> | Halibut Cove | We are writing to express our opposition to any changes to the ban on jet ski use in Kachemak Bay. We have been home owners in Halibut Cove since 1978 and have strong family ties to the area. We raised our children and now grandchildren on the waters of Kachemak Bay. In general the vessels on the bay are utilitarian in nature, for fishing and various transportation needs.<br>If the ban is maintained within the waters adjacent to Kachemak Bay State Park the boundaries would be confusing and expensive to enforce. Given the reality of state budgeting, the lack of enforcement would likely lead to jet skis entering prohibited areas which have been created to maintain the natural beauty and serenity of Kachemak Bay. Assuming the ban is maintained in the park, jet skis operating in the remaining areas would face the reality of the rough water conditions caused by the strong tides and winds of Kachemak Bay. This would force them into the more protected areas which are also the more populated areas. Halibut Cove has put out "No Wake" signs ay both ends of the protected water area, but it is not enforceable because the Community Association has no regulatory authority. The "No Wake" policy is an example the "will of the community", and the introduction of jet skis by the state would be an example of big government over riding local sentiment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Joe Griffo | Joe Griffo <joegriffoak@gmail.com> | | I just wanted to send you a note to let you know that I am strongly in favor of allowing JetSki's in Kachemak Bay. ——-The sooner the better.—- | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | MaryBeth Printz | MaryBeth Printz <printz.mb@gmail.com> | Anchorage, AK | See message: Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC20 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Karen Shemet | Don Pitcher <pitcher@xyz.net> | | I voice a big NO on this issue!!<br><br>That'd be the perfect way to wreck our bay and the exact experience that people come to Homer for, tranquility, peace and nature, not a Big Lake experience!!<br><br>This is a bad idea and I don't appreciate it being ram-rodded through either.<br><br>No, No, No and No way!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | larrifancher | larrifancher <larrifancher@gmail.com> | | Please open up the bay for personal water craft.. jet skis....it not right that few groups get to dictate this matter...its a big ocean out there.... | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | David Brittingham | amphibman7 <amphibman7@reagan.com> | Anchor Point | Hi Rick, i'm a resident of Anchor point. I just want to let you know I'm in favor of allowing jet skis in kachemak bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Tammy Hopkins, Tom Hopkins | Tamara Hopkins <taxito32@gmail.com> | | NoNoNo. I have been a commercial boat operator on this bay since 1986. I have seen the boat traffic greatly increase in the last five years. The congestion, particularly, around the homer spit is becoming intolerable if not dangerous. The insertion of jet skis, on top what we already have here is asking for trouble. Along with how I see Homer's growth, they don't fit in. I also don't think wildlife in this bay can tolerate them. It is bad enough with all the boat traffic as it is. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Margaret Griffo | Margaret Griffo <mkgriffo@gmail.com> | | Please register this email as a vote in support of the repeal of the Kachemak Bay jet ski ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Laurel Hilts | Laurel Hilts <lhilts@svt.org> | 279 Shoreline Drive<br>Seldovia, AK 99663 | I am in favor of having jet skiis in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Rick Foster | Rick Foster <rafoster@acsalaska.net> | | This letter in support of maintaining the Personal Watercraft moratorium in Kachemak Bay, and requesting an extension on the comment period.<br>As a past employee of Alaska Fish and Game Habitat Division and Sport Fish while at Kachemak Bay Research Reserve (KBNERR). My training and experience leads me to support the current moratorium. I have used personal watercraft in other water bodies for both research and recreation. While their use can be supported for research in warmer climes, as a recreational watercraft, it is likely to result in conflict between fishers, property owners,, shellfisheries, and wildlife. Kachemak Bay is a Critical Habitat and must be managed as thus. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Stan Lefton | Stan Lefton <slefton1@gmail.com> | | I'm also a" boat guy" just like you, and AGAINST personal watercraft use in critical habitat areas!<br>It's a tough call to make, intended to preserve the resource by it's critical habitat designation.<br>Let the guys use personal watercraft in designated areas like they do with dirt bikes in the deserts down south. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Sean Rhodes | Sean Rhodes <seanrh@icloud.com> | | I'd like to see the ban overturned. There are no reasons that PWC should be not be allowed in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>There is no difference between a PWC and a small skiff other than most PWCs are 4 stroke engines. Whereas there are still plenty of 2 stroke small outboards on skiffs in the bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Duncan Wanamaker | Duncan Wanamaker <dewanamaker@gmail.com> | | Hi Rick, I am a 40 year resident on the Kachemak Bay area. I strongly OPPOSE lifting the ban of jet skis in the Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Faith Schade | Faith Schade <fphc@horizonsatellite.com> | 35250 Schade Drive Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing in support of the repeal of the jet ski ban on Kachemak Bay. Allowing jet ski in the bay will allow the bay to be used by all the public not just the ones that feel their way is the only appropriate way. The two stroke argument of past discussions is not only ridiculous it is not a valid one. As almost all person water crafts are transitioning over to the 4 stroke motor. Plus there are already a large number of 2 stroke and 4 stroke motors that power skiffs and boats on Kachemak Bay. Thank you for allowing this to be discussed again. I support jet ski's and public use of Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Joseph Griffo | Joseph Griffo <jgriffo@fastmail.com> | | Please register this email as a vote in STRONG support of the repeal of the Kachemak Bay jet ski ban.<br><br>If pollution is of primary concern, I would like to propose consideration of a ban of diesel burning marine vessels. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Barrett Moe | Barrett Moe <barrettmoe@lppowersports.com> | PO Box 3334 Homer, AK 99603 | I support this new regulation to lift the 2001 ban on pwc. I want equal access for user groups on public waters. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Kevin Walker | Kevin Walker <homerkev@gmail.com> | 59975 Golden Plover Ave Kachemak City, AK 99603-1542 | See message: Keep the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area.msg in PWC20 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | rich fetterhoff | Rich Amy Fetterhoff <homerpioneerinn@gmail.com> | pioneer ave homer | please lift the ban on PWC in Kachemak bay.....thanks rich fetterhoff | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Dynamic Living | Dynamic Living <emmyellen@gmail.com> | | I would be glad to see the prohibition of personal watercraft lifted. I've rode jet ski before and to band them but still allow small boats serves no purpose, this needs to be lifted. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Allison Lentz | Allison Lentz <ajlentz2010@gmail.com> | | Having access to letting Jetskis in the bay is a just like owning a boat or car! Please help us get our freedom back! This has the potential of some tourist interest and its not like everyone will go out and buy a jetski. Please help us overturn this old ban! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Holly Alston | Holly Alston <beachgal88@hotmail.com> | Homer, Alaska | I am writing to you to let you know that I am opposed to the proposal by Fish and Game to lift the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I have lived in Florida, Hawaii and California as a previous Navy wife, and have heard and seen the effects of jet skis on the environment and other citizens.<br><br>Jet skis are loud, much louder than most boats. An 80dB jet ski is 4-6 times louder than an 80dB outboard boat. This is due to jet skis operating at full throttle all the time (thrill for speed is main reason for riding a jet ski). As jet skis leave the water during high speeds, they add 8-10dB more noise. Also, sharp turns add another 12-15dB of noise pollution.<br><br>Extreme noise is disruptive to both marine animals and humans. Imagine being a beach goer looking out over the beautiful waters of Kachemak Bay, only to be disrupted by an obnoxious sound of a jet ski at full throttle! This noise will disturb the whales, fish, birds, and other marine life in the bay, too.<br><br>Jet skis also can travel closer to coastal areas and fragile marine zones. Their presence can harm these precious ecosystems.<br><br>Yes, jet skis are fun. They are thrilling when you go fast. I have ridden on one on a lake with specific designated zones for use. Allowing them in Kachemak Bay, however, in a sensitive marine reserve, would be a mistake.<br><br>Please do not decide to lift the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>*my data comes from several sites on noise pollution, one being the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse at nonoise.org | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Brooke Dudley | Brooke Dudley <brookedmail@gmail.com> | | I was shocked to read that personal use watercraft may be allowed in Kachemak bay. Not only is this bad for wildlife such as nesting birds its downright dangerous and could place potential rescuers in danger too. This is no lake, K-bay should only approached with deep respect for its inherent dangers; a proper vessel with all safety equipment required by the Coast Guard and proper knowledge, it is frigid water, often rough with quickly changing conditions due to huge tidal rips (3rd largest tides in the world). The more protested water is full of blind corners and people who are often in kayaks or quietly fishing, aquaculture industry and animals who could be disturbed by the excessive noise, or endangered by the high speed. The article I read said there is a "segment of people banned" from using the area. Not true, nobody is banned just that type of watercraft for many good reasons. Anyone who can afford a jet-ski can afford a water taxi. I was born and raised across the bay from Homer and never ever approach the water without extreme consideration. We have a 17' heavy duty aluminum skiff with all the safety equipment, radio, flairs, fire extinguisher etc which I rarely take across the bay and only when I have considered the forecast, timing of tides and time of day. Otherwise I catch a ride in very seaworthy vessel. I think you will really be putting people at risk, all it would take is not putting the kill switch on your wrist and falling off, life-jacket or not the rider would succumb to hypothermia unless help arrived within minutes. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Jason Davis | Jason Davis <jasondavis63@gmail.com> | 693 Rangeview Ave, Homer Alaska 99603 | I am writing to OPPOSE the sudden decision by the State of Alaska under Governor Dunleavy to allow jet skis in the sensitive habitat area of Kachemak Bay. The ban on jet skis has served us well in recent decades and should not be changed, especially so hastily and on such short notice.<br><br>Your assertion on KBBI this afternoon that jet skis ("personal watercraft") are no different than skiffs in terms of their impact on wildlife is not only false, it is outrageous. Please stop making such ridiculous claims, and stick the the facts: jet skis are noisier and faster (up to 65 mph) than skiffs, and are used exclusively for thrill-seeking purposes. Skiffs are much slower, making them easier for wildlife to evade, and they are used by working people to accomplish specific tasks. PLEASE stick to the facts. 99% of Alaskan waters are open to jet skis; there is no need to expand this to include our sensitive bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Krissy Post | Krissy Post <kayempea@gmail.com> | Homer, Alaska. | See message: NO to personal watercraft repeal.msg in PWC20 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Frank Bailey | Frank Bailey <frank@jaggedsky.co> | | See message: Open Access to Alaska's Waters.msg in PWC20 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Mack & Sharon Bergstedt | Mack Bergstedt <007bergstedt@gmail.com> | | See message: Open Kachemak Bay to Personal Watercraft.msg in PWC20 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Tom Dunagan | Tom Dunagan <tom.dunagan@gmail.com> | Seldovia | See message: opposition to jet ski use.msg in PWC20 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Elise Boyer | Elise and Jay Boyer <ejez_2000@yahoo.com> | 935 South Larkspur Circle Homer AK. 99603 | I understand you are looking for a yes or no response on Kachemak Bay personal motorized watercraft.<br><br>No.<br><br>Based on the way the hillside funnels floatplane noise up the hill, there will be no place to get away from the noise of jetskis in most of the area.<br><br>I cannot speak to the impact on critical habitat, but I'm sure others will.<br><br>Please don't impose this on our community. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Crystal Collier | Crystal Collier <crystal@ccollier.com> | Box 207 Seldovia, Alaska 99663 | I support lifting the ban on personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay. There is no reason to limit the use of such watercraft in this area. I'm a lifelong resident, born and raised. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Kim Collier | Kim Collier <kim@ccollier.com> | Seldovia Ak. 99663. | I support lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I am a lifelong resident of 64 years and see no reason they shouldn't be allowed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Deanna L. Chesser | Deanna Chesser <rddcr@acsalaska.net> | | I am writing to you as an Alaskan, living on the Lower Kenai Peninsula. I am 100% in support of allowing personal watercraft, such as Wave Runners, or other brands, to be legally operated in the Kachemak Bay area.<br><br>It is an economical, and fun way to access across the Bay, to recreate, and there is no way that the noise, pollution, or use of such would cause any more harm than the boats we already have allowed in this area.<br><br>It would bring more monies, tax dollars, and tourists to the area as well. It would allow new businesses to spring up; rentals of the personal watercraft, sales of the same, and hopefully provide another revenue stream as folks come to enjoy the area in a new way.<br><br>Some people have complained about the noise. Give me a break. We have aircraft, helicopters, float planes, boats already. It's not as if thousands of personal watercraft's will hit the Bay at once.<br><br>There is a LOT less possibility of destroying the marine wildlife and/or habitat, than with a large boat. Personal watercraft has extremely good maneuverability, and being so close to the water, the operator can see much better than any boat.<br><br>Those are my thoughts. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Chancelen Collier | Chance Collier <collier325@gmail.com> | Seldovia | Just wanted to voice my support for lifting the personal water craft ban. As a life long resident of Seldovia. It would be nice to have the option of exploring Kachemak Bay on personal watercraft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Andrew Haas | Andrew Haas <yatra@ak.net> | | I OPPOSE the usage of personal watercraft.<br>I kayak along the bays and would find them dangerous and loud. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Tyler Haas | Tyler Haas <tylerhaasdesigns@gmail.com> | Bend, Oregon | I oppose the use of personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. The existing ban should remain unchanged. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Marianne and Bill Schlegelmilch | Marianne Schlegelmilch <schlegelmilchmarianne@gmail.com> | Homer | See message: Personal watercraft Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC20 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Benjamin Fetterhoff | Benjamin Fetterhoff <benjamin.fetterhoff@gmail.com> | | I wanted to write an email to you supporting the measure to allow personal watercraft (commonly referred to as Jet Skis) to be used in Kachemak Bay. I was born and raised in Homer and was a resident there for over 20 years. I live in Southeast Alaska now but still return to Homer several times a year to visit family and friends. I've logged countless fishing, hunting and hiking trips on and around Kachemak Bay over the years and consider it "my backyard". During my years in Homer, I was always disappointed that people were not allowed to use PWCs in a public body of water. PWCs are a widely used source of recreation and have made substantial improvements both in fuel efficiency and noise reduction since the ban was enacted nearly 20 years ago. I love Kachemak Bay and think that everyone should be allowed to use it safely and responsibly. That includes people who want to use PWCs. I urge the department to adopt the regulation change to allow PWCs to be used in Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Cody McCollum | Cody McCollum <cody.mccollum@yahoo.com> | | I Fully Support the repeal of the Ban in use of Personal Watercraft in the Fox River Flats / Kachemak Bay. I don't believe the casual use of the watercraft will create any negligible or lasting impacts to the environment. I don't believe the original ban was anything more than a infringement of personal access to the public land.