

prohibited from the park. Alternatives B and C would permit PWC use with certain restrictions, and alternative D would permit PWC use as currently managed in the park. The benefits of any alternative are measured relative to the baseline conditions, which are represented by alternative A. Therefore, there are no incremental benefits associated with alternative A. The primary beneficiaries of alternatives B, C, and D would be the park visitors who

use PWCs and the businesses that provide services to PWC users such as rental shops, restaurants, gas stations, and hotels. Additional beneficiaries include individuals who use PWCs outside the park where PWC users displaced from the park may decide to ride if PWC use within the park were prohibited. Benefits accruing to individual PWC users are called consumer surplus gains, and those accruing to businesses are called

producer surplus gains. Consumer surplus measures the net economic benefit obtained by individuals from participating in their chosen activities, while producer surplus measures the net economic benefit obtained by businesses from providing services to individuals. These benefits, projected over a 10-year horizon, are summarized in the table below.

PRESENT VALUE OF PROJECTED INCREMENTAL BENEFITS UNDER ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D, 2002–2012
[dollars]

| | PWC users | Businesses | Total |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Alternative B: | | | |
| Discounted at 3% | 74,112,030 | 2,031,990–11,232,060 | 76,144,020–85,344,090 |
| Discounted at 7% | 59,006,910 | 1,617,850–8,942,800 | 60,624,760–67,949,710 |
| Alternative C: | | | |
| Discounted at 3% | 100,580,610 | 2,477,690–12,863,370 | 103,058,300–113,443,980 |
| Discounted at 7% | 80,080,800 | 1,972,710–10,241,630 | 82,053,510–90,322,430 |
| Alternative D: | | | |
| Discounted at 3% | 105,874,320 | 2,597,680–13,426,400 | 108,472,000–119,300,720 |
| Discounted at 7% | 84,295,580 | 2,068,240–10,689,900 | 86,363,820–94,985,480 |

Costs

As with the benefits described above, the costs of any alternative are measured relative to the baseline conditions, which are represented by alternative A. Therefore, there are no incremental costs associated with alternative A. The primary group that would incur costs under alternatives B, C, and D are the park visitors who do not use PWCs and whose park experiences would be negatively affected by PWC use within the park. At Lake Mead, non-PWC uses include boating, canoeing, fishing, and hiking. Additionally, the public could incur costs associated with impacts from alternatives B, C, and D to aesthetics, ecosystem protection, human health and safety, congestion, and non-use values. However, these costs could not be quantified for all alternatives due to a lack of available data.

There are other costs associated with alternatives B, C, and D relating to NPS enforcement of PWC restrictions. Those costs, projected over a 10-year horizon, are summarized in the table below.

PRESENT VALUE OF PROJECT NPS ENFORCEMENT COSTS UNDER ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D, 2001–2012

| | [dollars] |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Alternative B: | |
| Discounted at 3% | 3,523,950 |
| Discounted at 7% | 2,793,080 |
| Alternative C: | |
| Discounted at 3% | 4,195,180 |
| Discounted at 7% | 3,325,090 |

PRESENT VALUE OF PROJECT NPS ENFORCEMENT COSTS UNDER ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D, 2001–2012—Continued

| | [dollars] |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Alternative D: | |
| Discounted at 3% | 5,202,030 |
| Discounted at 7% | 4,123,110 |

Quantified Net Benefits

The quantified net benefits associated with alternatives B, C, and D are presented in the table below. These net benefits do not account for the costs to non-PWC users, or those relating to aesthetics, ecosystem protection, human health and safety, congestion, or non-use values due to a lack of available data. Therefore, these net benefit estimates do not represent all costs. If all costs could be incorporated, the indicated net benefits for each alternative would be lower. Nevertheless, these estimates present a likely range of net benefits that can be estimated from available information.

PRESENT VALUE OF QUANTIFIED NET BENEFITS UNDER ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D, 2002–2012

| | [dollars] |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Alternative B: | |
| Discounted at 3% | 72,620,070–81,820,140 |
| Discounted at 7% | 57,831,680–65,156,630 |
| Alternative C: | |

PRESENT VALUE OF QUANTIFIED NET BENEFITS UNDER ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D, 2002–2012—Continued

| | [dollars] |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Discounted at 3% | 98,863,120–109,248,800 |
| Discounted at 7% | 78,728,420–86,997,340 |
| Alternative D: | |
| Discounted at 3% | 103,269,970–114,098,690 |
| Discounted at 7% | 82,240,710–90,862,370 |

Summary of Comments

A proposed rule was published for public comment on September 5, 2002 (67 FR 56785–94), with the comment period lasting until November 4, 2002. The NPS received 1,696 timely written responses regarding the proposed regulation. Of the responses, 1,636 were form letters in 3 separate form letter formats and 60 were individual letters. There were 1,060 electronic mailings. Responses received included 51 from individuals, 2 from businesses, 5 from organizations and 2 from public agencies.

Within the analysis, the term “commenter” refers to an individual, business, or organization that responded. The term “comments” refers to statements made by a commenter.

General Comments

1. There were a variety of commenters, including the Personal Watercraft Industry Association and United States Coast Guard (USCG), who