<br><br>Further more, I would support a BAN on people being able to BAN anything without providing a fully and subject matter expert peer supported "impact study" with proof to support the necessity of any type of access ban to any public land. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Jerry Meek Jr. | Jerry Meek <jerry_meek_jr@yahoo.com> | Soldotna | I wanted to shoot you a comment on jet ski use out of Homer.<br>I am very much pro jet ski. I think this would have a very positive impact.<br>I am a life-long Alaskan, I have lived in Soldotna for 33 years, and have owned/own multiple jet skis. I have owned a few of the newest 4-stroke watercrafts.<br>I have always wanted to explore the Kachemak, but haven't been able to justify buying a $40k to $100k boat to do so.<br>I have owned newer $7000 jet skis are more than capable of touring the area.<br>I have friends that run jet skis out of Seward and Whittier and they love it! They are able to run out on surf excursions and day tour trips.<br>I also have friends that have property in Seldovia that have often mentioned they would love to be able to run Jet skis across the bay.<br>I think lifting the ban would open up the area to more people that want to get out and see Alaska from a different vantage point.<br>I believe this could also bring more business to the peninsula as currently anchorage, Eagle River, and Wasilla are the only places to purchase jet skis and have maintenance done on them.<br>Thank you for your consideration in this matter and hopefully the ban is lifted. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Larry Mentzel | Larry Mentzel <h82luz@gmail.com> | | Thanks for taking comments on the ban reversal. It blows my mind that people still think they can take possession of State owned property (and bodies of water), build a substantial business operating on the State owned property, then ban other user groups that want to use the same State owned property. How many times do we have to tell Bob Shavelson at Cook Inlet Keepers he and his business counterparts do NOT own Kachemak Bay! The State does and we want equal access to the area! Great work to Dunleavy Administration for helping with this screwed up situation! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Roger L. McCampbell | Roger MacCampbell <kbayranger@gmail.com> | Homer, Anchor Point Alaska | See message: PWC ban.msg in PWC20 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Matt Brown | Matthew Brown <matt@ak-49.com> | | I am very excited with the proposal to open the bay to PWC. We would be a weekly user and am very environmentally conscious. This is a great way to get more business in the Homer area and way less impact than 100's of ocean boats going in and out of the harbor. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Jay Cherok | Jay Cherok <jcherok@summitptalaska.com> | | I would like to express my opinion on lifting the ban on jet skis in kachemak bay critical habit areas. This user group has been banned from obtaining access to our beautiful bay for far too long! The excuses made to keep the ban in place are erroneous, ignorant, and down right discriminatory to say the least. I am in great support of lifting the ban so that this user group gain access to an area that has been exclusively available to other watercraft groups for many years. Its time we progress forward and stop discriminating against people who want to access the bay with a safe, affordable, clean, and quiet watercraft that will do no more harm to the area or individuals using them. Thank you for your time and i appreciate you supporting lifting the ban on personal watercraft in kachemak bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Rachel Mentzel | Rachel Mentzel <watercrossgirl@gmail.com> | 11530 Jennifer Ann Circle Anchorage, AK 99515 | See message: Repeal administrative codes (05AAC95.310, 11AAC20.115 and 11AAC20.215).msg in PWC20 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Megan Corazza | Megan Corazza <megancorazza@hotmail.com> | | Hello, this is Megan Corazza from Homer. I was born and raised here, as was my mother. I have been an active outdoor enthusiast my life around this area on everything from horses to snow machines to xc skis to boats. I highly encourage you to repeal this ban based on equal access to all groups. There may be special areas near some flats that need restriction in order to not disturb certain bird species, but overall the use of jet skis would certainly allow people to quickly access areas like halibut cove, where my family has a house also. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Sybille Castro-Curry | seaotterlady <seaotterlady@gmail.com> | | Certain areas of Kenai Lake allow jet skies.<br>And Kachemak is bigger 😍...jet skies leave less impact than boats. Plus jet skies are registered and taxed.<br>Would be a great plus for Homer and fun for the people.💗us | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Ina Jones | Spek and Ina <lazyj@horizonsatellite.com> | Alaska | I am in support of appealing the personal watercraft ban. I am against having the Kachemak Bay, being only available for special interest groups. It should be open to all. If they fit into the legal requirements of the law. Personal watercraft run cleaner and produce less pollution then a regular boat engine. They are often the only type of craft allowed on water reserviours because of their small impact. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Ian Reid | Ian Reid <ian@eagleeyegallery.com> | Homer | I support the repeal of 5 AAC 95.310. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | darren keeler | darren keeler <darrenkeeler4@gmail.com> | | Water crafts use I'm homer waters but should have strict fines for miss use I personally dont have one but would definitely have one for transportation and sport fishing they are a great means to be able to enjoy this beautiful state | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Wm. Johnson | Bill Johnson <hermit825@hotmail.com> | | I'm contacting you to emphasize my support in changing the regulations regarding PWC use in Kachemak bay. There are many cabins and recreational opportunities that I am not allowed to participate in because I chose to purchase a fishing style PWC (Fish PRO Series from Seas doo) which is quieter, safer, and more environmentally friendly than most all the small crafts I seen operating in the area last spring.<br>It's also economically beneficial to support this proposed change to the affected commercial enterprises in the area, as myself and many I know do not hesitate to spend $500-$1000 on our weekend getaways or long weekends.<br><br>Thank you for taking the time to review this email and seeing the value of the proposed changes.<br>Personal Watercraft are changing from the way they were when the legislation was introduced, and I also realize there are knot-heads of all types out there, so maybe a stipulation that the operator/owner would be conscientious of their behavior, and also mandate they carry the boaters safety card and USCG approved safety gear as well as proper registrations/licenses etc…<br><br>Once again, this matter is very important to me, and look forward to enjoying the wonders of Kachemak bay in the near future. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Gregor Fiedler. | Gregor F. <gregor.hcmc@gmail.com> | | I'd like to let you know that I oppose the use of personal watercraft (jet skis) on Kachemak Bay. The existing ban should stay in place. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Terri Spigelmyer | Terri Spigelmyer <terrispigelmyer@gmail.com> | | I oppose the use of personal watercraft (jet skis) on Kachemak Bay. The existing ban should remain unchanged. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Daniel S Dykema | Daniel S Dykema <ddykema@hotmail.com> | | I see no harm of personal watercraft usage in Kachemak Bay. Fish and Game already has wildlife harassment laws on the books. Modern personal watercraft have just as good or better emissions then any boat running the same area. I only see it being a good thing for the community in bringing more bussiness to an already struggling fishing community. Whitter and other communities in Alaska have personal watercraft for many years and I've seen no harm or issues in those towns. Any problems with personal watercraft would be the same with people using boats and can be handled by law enforcement in the same manner. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | ??? | Rick_Green@192.168.2.2 | | This e-mail contains a voice message.<br>Double click on the attached file to listen.<br><2228@192.168.2.2> | | | | ? | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Kayci Hanson | Kayci Hanson <kaycihanson@gmail.com> | Ninilchik, Alaska | As we near the deadline with which to finalize decisions regarding the operation of Jetskis in Kachemak Bay, I would like to draw your attention to the voting members of our state population that disagree with an expansion of Jetski usage.<br><br>The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>In addition, over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis.<br><br>At this time, I encourage you to consider the impact this decision will have on the greater state, as opposed to the select few who believe this to be a low-impact decision. We are the Last Frontier. It is with a sense of responsibility to our children, to ourselves, and to the world, that we continue to remain as such, and allow for Kachemak Bay to remain unspoilt by a common-place instrument such as the Jetski. We are bigger and we are better. Let's meet that standard. | 1 | | | This message was sent along with the late comments, but shows a received on 3:34 pm 1/21 in th email- moved it to PWC20 and entered it here. | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC20 | Jane Handy | Jane Handy <jhandy.ak@gmail.com> | PO Box 1015<br>Homer, AK<br>99603 | I'm writing in opposition to permitting jet ski use in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive Homer's local economy. Science clearly that shows Jet skis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br><br>Unlike skiffs and boats, jet skis and PWC have overpowered 200-300 horsepower engines. Jet skis are designed and intended to be ridden for fun – to jump waves, make tight turns and spins, run in super-shallow water and congregate in small areas. As a result, they pose unique threats to birds, marine mammals and humans alike.<br><br>The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500.<br><br>Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jet ski use. Please do not add Kachemak Bay to the lengthy list of accessible places people can ride their jet skis and any other type of PWC. | 1 | | | This message was sent along with the late comments, but shows a received on 4:48 pm 1/21 in th email- moved it to PWC20 and entered it here. | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Mike Lowe | mike.lowe25@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I am writing to strongly oppose the repeal of 5 AAC 95.310, which would allow the use of Personal Water Craft/Jet Skis in the Critical Habitat Area of Kachemak Bay.<br>AS 16.20.500 states that the purpose of AS 16.20.500 - 16.20.690 is to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose. PWCs are not in any way compatible with this primary purpose.<br>Proponents of the repeal claim what they want is "equal access". That is a load of crap. Over 99% of Alaska waters are open to Jet Skis.<br>The right of free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of the US Constitution is not absolute – it does not give someone the right to go into a crowded theater and yell "FIRE!" just to see what will happen. Or to incite violence.<br>When one is granted the privilege of driving a car, they cannot drive anywhere, any way, and at any speed they want.<br>Laws and regulations are put in place to protect the public and the environment.<br>PWCs are dangerous, noisy, and destructive to habitat.<br>The American Medical Association once reported: "The rate of emergency department-treated injuries related to (personal watercraft) is about 8.5 times higher than the rate of those from motorboats."<br>According to US Coast Guard statistics, jet skis represent roughly 10 percent of all boats, yet are involved in approximately 30 percent of all boating accidents.<br>The Kawasaki Ultra-1 50 hits 65.5 mph on the radar gun, and the Kawasaki manual says: "Leave 348 feet to come to a stop." That's longer than a football field, without steering, without control.<br>And according to an article posted on The University of Vermont, personal watercraft like a jet ski greatly contribute to the contamination of our seas. This will directly damage the critical habitat of Kachemak Bay in all aspects.<br>There is no legitimate, reasonable, compelling or defensible argument for allowing PWCs in Kachemak Bay, and I strongly urge you to reject this proposed rule change. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jerome E Rombach | jerry.rkenai@hotmail.com | Anchorage, AK | Sorry, not a fan. My personal observation of PWCs - or jet skis - was on Ozark float streams in southern Missouri where I recreated the first 55 years of my life...fly fishing and canoeing. The nature of the equipment, and the mindset of most of the operators I witnessed, are reason enough for me to oppose this change. They tore up gravel beds, drained oil in the water, chased nesting cranes, caused unsafe wakes, and forced others to leave if they wanted to fish, picnic, swim, birdwatch, etc. And yes, they are terribly loud.<br><br>Six years ago, we looked at a house on a lake with float planes on it. A friend said we'd be making a huge mistake: "it's not the planes, it's the damned jet skis!" We didn't buy there. I have no doubt much of the opposition is "Not in my back yard", due to noise. Sometimes NIMBY isn't wrong, but it seems to me there are plenty of other reasons. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Debbie Patton | | Lahaina, HI, US | I oppose lifting the ban on PWCs in Kachemak Bay. Please leave a little bit of AK as serene and quiet as it all should be! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Jeff Ham | | Atlanta, GA, US | I have seen first hand the effects of jet skis on and in critical habitat. It only takes a few to destroy what is and has been an intergral part of a very unique eco system.<br>They are going to be driving fast and generally in groups, going places boats would not generally go, creating wakes that are going to eat up river banks. Disturb both fish and wildlife that would otherwise have been left un disturbed.<br>Sea Otters, Sea Lyons, Seals, Whales, Porpoises, Birds of every type are going to be harassed just by the very nature of how jet skis are generally operated. It is just human nature to get on a jet ski and go places nobody else can get to and to go fast.<br>Jet ski refueling is notoriously dirty in that they almost always overflow into the water. (My parents owned and operated a tackle shop/fuel dock) it was rare for a jet ski not to spill fuel. Imagine a perpetual sheen on the waters surface & banks of the Fox River Flats.<br>Who is going to enforce the rules and keep the fish and wildlife as well as the critical habitat they depend on; safe from the abuses that we all know are going to occur if this ban is lifted?<br>We all know that our enforcement resources are already stretched thin and there won't be any more in the near future so let's not open a can of worms by changing the rules now just so a few people who have the ability to enjoy this amazing place already can do so on a piece of machinery that invites the abuses mentioned above.<br>People spend thousands of dollars to go across the Bay and enjoy the peace and tranquility of Kachemak Bay State Park. Imagine setting on the shore of Halibut Cove Lagoon at half tide watching a dozen Sea Otters with pups sleeping, feeding , grooming when a few jet skis come flying up the channel right for the Otters at the outflow of the lagoon. Not a picture of the pristine tranquil wilderness we claim to have or be, nor a State that's truly caring for the wildlife it's mandated & entrusted to protect . | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jonathan | jonathanmb35@yahoo.com | Tacoma, WA, US | I believe the ban on jet skis should not be lifted | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Laura salazar | Lasalasweets@yahoo.com | Concord, CA, US | Please respect the serenity and beauty of kachemak bay. Don't allow personal thrill watercrafts. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jake wise | Jakerwise@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | Thank you taking the time to read my statement.<br>I am born and raised in Homer my grandparents came here in the 50's much has changed since then. Even in the last 20 years things have dramatically changed!. Growing up the bay was our play ground we boated/fished/camped/hiked/ and hunted all over. In those days outside of the very few locals that did the same the kay was a peaceful tranquil environment!! There where few lodges but outside of that not much. Now the park is full of businesses accessing ever inch of the park. There are becoming more and more trails that are a scar to the pristine landscape. Yurts are on most of my favorite beaches. All of this saddens me but its part of rural to population center. I don't wish to regulate those user groups i would like for PWC to be afforded the same opportunity to access the park! PWC have no more impact than any other boat on the water. In most cases they have much much less impact!! In 30 years you would not be able to tell a jetski ever ran these waters! You 100% can tell where a trail is in 30 years. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jack Dempsey | jdbruhr@hotmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I am opposed to opening these areas to jet skis. These areas were designated as Critical Habitat for a reason, and they are currently co-existing with boating and other uses. The information we have now continues to show that allowing jet skiis on top of the other uses would substantially diminish these Critical Habitat areas for wildlife resources that depend on them. It does not take an expert to see this.<br><br>Allowing jet skiis in these sensitive areas would essentially be an attack on our public resources, and would degrade or eliminate these areas. Sure, once the damage in done, we could ban jet skiis again and may have to add more restrictions on other access to recover these areas. But this trial and error method is idiotic when it is clear this will negatively affect these areas and only benefits a very small group who are either ignorant of the potential impacts or just really selfish and don't really care about these Critical Habitat. This would would be terrible management. It is also clearly at odds with the majority of the people of Alaska, which makes me and I hope other Alaskans reconsider how we vote in upcoming elections. These decisions should be a stain on the legacy of those that implement them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Emma Bauer | ejb427@gmail.com | Chesapeake, OH, US | While PWCs can be an enjoyable experience for thrill-seekers and first-timers alike, they can be detrimental to the wildlife in the area. I have spent several summers working, volunteering, and exploring coastal Alaska, and nothing compares to the beauty and serenity that is present in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Had I not experienced the area firsthand, I would probably not think anything of the ban. However, over the past several years, I have spent a lot of my time working around national parks and performing conservation work from the Gulf Coast of Texas to the bay areas of Alaska. No two places are the same, but all hold their own sense of beauty and diversity. Something I noticed around Kachemak Bay, though, is that it holds a special kind of peace. I spent a couple summers assisting in sea kayaking tours and saw more wildlife than I could have ever hoped to have seen. My boss attributed it to the stillness of the area; the slow and silent pace of kayaks (and even larger boats or skiffs that are meant to transport people) is not nearly as threatening to wildlife as jet skis and other personal watercraft. Not only is the speed and sound threatening to sea life, the sound also wards away rare sea birds that people travel from near and far to see. Also, PWCs have the added potential effect of transporting more invasive species to the coasts of Alaska. While you may do everything in your power to prevent it, there is no guarantee that this will eliminate such a drastic potential threat.<br><br>I am certainly not an expert; I only know what locals tell me and what my own research has shown me. However, based on the sources I do have knowledge of, repealing the PWC ban not only harms wildlife through noise, pollution, and disruption of habitat, it also has the ability to negatively impact local culture and small business. People come to these areas to experience Alaskan beauty; there is truly nothing like it. However, if PWCs turn wildlife away and disrupt natural habitat, what is there left to draw people in? Additionally, this can negatively affect local kayak companies whose large source of income is from those who venture out to experience the exact things that PWCs have the potential to ruin.<br><br>We live in a dangerous time. Wildfires storm across Australia and rain--not snow--showers Antarctica. Climate change is real, and although this may only be a small influence in the grand scheme of things, that is also the same way of thinking that has led us to this point of time. Please, do not repeal the PWC ban. Do what you can to preserve the coasts of Alaska. Do what you can to spare local culture and business. Do what you can to set an example. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | isaac stern | wvustern@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I oppose lifting the ban on PWCs in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Homer, AK, US | As a resident of Homer and someone very heavily involved in the tourism industry, I most certainly oppose the lifting of the restrictions on PWC's.. People come visit here to enjoy the peace and quiet that comes with Kachemak Bay. Furthermore, I hope you have considered mixing 60 mph PWC's with 2 to 3 mph kayaks--this is a disaster waiting to happen.<br><br>With all that said, if the ban ends up still being lifted, there needs to be two things: Strict controls and strict enforcement. How are you going to do that? I've been to areas that are heavily dependent on tourism and often PWC operations are limited to a 'box' they can play in--and if they get out of the box, they are ushered back in.<br><br>If this is not done right, you will be complicit in any injury (or worse) that occurs. Is it worth it? And do you have a comprehensive plan in place for enforcement? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Charles Derrick | cderrickak@aol.com | | I SUPPORT the removal of the prohibition on personal watercraft use in the Fox River Flats andthe Katchemak Bay Critical Habitat areas | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Jeffrey S Johnson | super.yooper@hotmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | My name is Jeff Johnson. I was the first park ranger at Kachemak Bay State Park, serving there for 10 years. I was also the first Boating Law Administrator for the State of Alaska as we became the last state to establish a boating safety program. As such, I actively represented Alaska on a wide range of recreational boating issues on the state, western region, and national levels for 20 years, including serving as president of the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators and on the National Boating Safety Advisory Council to the US Coast Guard. Over that time I have worked closely with some of the most respected boating professionals in the country.<br><br>The purpose of my email is to express to you that, as a former ranger, resource manager and boating professional, any restrictions on activities on state land and water should be justified based on science or strong evidence and, if that evidence exists, there are a myriad of ways to manage those activities - short of general prohibitions.<br><br>I was dismayed when the “Jet Ski” (a brand name used by the naive) ban was put in place on Kachemak Bay not because I am a PWC advocate or against resource protection or public safety but because the “science” presented at the time did not and still does not support a complete closure. Even the National Park Service, who’s mission is generally more directed to resource protection, has walked back these kinds of closures in part because of weak evidence. I believed then and still do, that public waters of the state should be available for activities such as recreation and transportation by all boaters, with reasonable and enforceable regulations to protect public safety and our natural resources. In my view, a complete closure to PWC on Kachemak Bay was a solution for a problem that did not actually exist. If as state resource managers we are lazy enough to simply close state lands and waters to public use as a solution to our challenges (instead of carefully considering the evidence), we fall to do our jobs and fall far short of the public trust.<br><br>While I know and respect many of the Kachemak Bay PWC ban supporters (we have a place in Homer) I believe public access to and enjoyment of our state lands and waters should be promoted, with reasonable protections. And if protections are justified, they should be based on solid evidence and common sense, not on ideology, opinion or interest group pressure. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Leanna Stern | leannajo1126@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I am opposed to the lifting of this ban. I am a jet ski rider, an avid outdoors woman and supporter of access for all, but this process by ADF&G is a joke. To repeal this ban, without any provisions for usage, boundaries, enforcement, explanation or plan makes me disgusted in the Dunleavy administration and it's hired buddies who have apparently decided, undemocratically, to simply lift the ban with no thought toward the future at all.<br><br>Kachemak Bay is a precious commodity in AK. As time moves on, this type of serene area will be less and less available which makes it more and more valuable. The ban was put in place to support this magical ecosystem and it was put in place with the proper process. To attack the original process, and it's subsequent revisiting, without a democratic process is the most egregious form of government there is and we the people will not let it slide by.<br><br>I have sent a comment to Rick Green as well, but quite honestly do not trust that the info will be shared truthfully or with out bias, considering his partisan stance on this issue as well as the questionable position he holds.<br><br>I urge ADF&G to follow the democratic processes in place. Do not repeal the ban! If those opposed to the ban want to change it, they need to go through the proper channels that are in place to make it a fair and appropriate argument. If PWCs are allowed into Kachemak Bay, there needs to be funds ready for management and enforcement, regulations for usage and clearly outlined guidelines. Thank you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Kimberly Bailey | kimofalaska@hotmail.com | Solomon, AK, US | I think opening the Kachemak. Bay protected area to jet-skis is a big mistake. There is a reason this area is closed to PWCs and the decision was made by biologists and scientists who had researched the area for years. This is critical habit to migrating birds, sea otters, fish, and countless other forms of wildlife. To open it up to a group of special interests, who have miles and miles of other places they could use their jet-ski, is ridiculous. Governor Dunleavy does not have the best interests of Alaskans or Alaska if he thinks this is a good idea. Far more tourists would be impacted by this decision than the group of people who want to jet-ski. People come from all over the world to view the wildlife in Kachemak Bay and the re-opening to jet-skis would have a detrimental impact on tourism. Not only would their wildlife be scared away, but instead, they would see motor-craft zooming around in an area they were expecting to see wildlife.<br><br>I have seen first hand what jet-skis can do in a similar area. At Resurrection Bay in Seward, I watched as two jet-skis zoomed around in waters where there were sea otters and sea lions swimming around. The operators seemed to have no regard for the possibility that they could hit one of these animals or that they were disturbing them. As a visitor, it was shocking to me that they were even allowed to be in the area. I hope this will not happen in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Please leave the restrictions as they were for the past decades and keep jet-skis out of Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | John Vanderhoff | nvanderhoff@yahoo.com | Lahaina, HI, US | I live on Kenai Lake in Cooper Landing and am so grateful that personal watercraft are banned on our lake. When I visit friends and family in the lower 48, it's appalling to see the lakes and oceans infested with "jet skis" going round and round recklessly and constantly. It reminds me of the stock car races I grew up with in central New York.<br>Kachemak Bay is an amazing marine wildlife habitat. People from around the world visit the area to experience the pristine setting for waterfowl and marine life.<br>I urge you to protect this Alaskan treasure and continue the ban on personal watercraft in the Fox River Flats and Katchemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Steven Harness | steveharness@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | My name is Steven Harness Iam 34 yr, a Journeyman Lineman with the IBEW. Raised in Little Tutka bay (a rural part of kachemak Bay) which is currently my permanent residence. I have a wife and three children that I plan on raising along this coastal part of kachemak Bay.<br>This ban was put into place originally for a really good reasons that were based on factual scientific evidence and respected testimony.<br>Kachemak bay since then has only had massive growth with marine vessel their traffic and all around human impact.<br>The lift of this ban would have an even grater effect of the problems personal water craft posed originally in the Bay.<br>I have owned and operated extensively most ATVs, for utilitarian and enjoyment purposes; however, kachemak Bay can not sustain additional industry especially a high speed water sport. Kachemak bay has suffered for decades from our impact in general and you wouldn't know it unless you've spent the time some of us have exploring it. I haven't missed a year since I was born being in the bay at some point.<br>The marine wildlife has drastically reduced and the marine traffic has grown exponentially to an obnoxious level to everything around.<br>Economically, the already established industry's the bay supports couldn't handle personal water craft then and even more so now.<br>An individual could spend a life time of enjoyment of in kachemak bay and it's surrounding coastlines with what's already in place. There is absolutely no need to lift this ban and if so would only entertain one specific person while creating a nuisance with its entire surroundings.<br>We should be talking about limiting the traffic that is already in the bay each season not how to add to the problem. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Emilie A Otis | otisemilie@gmail.com | 41364 Charlie Drive<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to oppose the opening of Kachemak Bay to Personal Water Craft (PWC). Below I have listed the reasons why I oppose PWC in Kachemak Bay. We have been through this process many times before with the same result, NO PWC in Kachemak Bay. Why are we doing this again?<br>Our state is under severe financial strain and adding an activity that will cost more to regulate is not fiscally responsible. We cannot pay for the basics of health, education, transportation and safety for our residents. The additional cost of enforcement for a pleasure vehicle is NOT where we should be spending money. If we are not going to increase enforcement then they should not be allowed.<br>PWC are allowed almost everywhere in Alaska except Kachemak Bay. Leaving one place that does not allow PWC is reasonable.<br>In summary: The ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay should stay in place because:<br>1. The state cannot afford to enforce regulations<br>2. Current businesses operating in Kachemak Bay will be negatively impacted by the presence of PWC, including eco-tourism, kayaking tours, and lodges.<br>3. PWC are not compatible with the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats Critical Habitat designations<br>4. The safety record for PWC is well documented and they are not safe<br>5. PWC impact on wildlife will be significant, including otters, whales, seals, sea lions, and birds<br>IF Fish and Game proceeds with the opening of Kachemak Bay to PWC they should all be 4 strokes. Users should have to take a class on safety and etiquette to other users of the bay and wildlife before they are able to use a PWC in Kachemak Bay. Users should pay the full cost of this class. Users should pay a license fee to cover the cost of enforcement associated with monitoring PWC on the Bay.<br>Please do not repeal the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Ron Smith | ronsmithsr@ak.net | Eagle River, AK, US | We are against jet skis in K-Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Roy A Lang | royalang@att.net | Kendallville, IN, US | I am in support of removing the ban of personal watercraft in public waters, such as Kachemak Bay and other navigable waters in the State of Alaska. Personal watercraft are boats and should not be treated differently then every other boat. Arbitrary rules against personal watercraft adopted into Alaska Code without any scientific study or research is bad policy and caterers to a select few prejudice individuals that would use the rule of government to limit access of personal watercraft to public waters without due process. This is a great opportunity to correct an egregious wrong against good people that enjoy Alaska waters on personal watercraft. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Ron Wilson | bigwater@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I am opposed to personal water craft in the KBay Critical Habitat based on evidence of potential harm to the environment. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | janet Romig | janetlarue@hotmail.com | | Please leave Kachemak Bay alone and free of the obnoxious noise of personal watercraft. Just because it is allowed somewhere else is no reason to allow it here. I am aghast that the governor is attempting to subvert the will of real Alaskans. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Anchorage, AK, US | Comment in favor of supporting PWC access to Kachemak Bay. Alaskans have limited access to recreate in the tidewaters of Alaska. Legal access to one of the few areas on the road system should not be restricted to certain user groups under the pretense of environmental protection. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Alan Fish | alakfish@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | PLEASE DONT ALLOW JET SKIS ON KACHEMACK BAY ! CAN YOU VISUALIZE A GROUP OF 20 CIRCLEING THE OTTERS OUR A WHALE FOR A PICTURE ? WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THEY CLOG THEIR INTAKES WITH KELP WHO RESCUES THEM?WHAT ABOUT A RENTAL COMPANY DISPATCHING 50 A DAY ON TO OUR BEAUTIFUL BAY THAT WOULD BE A IMPACT .WHAT ABOUT THEM REFUELING ON THE WATER THEY ALL CARRY EXTRA GAS ? CRAZY IDEA PLEASE DONT ALLOW . FISHING THE BAY FOR 40 YEARS NOW AND LOVE IT | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Alexander C Nichols | andnichols@yahoo.com | Anchorage, AK, US | "Critical habitat is a term defined and used in the Endangered Species Act. It is specific geographic areas that contain features essential to the conservation of an endangered or threatened species and that may require special management and protection."<br><br>Based on the above definition, I strongly oppose this proposal to end the personal watercraft ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jo Fisher | Jofisher2004@juno.com | Eagle River, AK, US | I am absolutely against allowing jet skis on more waters in Alaska. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Kristine Abshire | krisupnorth@gmail.com | Arlington, WA, US | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the issue of lifting the ban on personal watercraft (PWC) in Kachemak Bay. As an Alaskan for the better part of fifty years, I care deeply about her public lands and waterways and understand the difficulty of management under political pressure.<br><br>Allowing “personal watercraft” should not be about “equal access”. As educated, trained biologists dedicated to the protection and sustainability of ecosystems, I expect you also know this. To compare the impact of high speed, erratic motion watercraft to non-motorized recreationists is a false equivalency, as it is for motorized boats going somewhere with a purpose. The Department has heard over and over again from Alaskans wanting to continue the ban, which naturally would fall in line with your education, training and true dedication to protection of wildlife as the priority. For myself, the priority should be sea mammals surfacing in peace, shallow fish and water birds not harassed by confusing, high speed, erratic motion caused by personal watercraft users. Proponents argue there will be few users and only occasional use……. Something to consider is, if the ban is lifted, how long before there will be a local business opening to rent these PWC to anyone happening to visit Homer. No doubt, this will *greatly* increase the frequency impact, along with unenforced abuse of boundaries, etc. This is not speculation. It has happened many times in many areas of America’s public lands. It would seem to me this should be a serious consideration for continuing the ban.<br><br>Managing wildlife and the ecosystems upon which they depend, while at the same time managing sensible human access and impact, is no small task. But, this is the task you face every day. I commend the Department for staying strong by keeping this ban, in spite of political pressure, and respectfully request you continue to resist and follow this, your highest calling. The majority are with you. The wildlife is with you. Kachemak Bay is with you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Eagle River, AK, US | No to the repeal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jon Cannon | Tridentloop@hotmail.com | San Francisco, CA, US | I would prefer that now personal water craft be allowed in kachemack Bay or Fox River flats. They are a loud and dangerous nuisence to Animals and people. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Nina Faust | aknina51@yahoo.com | Homer, AK, US | Please change the date for the closing of the comment period. It still says January 6. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Zachary Neubauer | neubauer.zachary@gmail.com | Hurricane, UT, US | I wanted to express my concern over lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. Those with scientific expertise have expressed concern over ecological impact. Risking this impact, without any large benefits to the state or its populous, if personal watercraft are allowed is irresponsible and shortsighted. Being born and raised in Alaska, I value the natural beauty of the State. I understand the balance between individual freedom and environmental protection, but I do not believe the potential adverse risk to the ecosystem for the mere entertainment of a minority of citizens is allowable. Please oppose lifting the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Klahanie, WA, US | Please repeal the personal watercraft ban! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Susan Hood | Bla5siss@gci.net | Fairbanks, AK, US | I have kayaked Kachemak Bay almost 50 years. The lobbing from the personal water craft users are trying to change something that is a recent phenomenon and clearly impacts the wild life and the sustained life style of the residence of Homer. I oppose lifting the ban on personal water craft use in kachemak bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Blaine Sisson | nossis4@gci.net | Fairbanks, AK, US | If you think the majority of ALASKANS are in favor of personal watercraft (pwc), then you are not listening to basic facts. I have seen pwcs disturbing whales in western Alaska. The average for people to live in Alaska is only 5 years (military personnel included) so the old timers like me who've lived here 50 years or more are rare and there weren't pwcs running around then. The silent majority like me refuse to understand political appointees decisions to lift bans on pwcs in Katchemak bay. Do you understand: personal watercraft disturb wild life. I go to Homer and kayak where most boats cannot in Bays that would expect shallow draft pwcs - I have heard how loud pwcs are and they would make Katchmak Bay a circus. Have you kayaked-many Alaskans are ocean kayakers. The pwc group lobbing for lifting the ban is analogous to snow machine groups wanting every millionth of Alaska acreage to use. Draw the line and keep this special Bay separate with no pwcs. The pwc people want every Bay in Alaska to exploit. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Charles Ryan | cryanalaska@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I strongly oppose changing this policy. Katchemak Bay has been subject to extreme environmental stress in the last few years. There have been massive die-offs of sea birds and the disappearance of humpback whales. Virtually all of the sea stars and a huge number of jelly fish are gone. The sheltered tidal bays and fiords on the south side of the bay are especially vulnerable. There are large areas of shallow water where wildlife propagate and feed. That is just the kind of environment where jet skis can do maximum damage. Unfortunately, these are exactly the areas that would be most attractive to enthusiasts as well. A state with more coastline than the whole rest of the United States can afford to continue to protect a fraction of one percent of its waters from the noise and destruction of jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Wasilla, AK, US | Personal watercraft are no different than big boat millionaires. Put noise/wake restrictions If needed, but don't exclude them. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Chicago, IL, US | I believe PWC should be aloud | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Chad devore | Cdevore173@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I agree that these areas should not be restricted and not limited to just boats. Thes new pwc are more than capable and don't create any extra wear and tear on docks,beaches,etc. the pwc are way more Efficient than my boat and on good days would love to be able to take my pwc out on the bay. As I do prince William sound. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Chris Yelverton | Chrisyel@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I support the repeal of the personal watercraft ban. Katchemak Bay is large and should be available to multiple user groups. I do not see a significant difference between the operation of a watercraft and a small skiff. The modern watercraft are quiet and have to meet strict emission requirements. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Steven DeVries | stevenjulia012@yahoo.com | Anchorage, AK, US | Lifting the ban on personal watercraft in these areas, particularly the Kachemak Bay critical habitat is a really bad idea. These watercraft (jetskiis) are noisy and intrusive, and very capable of disruption and destruction of these critical habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Kristen Shake | raveningirdwood@gmail.com | Juneau, AK, US | I feel very strongly that personal watercraft SHOULD NOT be allowed to operate in Katchemak Bay. The nature of personal water craft traffic, especially the capability to execute rapid changes in speed and direction in nearshore shallow waters, has a high impact factor to habitats, marine organisms, and wildlife that cannot be easily mitigated. Therefore I feel this proposed regulation change is ill-advised and does not serve the best interests of the people of the State of Alaska, nor the critical habitat of this unique coastal region. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | julie robinson | alaskajulie@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I do NOT support lifting this ban.<br>Personal watercraft are loud, intrusive and can go into shallow waters and pristine locations that larger boats cannot access. Tourism is a major industry in Homer and most tourists are looking for a wildlife experience without the intrusion of personal watercraft. We need to be mindful not only of the wildlife, but also of the tourism experience. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Greg Sutter | captgreg@alaska.net | Hampton, VA, US | I am opposed to Personal Watercraft (i.e. PWC) operations in the Fox River and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas. By definition, the areas in question are critical habitat areas and warrant the prohibition of PWC.<br><br>There are thousands of square miles of water within Alaska not designated as "critical habitat" were PWC can recreate. PWC operators have many options as to where to recreate and have plenty of choices as it is. Fox River and Kachemak Bay should remain off limits to them.<br><br>The benefits gained by a limited few users of PWC, do not outweigh the detriment that will be caused to other user groups (many of whom depend on the Bay for a livelihood), the wildlife and the local surrounding communities that will bear the brunt of any potential, consequential negative economic impacts. What makes Kachemak Bay unique is the way it is currently managed. Do not change it. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Andrews Robert | andrews@aptalaska.net | Craig, AK, US | Personal watercraft are little more than carnival thrill rides. They are loud and intrusive and dangerous to wildlife. They do not belong in Kachemak Bay. Please do not allow them. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Ila Dillon | iladillon@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I strongly oppose personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and I oppose the repeal of the ban. I have lived in Seldovia for 35 years, raised my family there and now my daughter is raising her family there. We have chosen the area for the peace and quiet and for its natural beauty. Please don't ruin our piece of wilderness. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | David Zimmer | dzim54@gmail.com | Wasilla, AK, US | Please keep the ban on jet skis (personal watercraft) on Kachemak Bay and Fox River Critical Habitat Areas in place. Jet ski use is a threat to fish and wildlife as well as to other human users of these areas.<br><br>Jet skis pollute the air, make sound pollution, damage shallow water habitat for aquatic life, and create a personal physical threat to other humans wading swimming, kayaking, and floating and fishing in small minimally maneuverable watercraft. Jet skis also interfere with virtually every other human, as well as animal, enjoyment in the area in which they operate.<br><br>Jet skis operating in the water, like dirt bikes tearing up and destroying landscape, should be limited to a small controlled area and be licensed and operated only by licensed operators. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Edward Donald Martin | keeconstructionllc@yahoo.com | Keaâ€¯au, HI, US | Open it up to equal access! It's not just for the ENVIRONMENTALIST & SEA LIFE , do enforcement on speed if necessary... Alaskan waters are for ALL ALASKANS ! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Elizabeth Holt | lizzoir@hotmail.com | Meriden, CT, US | I have kayaked in this bay and seen otters hugging their babies, orcas leaping in the waves and bald eagles soaring overhead. Motorized devices such as jet skis will interfere with the habitat of these beautiful animals. The ban was put in place for a reason. Let's make sure to keep it | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Malcolm R Herstand | malcolm.herstand@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I believe the ban should NOT be repealed. I have seen jet skis around Whittier (while I was in a kayak or in small boats) that are going faster and in shallower water than any other boat - besides the great potential to harass wildlife they often travel in nearly the same paths as kayaks, which definitely is a user conflict. Nearly everyone I have spent time on the water with thinks they are obnoxious and wishes they were banned in more places, not less. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Ed Harman | eharman@gci.net | Anchorage, AK, US | Is it not public water/why should you tell us we can not ride there?<br>Repeal the ban! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | jake whittaker | 007jakew@GMAIL.COM | Anchorage, AK, US | No, please do not allow personal water craft on k bay, Not only it s going to harm the otters , just take a look at big lake and the issues there . Right now I do not own a boat but having to dodge idiots on small , fast and loud water craft make me shudder. It will do nothing for the enjoyment of the area and add nothing to the economy of Homer.<br>Just because some group has donated to the idiot in the governors office does not mean it makes good policy nor sense.<br>Where is the federal environmental study on this proposal? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Anchorage, AK, US | I oppose the repeal of the personal watercraft restriction for Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. I appears to have no basis on factual evidence that this restriction is no longer needed - at least no facts were provided in this notice. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Lauren Bell | Lebell1185@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I do not support the move to repeal 5 AAC 95.310; I do not support allowing personal use watercraft in the Fox River flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Deirdre Brust | ddb64@msn.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I strongly oppose the proposal to lift a ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I don't want to hear the annoying sound of jet skis when I visit Homer or other places on the Bay. Also, I think the negative impact on wildlife would be unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration of my remarks. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Michael Opheim | michaelopheim@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | Personal watercraft should be allowed in Kachemak Bay. They are not the loud machines they once were. They have 4 stroke motors now that are very quiet. They are bigger now almost to the point of being more of a skiff size than a personal watercraft size as people once knew them. This larger size makes them more stable. They do have jet drives that have impellers so the worry of people running over otters, seals, or whales is not as much a concern with prop strikes. The impellers can get damaged if run in too shallow of water because impellers and sand don't like each other. I don't think there is a real concern about these personal water craft running along the beaches or up streams. Jet drives also don't like kelp so again that would probably keep them from running in close to beaches in many areas. Over the years of all the water taxis running up and landing on the beaches in Kachemak bay they have left much bottom paint and pieces of props as the props hit bottom in shallow water. The personal water craft do not have much of a wake and never have so saying the wake was going to erode the shoreline was never a good argument. I do think there should be a educational component to the use of personal water craft when they are allowed on the bay. The safety troopers are at the ramps on the big holidays to talk to and educate boaters so they could just as easily talk to the folks showing up with personal water craft. Making sure they are safe to go on the water and have PFD's and know the rules of the road and things of that nature. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Fred B Hall | fhncak@gmail.com | Solomon, AK, US | This encourages unsafe behaviour,results in habitat degradation, and is a noisy smelly source of emissions in a beautiful place not to mention a gigantic pain in the butt for the general public | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Chicago, IL, US | Liberty for all. Please allow PWC. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | David Stutzer | dastutz@pobox.xyz.net | Kailua-Kona, HI, US | The proposed regulation change is ill advised and a terrible idea. Large parts of Kachemak Bay are an estuary and as such drain completely of tidal waters. At certain tide levels, the flora and fauna of the Bay are barely covered and extremely susceptible to irreparable harm. Personal watercraft are able to run in these shallow conditions and cause such harm. Other small craft, such as skiffs and other boats don't have such shallow draft and would not and, historically, have not caused such harm.<br><br>This proposed regulation change should be promptly withdrawn and never brought up for discussion again. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | John Lang | jolang000@yahoo.com | Wasilla, AK, US | Personal watercraft (PWC) are Boats and they should not be discriminated against. PWC owners pay the same fees as every other boat owner. They are more than just "thrill Craft" as some opponents would like to have them painted as. PWC are a viable part of transportation and I have personally ridden my PWC hundreds of miles in the ocean, and used them to access hunting , fishing and camping locations. we even fish right off them.<br>Those who are prejudice to PWC will say staments like this.<br>"PWC traffic capability to execute rapid changes in speed and direction in nearshore shallow waters, continues to have a high potential to impact habitats, marine organisms, wildlife, and other traditional user groups and those cannot be easily mitigated."<br><br>That kind of rhetoric is pure conjecture. There has never been any scientific studies that prove those kind of prejudice statements. In fact in every case when studies were taken the exact opposite was discovered.<br><br>In 1998 the Blue water network filed a lawsuit against the National Park Service (NPS) to get the NPS to BAN PWC in the All National Parks.<br><br>In 2000 the National Park Service made a settlement with the blue water network that said in oder to allow continued PWC use in the parks a study had to be completed. The settlement agreement was in response to a lawsuit that challenged the above NPS decision to allow continued personal watercraft use in 21 units while prohibiting personal watercraft use in other units. The settlement agreement specified that there would be no PWC use within any unit of the National Park System after September 15, 2002, without a comprehensive environmental analysis and a rule allowing that use in the unit. Under the requirements of the settlement agreement, each environmental analysis must, at a minimum, evaluate personal watercraft regarding eight resource topics: impacts on water quality, air quality, sound, wildlife, wildlife habitat, shoreline vegetation, visitor conflict, and visitor safety.<br><br>Of the 21 units originally considered in the service-wide rule for continued PWC use, five units have made an administrative determination not to complete the rule making process to allow PWCs. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Warren brown | Buck@xyz.net | Anchor Point, AK, US | No | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | James P Sweeney | jsweeney295@gmail.com | Chico, CA, US | Rick Green, I am against Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay. As a 37 year Alaskan I know what a yahoo from Anchorage on a Jet Ski will be like. I know Charley who runs the JET Ski tours in PWS and he's a clown and shouldn't be allowed on the water. Plus he drive too fast on his daily commute from Hope because he's always late. Please save Ak from itself and do not allow Jet Skis in Kachemak Bay | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Eric Knudtson | epknudtson@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I would like to submit my support for maintaining the regulatory ban prohibiting personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats. We've already previously banned these vehicles for good reasons based on the determination by both DNR and ADFG with a lengthy public process. I believe that jet skis are incompatible with the values protecting these lands and waters and harmful to wildlife and the environment. I am a kayaker and hiker who lives in Homer and frequently uses the bay. In addition to the adverse effects personal watercraft have on wildlife and the environment, I believe that jet ski use is incompatible with non-motorized recreationist use. Natural sounds and quiet are also resources of our public lands that deserve protection by managers and would be further compromised by allowing jet skis.<br><br>Thank you for this opportunity to voice my continuing support of the current regulatory bans prohibiting the use of personal watercraft in this unique, beautiful, and quiet area | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Jan Yaeger | janyaeger@yahoo.com | Homer, AK, US | As a resident of a boat-andplan-only access community in southern Kachemak Bay, I oppose the proposal to allow 'personal water craft', or jet skis, into Kachemak Bay. These craft are purely recreational in nature and serve no utilitarian purpose not better served by other types of water craft. Users of PWCs tend to travel at much higher speeds and have a significantly higher accident rate than users of other small craft. There is a much higher potential for harassment of marine life, as well. I also find it very alarming that that this proposal will not be reviewed by the Kachemak Bay Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Area management plan revision group, and that Special Assistant Green stated that the numbers of public comments for or against will have no impact on the repeal decision. He claims his concern is about public access to public resources, and yet the public, who have shown time and again (and as recently as 2017) that we do not want PWCs in Kachemak Bay are to be ignored? That is not responsible management of public resources. The ban was put in place for sound reasons, and the people of Alaska have repeatedly stated that it should remain in place. The Alaska Outdoor Council and the Personal Watercraft Club do not speak for the majority of Alaskans on this issue. Uphold the ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | JUDY ROZZELLFLORA | rozzellflora@yahoo.com | Homer, AK, US | . this issue has been thoroughly explored, and the resounding local opinion among Kachemak Bay residents is to not allow personal watercraft. So, No. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Shaulane | shaulane@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I'm in favor of a repeal of this rule. Please get rid of it. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Marianne Aplin | Marianne.aplin@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | No. Please leave the jet ski ban in place on Kachemak Bay. Jet skis negatively impact wildlife and the experience of other users on the bay. The big tides and currents of the bay are not safe or suitable for jet skis. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Bill Brock | Williambrock.emtp@gmail.com | Fairbanks, AK, US | I fully support the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The ban is foolish and holds no merit. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Alison O'Hara | alaskaselkie@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | As a resident and owner of a kayak guiding business for 29 years in Kachemak Bay I am against allowing jet skis into Kachemak Bay. We went through political process to have them removed in 2001. We also had to revisit the issue in 2011 and 2016 to continue to retain the ban. Why do we continuously have to defend this ban? Kachemak Bay is a Critical Habitat Area. Scientific research has proven that jet skis are harmful to bird and wildlife habitat which the Critical Habitat Area has been mandated to protect. PWC are also dangerous, loud and use mostly 2-stroke engines which are don't combust efficiently and therefore unused fossil fuels are dumped into the ocean to contaminate and pollute. The noise is disruptive to locals and visitors who visit Kachemak Bay for it's quiet, peaceful atmosphere. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Dora Coen | boobertbear@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I do not want to change the laws on personal watercraft in Kachemak bay critical habitat and fox river flats. No personal watercrafts please. Thank you. The noise would disrupt wildlife, and people living along the bay, like me!! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Leanna Stern | leannajo1126@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | First of all, why oh why did you decide that 30 days of public comment was a good idea over the holidays?? Likely on purpose in hopes of a null response... at least that's how it looks when you put the this announcement, the email declaring the governor has already decided, and the timing together.<br>Secondly, because we have seen/read an email that the governors office has 'already decided' on this issue, you set the public as well as yourselves up for failure.<br>We have fought this fight, jet skis do not belong in Kachemak Bay, period. There is an inherent issue with multiple subjects: wildlife, safety, and the main reason tourist flock to the area, for the peace and quiet provided by a place that does NOT ALLOW jet skis.<br>The public comment needs to be extended.<br>The abuse of power by Dunleavy should be investigated or his recall should be enforced.<br>When special interests hold power over the people of the state, there is seriously something wrong with our system. And if AK F&G plays by those rules, shame on you. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Michael Sirofchuck | yellowporcupine@gmail.com | Chicago, IL, US | It is clear that the request for this change was not generated from the community. In fact, the Homer community has made it clear multiple times that it supports a ban on these watercraft. This change in the regulations should not be implemented. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Danielle Wiles | danielle_wiles@hotmail.com | Eagle River, AK, US | I'd like to vote to open up personal watercraft for katchemak bay! Thankyou | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Roxy Lawver | roxlaw@hotmail.com | Soldotna, AK, US | This should have never been enacted in the first place. It's time to bring it back to the bay, so ALL people can afford and enjoy recreating on Kachemak Bay. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Rob Lund | summersong@alaska.net | Anchorage, AK, US | Please continue the ban on personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Wm. Johnson | hermit825@hotmail.com | Fairbanks, AK, US | I emphasize my support in changing the regulations regarding PWC use in Kachemak bay. There are many cabins and recreational opportunities that I am not allowed to participate in because I chose to purchase a fishing style PWC (Fish PRO Series from Seas doo) which is quieter, safer, and more environmentally friendly than most all the small crafts I seen operating in the area last spring.<br>It's also economically beneficial to support this proposed change to the affected commercial enterprises in the area, as myself and many I know do not hesitate to spend $500-$1000 on our weekend getaways or long weekends.<br><br>Thank you for taking the time to review this email and seeing the value of the proposed changes.<br>Personal Watercraft are changing from the way they were when the legislation was introduced, and I also realize there are knot-heads of all types out there, so maybe a stipulation that the operator/owner would be conscientious of their behavior, and also mandate they carry the boaters safety card and USCG approved safety gear as well as proper registrations/licenses etc...<br><br>Once again, this matter is very important to me, and look forward to enjoying the wonders of Kachemak bay in the near future. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Ryan Turkington | Skidooryan@hotmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I'm writing in support of lifting the water craft ban on Kachemak bay. When this ban was put in place there were a lot of lies coming from the side that wanted ban. It boiled down to a single user group not wanting them. There arguments aren't that valid because for one all the 2 stroke outboards and diesel boats running around are fare louder and pollute fare worse. A user group shouldn't get singled out. They never were a problem before because it's a small group of people who actually had them. They never could produce actual studies of Kachemak bay and shat harm they could do. All the arguments were from other places like Lake Tahoe. I encourage you to lift the ban. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Stephanie Jones | Billandsteph@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | Please repeal the ban on PWC in Kachemak bay. There are no good reasons to ban a specific user group from accessing the bay. PWC are safe, affordable, clean, and would be a great option for transportation within the Bay Area. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | BILLY JONES | | Homer, AK, US | I fully support repealing the PWC ban in Kachemak bay. There is no good reason to have them banned. Modern PWC are safer, and cleaner than they used to be. They are also more environmentally friendly than many boats currently using the bay. Boats currently using the bay often have 2 stroke motors or large gas or diesel motors with no emissions systems installed. Modern PWC have 4 stroke engines that meet strict emissions standards and are very fuel efficient. There is no legitimate reason to ban PWC other than to restrict access to the bay and give preference to one user group over another. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| online PN | Bradly Wythe | aktrapperbrad@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I think that lifting the ban would help the community by providing more recreational activities. I also believe it would help the local economy | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Herndon, VA, US | Outstanding!!! 100% support this! | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Vincent Waddell | Vwaddell99@gmail.com | Wasilla, AK, US | I think this should be passed because personal water craft would not impact the habitats of Kachemak bay or surrounding areas directly and it would boost economics of the surrounding areas. So in my opinion there is no reason personal water craft should be outlawed in this area | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Clint Greathouse | alaskakajun@aol.com | Anchorage, AK, US | Please consider allowing users with personal watercraft into the Fox River flats and Katchemak Bay areas. These water craft pose no significant risk to the habitat or wildlife, it's unreasonable to say that they affect the area any differently than any other water craft. Please consider lifting the ban and allowing personal watercraft user groups to enjoy the area like everybody else. Thank you | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Garrett Collins | Stupid_hurts@hotmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | Well personally I don't understand the reason that there is a ban on what people are calling thrill crafts. I feel that just like the mind set, guns are taking the blame for killing people or the spoon made people fat. people are responsible for there actions and should be held accountable. So wether you are in a boat that carry's the whole family or a one man sport craft we should all be able to enjoy the waters around here. It's wrong to ban one without the other. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Anonymous User | | Homer, AK, US | I just wanted to make a couple valid points about PWCs. Comparing them to sport fishing boats and charter vessels, PWCs are much smaller and a lot more nimble so they have much more control in the water for the sake of wildlife like sea otters. They will not be as big of a hazard as sport fishing boats. They also won't make as big of a disturbance in the water with them being the size they are. They draw very little water and are less noisy too. Almost all PWCs are quieter than the outboards the boats run, and that's not mentioning the ones with diesel/inboard motors. I believe lifting this ban can bring in extra business to local powersports shops with sales of PWCs. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| online PN | Alec Valdez | Akquake1@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | Personal watercraft should be allowed in Homer and Kachemak Bay. Now days with 4-stroke technology Sea Doo has come out with very environmentally friendly machines. The machines are quieter, more fuel efficient and leave no oil trace behind. I have fished and boated in Kachemak bay and always thought it would be a great riding spot on a nice day. Allowing personal watercraft is a great idea and I am pro Motorized recreation. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Mike Coffing | chikuminuk@msn.com | Solomon, AK, US | I am opposed to the proposed changes on Personal Watercraft use in the Fox River Flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Areas. Personal Watercraft should not be allowed to operate in this area, due to the nature and character of this special area and the value of the area's unique habitat and wildlife, and the unique wildlife viewing and educational opportunities provided by this area of protected wildlife, fauna and habitat. The use of personal watercraft and the very likely and potential thrill-seeking joy-riders that will use these personal watercraft potentially have a very negative impact/effect on this area. I urge that this proposed change be thoroughly reviewed and denied. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Dennis Daigger | daiggerd@mtaonline.net | Wasilla, AK, US | I'm am opposed to opening Kachemak Bay to the use of jet skis. Their use in a critical habitat area is incompatible with the purposes set out for critical habitat areas, is detrimental to wildlife and specific wildlife habitat needed for nesting, feeding and sanctuary. Jet skis create noise pollution that degrades the experience of non-motorized users. Additionally, they pose a threat to small craft users such as kayakers. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Jeffrey Gordon | jeffrey.gordon@me.com | Fairbanks, AK, US | I urge you to reconsider; do not repeal. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Anonymous User | | Anchorage, AK, US | I am against the proposal to allow personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay. ADF&G was against this in 2017 and the concerns are still valid today. Critical habitat areas should not be disturbed in this way. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Audrey Daigger | | Anchorage, AK, US | Please do NOT lift the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay. Traffic from high-speed PWC would be dangerous to wildlife and the many other recreational users of the bay. This is a conclusion that ADFG has reached and is supported by research and science. There are many places that PWC can be used in the state, please do not make the mistake of thinking that we must open critical habitat areas to these disruptive machines. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Anonymous User | | Fairbanks, AK, US | I do not support allowing personal watercraft usage in these critical habitat areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Heath Sandall | | Anchorage, AK, US | I've been a resident of Alaska since 1994 and have recreated, fished, and gathered food in Kachemak Bay. I strongly oppose lifting the current regulations on personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay critical habitat areas and Fox River Flats.<br><br>Not all areas should be open to all uses and it's a job of government to protect fragile areas whether or not it makes everyone happy. This management should be executed based on best information and science. You are well aware of the May 9, 2017 ADFG memo which clearly states that the best information and science recommends maintaining the current regulations. The administration should follow that recommendation.<br><br>As a state, culture, and society, we need to put the health and well-being of the natural environment above our desire to recreate and play. Damage to critical natural habitat is never worth an opportunity to play. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supplemental OPN | Paul Clayton | rainriversea@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | As a long time fisherman and boater in Alaska and Kachemak Bay, it is my opinion that allowing PWC into the critical habitat area will be detrimental to the peaceful enjoyment that leads so many people visit this area. It will lead to increased impact on wildlife which is contrary to the entire point of having a critical habitat area in the first place. Alaska is a huge place, and it is entirely appropriate to set aside a tiny percent of this land and water as refuges from thrill seekers on noisy machines. Nobody is asking for a statewide ban, just that this small slice of nature be preserved to the best of our ability.<br><br>Yes, there are safety concerns and eventually a PWC user will die out there on the bay. Somebody will fall of a ski which won't stop, or will run out of fuel at dusk, or will misjudge a change in weather. Perhaps there will be a crash between skis which is a common occurrence between PWC riders. Most likely the deceased will be a tourist on a rental, but these are mistakes locals can certainly make as well. Opening up cold ocean water to beginners with no boating experience will cost lives. This is Alaska though, where we each take safety into our own hands, and I'm sure the rental company will have a very broad safety waiver.<br><br>Yes, existing businesses in Homer will suffer as people quite visiting the park because what's the point of visiting a jet ski rodeo? That's just the free market at work though. It's unfortunate and will create far more economic harm than benefit, but government shouldn't pick economic winners.<br><br>Yes, there will be harbor conflicts as PWC are launched, increasing ramp wait times, along with unsafe behavior navigating out of the harbor. Only the most experienced and prepared PWC users will be tuned to channel 16 as they head out into the bay. It is plainly obvious there will be regular conflicts with the current harbor users. Picture a couple of beginners tipped over in the middle of the harbor entrance after losing their balance, as charter boats or the Seldovia ferry try to slow to a stop and perform avoidance maneuvers. This is an accident waiting to happen.<br><br>Even given all these other negatives, I primarily oppose this measure because of the impact on the mammals and birds of Kachemak Bay. You know, and I know, it is only a matter of time before a group on PWC tries to slalom between a pod of humpbacks, or tries to play tag the otter. Kachemak Bay is a special place today and the far side of the bay is a step back in time. Please preserve this unique spot, to the best of our ability, by not overturning this ban. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Warren Petrasek | wephppak@icloud.com | Wasilla, AK, US | TERRIBLE IDEA. !! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Rob Lund | summersong@alaska.net | Solomon, AK, US | Please do not change the rules that prevent people from using personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Paul Dungan | icybay1@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I am a 30resident of Homer and a forty year resident of Alaska.<br>I strongly oppose the allowance of personal water craft in Kachemak Bay.<br>I heard you on the radio say that this is not a beauty contest and that your decision will not be made according to counting public comments for or against the removal of the PWC prohibition.<br>I would remind you that you live in a representative democracy. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Mairiis Kilcher | seasidefarm@alaska.net | Homer, AK, US | I am opposed to repealing the ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I am a 77 year lifetime resident of Homer, Alaska and own 5 properties along the coast of Kachemak Bay, (two of which are in Bear Cove and accessible only by boat). One large parcel is adjoining the Fox Creek Critical Habitat area. Also am part owner of the Kilcher Homestead on Kachemak Bay. I am a farmer, and own and operate seaside farm guest accommodations and also nature tours. Previously I was a member of the Fox River Cattlemen's association for 30 years.<br><br>Jet skis are not appropriate in this unique area and will destroy the values, peace, quiet, tourist activities, and quiet sightseeing opportunities that only this place has to offer. Kachemak Bay is unique, and personal watercraft have access to most other areas in Alaska.<br><br>Do NOT let jet skis into Kachemak Bay! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supplemental OPN | Bruce Davidson | yeagar@gci.net | Kenai, AK, US | I am not in favor of the proposed changes that would allow motorized personal watercraft to utilize the Fox River Flats and especially the Kachemak Bay. I believe that they are a major marine safety consideration and will severely impact wildlife, especially sea otters and sea birds.<br><br>These craft move substantially faster and maneuver incredibly quickly and much of the time they are known to operate their craft in an unpredictable fashion. The Homer area is teaming with personal and commercial watercraft and the harbor area and Homer Spit are already crowded during busy times. The marine mammals and sea birds are typically not affected by the slower moving and larger watercraft that can can see coming and easily avoid. The slower moving boat traffic is able to plan ahead and adjust course when needed to avoid collisions with the mammals and other watercraft.<br><br>Adding a faster moving and small difficult to see watercraft to the equation, especially in rougher conditions, will only increase the chances of mishap or injury to mammals.<br><br>I am also concerned about the damage they could do to the environment in the shallow areas of the pristine coves and bays due to their ability to travel in extremely shallow waters using water jet propulsion. Also, the potential of a group of these craft to affect migrating salmon patterns and areas where salmon pool and rest would be great.<br><br>I'm generally not a person in favor of banning specific classes of anything however I believe that adding personal watercraft usage to these areas is not a prudent decision to make. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Jennifer Gordon | Jengordonmom@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | There are so many reasons that allowing personal watercraft like jet skis into the pristine waters of Kachemack Bay is a terrible idea and should NEVER be allowed, I am not sure where to begin.<br><br>First, the noise. The relentless sound of loud powerful jet engines is not only detrimental to the enjoyment of the quiet wonder of the area that humans enjoy, but what about the myriad of wildlife that live on, in and around these waters. Hundreds of species of fish and sea mammals and birds will be hugely affected by this change.<br><br>Second, the pollution. More fossil fuels, more chances for spills and accidents.<br><br>Lastly, the disruption to non-motorized water sports like kayaking, paddle boarding and sailing will be forever changed with the addition of high-powered buzzing jet skis all around.<br><br>Please leave the restrictions as they are and protect the pristine wilderness that we all enjoy in and around Kachemack Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Greg & Shari Durocher | akrockhound1@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | Please put us on record as being strongly opposed to allowing the use of motorized personal watercraft, whose primary function is to provide entertainment to the rider(s) via speed and maneuvers, in Kachemak Bay. I can find no studies showing neutral impact on wildlife by such craft, but myriad references to negative impact. What is being proposed, therefore is near-guaranteed adverse impact to marine mammals, waterfowl, and quite possibly small boats, paddleboards and wading fishermen. Quite frankly, we believe this shouldn't even be up for consideration! | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Dan Presley | danpresley57@gmail.com | Klahanie, WA, US | I fully support the right for people to have and use personal watercraft within the katchemak park. | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Gracia M. de la Pena | mireyadelapena@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I am writing in support of the repeal on the administrative codes (05AAC95.310, 11AAC20.115 and 11AAC20.215 on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area. Finally, an administration that is not prejudiced and understands access.<br><br>Any conservation concerns area already addressed in regulations that apply to all boats which includes personal watercraft, airboats, etc. Separate regulations do not need to be addressed regarding each individual type of watercraft.<br><br>It seems that because no one can find valid current scientific studies regarding boats, especially watercraft on the impact to fish, wildlife and other biological resources, the members of Cook Inlet Keeper have just decided to label personal watercraft as thrill craft portraying the owners/operators as some kind of renegade.<br><br>This is simply an equal access issue where all Alaskans have the right to use their vessel in the State's waters, especially an area that encompasses more than 200,000 acres and includes the Alaska Marine Highway. The State simply does not have the right to ban anyone from travelling on the Alaska Marine Highway. Bob Shavelson of Cook Inlet Keeper makes it sound like he and other business and property owners in the Kenai Peninsula area own the bay - the do not. It belongs to all the people and the Dunleavy administration understands that. That is why I believe the ban will, and should be repealed.<br><br>Thank you Rick Green, for stepping up to the plate and taking this first very important step to right a wrong done long ago by administrations who did not believe in equal access. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supplemental OPN | Meg Cicciarella | megcicciarella1@gmail.com | Homer, AK, US | I wholeheartedly oppose the use of personal watercraft on Kachemak Bay.<br><br>Apart from the fact the water is way too cold for that (— wetsuits not withstanding — the Bay not suited to small craft such as jet skis, for the same reason one wouldn't use one in the open ocean), public, first responder, and marine animal safety is endangered.<br><br>The regulatory and budget impact on the State, Borough, Feds, and City of Homer is too great to make rescinding the PWC ban worthwhile.<br>.<br>Finally, people don't need to be allowed to do whatever they want to whenever they want to do it. Leave Kachemak Bay alone and use jet skis in the warm waters of places set up to safely accommodate this kind of activity. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Blaisdell Alan / Barbara | hogbackgala@gci.net | Palmer, AK, US | I am against lifting the ban on PWC's on Kachemak Bay. Nothing has changed in the last 18 years since the ban began in 2001. Making this an access issue is bogus in the extreme. There are plenty of examples in the state where motorized vehicles are banned for one reason or the other. One example is you cannot use an ATV in most if not all state wildlife refuges when the ground isn't frozen to a certain depth. It's common sense. Don't tear up the ground in a wildlife refuge. And this isn't even about wildlife. Kachemak Bay is too precious to risk hurting critical habitat. The vast majority favor leaving the ban in place. The will of the people. End of story. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Anonymous User | | Wasilla, AK, US | Terrible idea. Who knows where that came from. Yeah right.<br>Seriously<br>Noise, pollution, and stress on wildlife NOT WORTH it.<br>Bad idea | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Eric A. Havelock | Eahavelock@ak.net | Anchorage, AK, US | As an upland property owner, I am strongly opposed to personnel watercraft in Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area. The issue is safety. PWC do not meet coast guard navigation and safety requirements. No navigation lights. How many people are you trying to kill with this rule change? First person to drown trying to get to Seldovia will be on you! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Antoinette Kahklen-Hoffman | toni.kahklenhoffman@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | As someone who has spent a considerable amount of time fishing and clam digging in the Kachemak Bay, it has been a truly renewing experience after intense work weeks in Anchorage. Our family including two other siblings and their families established a tradition with all the cousins enjoying the camping, fishing and camping experience year after year. After experiencing other waterways where regular boats compete with personal water craft, I can only imagine how disruptive the very fast moving personal water craft (jet skis) would be where people are either just sightseeing marine mammals and birds or quietly fishing. It would not be what it has been for so many locals, other Alaskans, and out of state visitors. I would definitely urge that personal watercraft (Jetskis) not be allowed to operate in the Kachemak Bay. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Rod Hoffman | rhoffman@ak.net | Anchorage, AK, US | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on what I think is a mistaken direction proposed by ADFG.<br><br>Kachemak Bay provides a diverse and productive environment that makes it important to residents and visitors alike. Fish and shellfish populations abound. Two hundred thirty-one species of birds have been identified on and around Kachemak Bay, making it the most important marine bird habitat in lower Cook Inlet, with no comparable areas in upper Cook Inlet. During winter months over 90% of the marine birds in lower Cook Inlet are found in Kachemak Bay. In the spring, summer, and fall, the bay hosts tens of thousands of feeding waterfowl, shorebirds, and seabirds. In the winter, marine mammals and waterbirds stay in the bay's protected waters. Thats why it was designated as a critical habitat area by the Alaska Legislature in 1974 to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose. Those attributes led to the Legislature trying to protect the resources that attracts approximately 200,000 annual visitors, more than 100,000 from out-of-state. It makes Homer the 12th most visited community destination in Alaska.<br><br>What do all these visitors do? They fish, hunt, bird-watch, kayak, - uses dependent on the biological resources of the bay.<br><br>So imagine you are a visitor, kayaking along the shore viewing birds and marine mammals or in a vessel, fishing for halibut or salmon. You're enjoying the environment, communing with nature, relaxing with friends. And all of a sudden your enjoyment is disrupted by several speeding PWC. They rock your kayak and frighten the off the birds you were just watching . They rock your fishing boat and run over your lines. Are you in Kachemak Bay or Big Lake? Think that will bring you back to Homer next year?<br><br>PWC are incompatible with other water uses. Thats why they were banned, and why they should remain banned. They are the 4-wheeler on a hiking trail or snowmobile on a cross country ski course. They are not compatible uses. PWC have plenty of areas to be used, including Cook Inlet, Resurrection Bay, and Prince William Sound. They don't need Kachemak Bay and are incompatible with its designated use. Don't make Kachemak Bay Alaska marine Big Lake. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supplemental OPN | David Eberle | cdeberle@gci.net | Homer, AK, US | I am adamantly opposed to the proposed lifting of the ban on the use of personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. The lifting of such ban would have mutiple negative effects on the Critical Habitat area as well as the Bay as a whole.<br>The use of personal watercraft would dramatically increase watercraft traffic in Kachemak Bay resulting in an increased concern and very real risk of waterborne collisions with fishermen and other watercraft. Users of personal watercraft have a perpencity to drive very fast. In addition, entrance to the harbor is currently crowed on weekends and throughout the summer. This makes for a very high probability on collisions.<br><br>The noise level throughout the Bay would increase significantly, reducing the current relaxing and peacefulness of the Bay which is a major draw for tourist throughout the Bay. Allowing personal use watercraft would also open access to virtually every corner of the Bay and have a detrimental effect of the wildlife and resources throughput the area. Such impacts include added stress on wildlife caused by noise and the presence of people in areas otherwise very difficult to access. Increased hunting and fishing pressure would also result from the lift of the ban.<br><br>This is simply a very BAD idea, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Angela Roland | angelaroland@gmail.com | Anchorage, AK, US | I am opposed. The science is clear about the habitat and personal watercraft. No! | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Drew Carey | drew_carey@live.com | Portland, OR, US | Personal water craft should be allowed in Kachemak bay, they are no more harmful then boats. The wildlife isn't what this ban was ever about it's about some people in homer trying to keep public access to public water ways closed to all users | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Anonymous User | | Soldotna, AK, US | I am against opening the Fox River flats and Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat areas to personal watercraft. These craft are designed for high speed operation as their reason for existence, not as a means of transporting people or materials from point A to point B. There is already an enormous area open for personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay so use in critical habitat areas is not necessary. Increasing the risk of harm to already stressed wildlife cannot be justified.<br>However, if the decision is made to allow these craft into currently prohibited areas it should be with a 2 year probationary period, limitation on group size, speed limits AND adequate funding to provide staff for enforcement of regulations in all areas. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Anonymous User | | Wasilla, AK, US | Why would anyone want to do such a thing. The noise pollution, water pollution, and stress on wildlife is not worth it. Not a good/wise idea. Please NO. PLEASE | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental OPN | Skylar Phoenix | myeye99@outlook.com | Anchorage, AK, US | As a local resident of Homer I am opposed to ANY changes to the current regulations.<br>In my opinion, it is a small group with outside interests and people uninformed of the importance of keeping current regulations in place to protect our wildlife in Kachemak Bay.<br>I've watched as ATV and vehicles violate our current laws and regulations that are ALREADY in place that damage beaches in our area.<br>Do not change current regulations- Thank You, | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | B Mastolier | | Homer | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: B Mastolier support to lift ban on PWC20200101.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | D Mastolier | | Homer | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: D Mastolier PWC Letter of Support.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | D. Brandenburg | | | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: Brandenburg PWC-lift the ban in Kachemak Bay-template letter.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Sean Eastham | | | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: Eastham PWC-lift the ban in Kachemak Bay-template letter.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: Team CC letters recvd 12.30.19.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: PWC ban20200120.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Alaska Outdoors Council form letter- see: all other hard copies AOC form letter PWC.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Form letter 1 See: 5 AAC 95.310 Form letter 1.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Form letter 2 See: 5 AAC 95.310 Form letter 2.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | mulitple | multiple | N/A | Form letter 3 See: 5 AAC 95.310 Form letter 3.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Wil Graves | wilburgraves@gmail.com | | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Willbur Graves.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Van Hawkins | | | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Van Hawkins.pdf in hard copy comments folder | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Ncik Olzenak, VP, GM Alaska Mining and Diving Supply, Inc | | | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Nick Olzenak.pdf in hard copy comments folder | | 1 | | business | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Anthony Lastufka, Across the Bay Adventures LLC | | POBox 81 Seldovia AK 99663 | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Anthony Lastufka.pdf in hard copy comments folder | 1 | | | business | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | Janette Cadieux | jette.cadieux@gmail.com | | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Janette Cadieux.pdf in hard copy comments folder | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| hard copy comments | Frani Scheffer | | 3179 Lake St., Homer AK 99603 | See: 5 AAC 95.310 Frani Scheffer.pdf in hard copy comments folder | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| hard copy comments | David Kelley | | Anchorage AK | See: 5 AAC 95.310 David Kelley.pdf in hard copy comments folder | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 AAC 95.310 Repeal signature sheet petition.pdf in hard copy comments | Multiple | | | 5 AAC 95.310 Repeal signature sheet petition.pdf in hard copy comments | | 87 | | Petition | | | | | | | | | | |
| See messages: Final Petition Signature List Kachemak Bay PWC.msg and Re:Final Petition Signature List in PWC2 | Mutiple | Casey Fetterhoff <casey.fetterhoff@gmail.com> | | Petition Signature List from Change.org | | 1180 | | Petition | | | | | | | | | | |
| **End** | | | | | **1005** | **1677** | **41** | **Tally ontime comments** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Late Comments. Not considered.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | David Dickerson Exec. Dir., PWIA | David Dickerson <ddickerson@nmma.org> | | See message: Comments re: opening Kachemak Bay.msg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Captain Tabb Thor | 907time@gmail.com | | I am a life long Alaskan, Master ship Captain with generations of my families living here since homesteading in Homer years before Alaska statehood.<br>This is to support the repeal on the ban of PWCs or motor vessels in Kachemak Bay.<br><br>1. Current Personal Water Crafts (PWC) are certified as "Motor Vessels" by the USA and State of Alaska and are actually cleaner and quieter than a majority of the vessels that currently operate in the bay.<br>2. To assist in economic vitality, individuals who purchase PWCs may have higher disposable incomes than many of the regional operators.<br>3. Statistics on PWC owners indicate that they are better educated, more environmentally and ecologically aware, as well as more respectful of the marine wilderness than many boat owners including those who operate legally in Kachemak Bay.<br>4. It is discriminatory to enforce a law where USA abiding citizen cannot enter the port of Homer on their legal registered "Motor Vessel" if they are sitting on it instead of in it!<br>5. The Homer spit sunk during the 64 earthquake and US Federal funds were utilized to rebuild our way back from that day.<br>a. There is NO sign at the top of Homer hill that states NO "Motor Cycles" allowed to enter Homer if "sitting" on their motor vehicle. (if so, Federal funds would be cut off)<br>b. However this current law is stopping "Motor Vessels" from entering or leaving on its Federally funded water ways that are needed to enter or depart Homer harbor<br>6. A few ignorant individuals who held authority to promote their personal and hidden objectives without scientific research is what should be banned<br>7. Homer "Where the Land ends and the Sea begins" unless of coarse your sitting on your Motor Vessel?<br>8. This repeal should not be confused with allowing illegals to enter the port of Homer, but rather allow those that actually live here access to where the Sea begins.<br>9. The current law is not taking into account the navigable waters of the Bay<br>10. If there is concerns of Illegal activity or harm that will be allowed then these areas of activity or harm should be addressed individually, instead of stopping ALL activity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Jack Oudiz | dizj10@gmail.com | Homer, AK | I have lived in Homer and fished Kachemak Bay since 2009. I am vehemently opposed to the proposed change to the PWC ban. There is simply no merit to the reversal of a decision that was widely favored on environmental and ecological grounds by those living in the impacted areas. Nothing has changed in the interim that would justify this reversal other than a political and ideological shift. That is not an acceptable reason. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Laura Hahn | Laura Hahn <ljhahn@m | Iowa City IA | I am writing to encourage you to keep jet skis from Kachemak Bay.<br><br>I've visited various places during 3 different trips to Alaska. Much time was spent bicycling, camping, canoeing and the like. I so enjoy the vastness, beauty and quiet.<br><br>After several days in the Nome area in August 2018, I had the great privilege to spend time on the Kenai peninsula. This included a day kayaking on Kachemak Bay. What a beautiful, peaceful and quiet place. We saw sea otters and eagles. We enjoyed a peaceful lunch along the shore.<br><br>Please keep Kachemak Bay a quiet peaceful place. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | mike byerly | byerly.mike <byerly.mik | Pob 1161<br>HOMER ak 99603 | I would like to voice my opposition to lifting the jetski ban in kachemak bay. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Marjorie Belieu | Marjorie Belieu <marjor | 57270 Glacier<br>View Rd. N<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I have been a resident of Homer since 1982.<br><br>I am disheartened of the proposal to open the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat area to Jet Skis (PWC) I urge you to retain the current regulation of prohibiting such watercraft from our critical habitat area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Natalie Dawson | Natalie Dawson <natstra | Anchorage, Alaska | As a long time Alaskan, I strongly oppose the changes to the Critical Habitat area for Katchemak Bay. I understand you feel a need to respond to political pressure from the state of Alaska, and a few individuals that want to open everything for the benefit of few, without listening to local voices.<br><br>You have also made it very clear that you see this as something you need to do to check a box, and I would like to remind you that in fact, public opinion has legally binding requirements for response from state agencies. If you choose to lift protections without listening to public comments, the state can and will face lawsuits. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Mary Lynch | Mary Lynch <maryandlin | Box 82086, Fairba | Please prohibit jet skis from Kachemak Bay. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | LeMay Hupp | LeMay <hupp@gci.net> | Anchorage, Alaska | As a land owner in Homer, I bought property because of the scenery AND wildlife.<br>I have spent my entire life in Alaska and watched the deterioration of local habitat when PWCs are introduced. The speed, the many times reckless driving behavior and the ease of use at all hours certainly affects wildlife. In my experience watching PWCs flagrantly ignore any rules and laws is the norm - not the exception. Do not allow this change to go into effect - Katchemak Bay will never be the same. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Pat Pourchot | Pat Pourchot <ppourcho | Anchorage AK | Please do not allow personal watercraft (jet skis) in the Kachemak Bay critical habitat area. The original reg prohibiting this activity was done in full coordination and with full support of ADF&G based on known adverse impacts of such use on wildlife and other uses of the Bay. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Donna Laschuk | Donna Laschuk <donnal | Maui Hawaii | My name is Donna Laschuk and I worked in Alaska for many summers when I was a young adult. Originally coming from New Jersey, I sought beautiful clean nature and found it there. Please Rick please keep it that way! We need to care for all of life and keep the future in mind not the desires of a few who could possibly destroy this amazing ecosystem over time. Please don't be the guy remembered for destruction. Lets work on creation together! All together! Hold that vision and impress our children and those to come. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Ashley Byrne | Ashley Byrne <ashleythe | 1710 Scenic Way<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99501 | Kachemak Bay is a critical habitat wildlife estuary that supports millions of waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds and marine mammals and fish, shellfish, and other marine life, therefore, I am direly opposed to personal watercraft being allowed as it will have such a negative impact.<br><br>As a voter and citizen, I enthusiastically oppose opening Katchemak Bay to personal watercraft. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Lindsay Olsen | Lindsay Olsen <lindsay.c | P.O. Box 211<br>Homer, AK 99603 | I am writing to oppose the proposed lifting of the existing ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. My family runs a rental cabin service on Hesketh Island and a large part of our income is dependent on Kachemak Bay remaining a pristine wildlife area that attracts ecotourism. I am deeply concerned that the introduction of jet skis into the area would be devastating for the ecosystem, the wildlife, and my family's income. I urge you to please keep the ban in place and help protect Kachemak Bay as a nature sanctuary. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Aubrey Smith | Aubrey Smith <aubrey9 | Talkeetna | I was born and raised in Seward on Resurrection Bay. My family spent a lot of time recreating in and around the bay as well as numerous other bodies of water. I now live in Talkeetna, AK. I feel lucky to live in a place with fresh air, space, quiet, serenity, wild spaces that seem untouched by man.<br>I implore you not to allow personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay. I have seen too many lakes ruined by their presence, obnoxious noise, often obnoxious handling. In Alaska we pride ourselves on being utilitarian, and these personal watercraft are not only superfluous but dangerous to both humans and animals in the area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Patrick Houlihan | patrickhoulihan.ak@gmail.com | | Having been involved with the initial ban on personal water craft within Kachemak Bay, I remain opposed to their use within the Bay, and especially within Critical Habitat Area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Kei Hill | my_email_address22 <n | Please protect the wildlife by banning Jet Ski's from entering Kachemak Bay. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Carla and Tony Sla | SlatonBarker <slabar@n | 828 Hiland Road<br>Eagle River<br>AK 99577 | As Kachemak Bay property owners, we are emailing to provide public comment on the intent to lift the current ban on jetskis and other personal watercraft in the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Critical Habitat Area. WE ARE STRONGLY OPPOSED TO LIFTING THIS BAN. Jet skis will change the character of the bay. Jet ski use is very different than use of traditional vessels—their ability to run at high speeds, jump waves, and run in shallow water would negatively impact nearby property owners and shoreline habitats and creatures. We encourage the State of Alaska to keep the ban on jet skis in place. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Kachemak Bay Co | Kachemak Bay Conservation Society <kbay | | See message: Re: Kachemak Bay Conservation Society Comments on PWC in CHA.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Margi Blanding | Margi B <margib543@gmail.com> | | See message: Re: Keep the personal water craft ban in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Tate Thoms | Tate Thoms <alaskant6@icloud.com> | | Support the repeal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Kara Kirkpatrick | kara <wabutterfly@hotmail.com> | | I oppose lifting the ban on PWC's in Kachemak Bay! | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | MAGGIE O'BRIEN | Maggie O'Brien <maggie | 5805 NO. FARM L | Kachemak Bay contains critical habitat areas. These are places that deserve special protections. And all the available evidence indicates jet ski recreation is an inappropriate activity in such coastal areas. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Barbara Pittman | bd.pittman@hotmail.co | MacDonald Spit | I wish to express my opposition over the use of personal watercraft (jet ski) in Kachemak Bay. I own property on MacDonald Spit and do not wish to see our environment filled with personal watercraft in either Sailors Cove, Jakalof Bay or greater Kachemak Bay area.<br><br>Wildlife are already stressed by human interactions in our area. Adding this additional noise and disruption to both wildlife, and the peaceful enjoyment of the quite in the area is very concerning. We chose this area specifically because of its remoteness, peaceful environment, and opportunities to see wildlife.<br><br>I am also concerned that there isn't enough presence of medical rescue personnel either from Homer, Seldovia, Halibut Cove, etc. to properly respond to accidents involving these types of watercraft. Yes, boats too can have accidents, but they typically are much slower moving, and therefore the opportunity to have run-ins is statistically much lower.<br><br>In Sailors Cove - boats enter into the area at a reduced speed and are respectful of the boats that are buoyed or moored. Smaller personal watercraft would have a field day inside the sandbar wreaking havoc on the boats in the bay.<br><br>I urge the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to not allow personal watercraft - jet ski type - equipment use in the greater Kachemak Bay area.<br><br>On a 2nd note, it is terrible to see people using drones to film Eagles, and other wildlife on our beaches. It should be investigated as harassment to wildlife. It is also invasive to property owners to have these drones flying over our property. If you need examples - please contact me. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | glenn olson (Via B | golson47@yahoo.com | 6771 Lauden Cir<br>Anchorage<br>99502 | No jet skis in Katchemak Bay!!<br><br>The Board of Fish has a constitutional obligation to maximize the benefit of fisheries for all Alaskans. In Upper Cook Inlet, that benefit is maximized when the resource is made directly available to each of us - that means we need more fish in the rivers and greater access to personal-use fishing throughout Cook Inlet. We want healthy, sustainable fisheries, and that means we all need to share in the work of conservation and strengthen Conservation Corridors. As an Alaskan angler, I support the proposals that work towards those goals and I encourage the Board to support proposals 78, 88, 104, 121, 129, 154 and 195.<br><br>Thank you for your time, and your service to Alaska. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Meg Eggleston | truffle@gci.net | Anchorage | Hello ~ I hope missing the deadline by 20 minutes will be OK. I have enjoyed birding on the Homer Spit many times a year since 1979. The incredible flings of shorebirds that used to pause on the Spit during migration have been reduced to small numbers. But they are still seen. And they need their rest. I totally worry for them if jet skis are permitted.<br>I also worry for the recreational salmon fishing people who cannot afford to go our on a charter but can do some pretty great fishing form the Spit. I don't suppose the salmon would enjoy swimming amidst jet skis.<br>My third concern for myself and others is the simple problem of noise pollution. At 67 years old I still prefer to camp in my tent on the Spit during my summer visits. The sound of jet skis would be totally offensive to my need for listening to the surf, experiencing the natural sounds. And to me, the sounds of fishing boats belong. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rob Shively | Rob Shively <shivelyrob | Kasilof AK | I would be very disappointed were jet skis to be permitted in the Kachemak Bay critical habitat area. I realize you have already learned of many good reasons why so many of us are opposed to repealing the ban. I could cite all of them; instead, I will simply say my main concern is that jet skis would entirely transform the whole wild aura of Kachemak Bay. Rather than feeling like I were touring a pristine, natural environment, with all the peaceful wonders of nature, I would feel I were somehow out of place in a "Cancun North" party haven for adrenaline and alcohol junkies gone wild. Some places are simply meant for certain things and not for others. Cabo San Lucas, Cancun, Lake Powell, and even Big Lake and Longmere Lake are apt destinations for the jet ski hordes. Kachemak Bay is not. Let's not ruin it simply so a small but vocal group of niche users can go nuts there. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Sharon Whytal | sharon whytal <swhytal | PO BOX 1529<br>Homer ak 99603 | I have written and testified three times in the past against jet skis in the fragile Kachemak Bay. Please do not let this happen. The law is clear: the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat Areas is to "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other sues not compatible with that primary purpose." Alaska Statutes 16.20.500 (emphasis added).<br><br>•The science clearly shows Jetskis and PWC's are NOT compatible with the purpose of the Kachemak Bay & Fox River Flats Critical Habitat to protect fish and wildlife, including a recent 2019 National Park Service EIS, a detailed 2017 literature review by ADF&G, and in the opinion of ADF&G's own staff experts.<br>•Over 99% of Alaskan waters are open to Jetski use. The unique natural values of Kachemak Bay attract tens of thousand of tourists and Alaskans each year, and help drive our local economy. It makes no sense to threaten our resources and our economy so a few people can play on Jetskis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Clarence Crawford | Clarence Crawford <sun | 5500 East 104<br>Avenue<br>Anchorage 99507 | Please add this to the list of opponents to allowing jet skis into Kachemak Bay.<br>The reasons are many:<br>1. There is a well established history of opposition to this use.<br>2. Unlike Prince William Sound, Kachemak Bay is a compressed and relatively confined area. Though it is a high-quality environment, it is not a wilderness. The sensitive biological areas are well-known within the Department of Fish and Game. In addition, there are numerous residences and recreational cabins. Not only would the sensitive biological areas be affected, but also the quality of life for those residents and visitors. In my case, our property in Sadie Cove fronts an area barely a mile wide. Recreational boats and fishing boats can come there and be little noticed; also, those boats are there for a clear and legitimate purpose. The purposes of using jet skis are entirely different and unwelcome.<br>3. Kachemak Bay includes forms of aquaculture, such as oyster farming, that jet skiers are apt to disturb. Someone out for a joyride could easily blunder into those floating pens.<br>4. The precedent of banning jet skis is long-standing and well-documented. To add to my first point, it is perverse for the Dunleavy administration to propose something that benefits few people and harms many. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Donna Bartman | Donna Bartman <dmbar | P.O. Box 400<br>Kasilof, AK 99610 | Please do not repeal the ban on jet skis in Kachemak Bay. I have recreated on the bay for about 30 years in kayaks, inflatables, skiffs, etc. and I would like to continue to see wildlife, enjoy the serenity, and not have jet skis zooming around. Yes, I am concerned about the critical habitat, the safety of boaters, waterfowl and marine mammals populations.<br>Please find another place for the personal watercraft group to use. NOT Kachemak Bay. Thank you. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Lane Bottemiller | Lane Bottemiller <laneb | 536 W 15th Ave<br>#A<br>Anchorage, AK<br>99501 | Please continue to support your long-standing commitment to the diverse, productive and precious water-ways of Alaska.<br>Here is another Alaskan against allowing PWCs in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.<br><br>You've heard and know all the arguments on both sides. Here is why my voice matters: I came to Alaska in 2004 to work in tourism and Alaska has been my home ever since. People come to visit our beautiful state —and that includes folks by the tens of thousands drawn to the Kachemak Bay area — because of the pristine and serene experiences that can be enjoyed there. I think we can ALL agree that there is something extra special about the bay. And that makes it worth the extra attention and dedication to KEEPING IT SPECIAL. By special, I mean —like MOST residents of the area— quiet and protected from noisy water craft that are disruptive to people and wildlife. (I don't live there. I visit and I know folks who DO live in the area.)<br><br>I LOVE renting jet skis I've used them in big noisy places like Mexico and Lake Tahoe. I would even love to rent a jet ski here in Alaska. Somewhere OTHER than the bay.<br><br>There are rules and procedures in place. It's the democratic process of affected parties finding compromise. This apparently sneaky end-run on the public process is out of line with fairness and the spirit of community that we value so highly here in Alaska.<br><br>Bottom line:<br><br>1) Please give your best effort to re-direct all agency efforts towards the public process in decision-making while using your publicly funded power of office to gently push back to the the voices that seek to bypass a fair discussion.<br><br>2) Please make every effort to keep these noisy, disruptive vessels out of waterways that have such close proximity to quiet homes, businesses and wildlife. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Jose Heredia | Heredia, Jose <JoseHeredia@ferrellgas.com | | My last two vacations were to Alaska the most memorable was a quiet and peaceful kayaking and fishing In Kachemak bay and Sadie cove . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Jan Stewart | Jan Stewart <janbike56 | 428 Scott Park Drive Iowa City, Iowa 52245 | Last year I visited Homer and the Kachemak Bay area and enjoyed the true beauty of nature and the animals in the area while kayaking and touring the region.<br><br>I am now writing to request that you extend the ban on jet skiis in the region. High speed jet skis tend to congregate in small areas and shallow waters, drive in circular patterns, and jump wakes. In 2001, the State of Alaska went through a rigorous public process, and the overwhelming majority of comments favored a ban on jet skiis in Kachemak Bay. And please remember that the purpose of the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area is to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Gerald R. Brookma | brookman@alaska.net | 715 Muir Avenue Kenai, Alaska 99611-8816 | Dear Sirs:<br>I submit the following statement concerning this matter and request that it be recorded and considered when the final decision on this matter is made.<br>I believe that the use of "personal watercraft". also known as "jet skis", is a totally incompatible use of the area concerned. I urge that these devices be totally prohibited from entering or remaining in the area of Kachemak Bay that is under State of Alaska jurisdiction. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Karl Stupka, Sr. | Karl Stupka <karl@ncso | Bear Cove | I am writing on behalf of my father Karl Stupka (I am also named Karl Stupka). He is the owner of a small plot located off Bear Cove. Located at: 59°43'13.3"N 151°01'06.9"W<br><br>Soon I will also be a joint owner of the land. We are working on the paperwork but we are both very busy and located on opposite coast of the continental states. One day we plan to establish a small dwelling or structure on the property.<br><br>He wanted to make sure I expressed his objection to the proposal to allow Jet Skis to operate in the bay. He agrees with the statements made in the letter inquiry letter you sent and does not want to open the bay to that type of disturbance.<br><br>He is not equipped to correspond through email so I am voicing his concern as his representative. If possible please respond with your receipt of this correspondence so I can let him know his concerns were heard. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Continue the BAN on Jet-skis and PWC in Kachemak Bay!.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Jet ski ban.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Jet Skis on Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Jet-Skis and PWC Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Jetskis.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: No Jetskis in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Rep. Sarah Vance | Vance, Sarah (LEG) <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akl | | See message: RE: Support ban on personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay.msg in PWC after 5 pm comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Multiple | | Kachemak Bay Conservation Society | KBCS JetSki Free Zone Paper Petition | | | | Petition | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWC after 5 pm comments | Multiple | | Kachemak Bay Conservation Society | KBCS Jet Ski Free Zone online petition | | | | Petition | | | | | | | | | | |