

NPS Response: The alternatives in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements were developed based upon the best information available. The area restrictions under the modified preferred alternative B on PWC use were identified because of the levels of non-motorized and passive uses that pose present or potential conflicts.

Alternative B currently provides for a three-year pilot study to further evaluate PWC use areas. Potential restrictions of PWC use in other locations of the recreation area will be evaluated during the pilot study. The pilot study will provide the recreation area managers with additional information to evaluate reasonable measures to manage all lake uses and activity until a lake management plan is developed for Glen Canyon NRA. The purpose of the pilot study and a description of how it will be implemented are provided in appendix C of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements.

20. One commenter was opposed to implementing a pilot study because it would result in PWC users avoiding areas zoned as flat-wake and would concentrate their use in other areas of the lake thereby reducing the ability of the study to adequately assess conflict between PWC and other users.

NPS Response: The National Park Service must manage Glen Canyon National Recreation Area to protect the recreational opportunities available at the park, as well as the natural resources found in the lake and surrounding lands. To accomplish this, a lake management plan will be developed which will provide the tools necessary to analyze activities that take place on the lake and determine if unacceptable impacts are occurring. Even though there is rationale and need to consider management of PWC under a separate decision-making framework, there remains the need to examine all uses of the lake collectively. As identified in the cumulative effects analysis under each impact topic, there are many management issues involving the mix of lake uses that will require additional planning in a lake management plan.

Modified alternative B provides for a three-year pilot study to further evaluate PWC-use areas. Potential restrictions of PWC use in other locations of the recreation area will be evaluated during the pilot study. The pilot study will provide recreation area managers the best available data to manage all lake uses and activity until a lake management plan is developed. There are no guarantees or predictable outcome for what open areas PWC users will or will not utilize during the initial implementation of this regulation. The

data collected will be analyzed based on the best information available to National Park Service managers at that time. The purpose of the pilot study and a description of how it will be implemented are provided in appendix C of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments Related to Visitor Conflicts and Safety

21. One commenter stated that children under the age of 16 that operate PWC is a safety issue that should be addressed.

NPS Response: The National Park Service does not currently have regulations which set a minimum vessel operator age. The States of Arizona and Utah do have current operational age requirements for PWC users and those requirements are enforced by Park Rangers at Glen Canyon as NPS requirements pursuant to 36 CFR 3.1. Arizona regulations require children younger than 12 years of age to be accompanied by an adult when operating a PWC. Children older than 12 years can operate a PWC alone. Utah laws and regulations state that children between 12 and 15 can operate PWC after completing a mandatory boating education course if they remain within visual parental supervision. Children ages 16 to 17 must complete a mandatory boating education course to operate a PWC without supervision. The NPS thinks the current age requirements are acceptable and do not pose a safety issue on Lake Powell.

Comments Related to Recreation Area Operations

22. A number of commenters stated that the problem with PWC is that there are sufficient laws in place to protect visitors, however these laws are not being enforced and that there needs to be more enforcement of these laws.

NPS Response: We disagree that the existing laws are not being enforced. NPS agrees that there is a need for more enforcement and an element of the modified preferred alternative B is to seek increased funding to provide additional law enforcement at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area to enforce the existing regulations. An increased number of law enforcement officers on the lake would have the added advantage of increasing the number of visitor contacts on the lake to prevent unsafe behavior. In addition, an active information and education program, also an element of the modified preferred alternative B, will help to reduce the need for enforcement actions. However, the NPS is working with law enforcement officers from

Arizona and Utah to provide a proper level of enforcement of the existing laws.

23. One commenter asked how the Federal noise standard which states "Operating a vessel in or upon inland waters so as to exceed a noise level of 82 decibels measured at a distance of 82 feet (25 meters) from the vessel is prohibited," would be enforced in the areas such as confined canyons and rivers where there is no point 25 meters from the shore.

NPS Response: Federal and State law enforcement staff within Glen Canyon NRA enforce the Federal sound standard in areas where a distance of 82 feet (25 meters) occurs such as marina launch areas and large open bays. In confined canyons and river areas where 82 feet is not obtainable, a stationary sound level test can determine if a motorboat engine is exceeding acceptable sound levels. Federal and State protection staff have the ability to enforce excessive or unusual noise within confined areas utilizing the SAE J2005 and SAE J1970 as stated within the State of Utah Boating Laws and Rules.

Comments Related to Water Quality

24. Based on the analysis of water quality in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement which stated that some hydrocarbons can adsorb onto suspended soil particles and settle out, one commenter requested that any monitoring plan should therefore include sediment chemistry monitoring in marinas and sediment deposition areas down current for the constituents most likely to settle, including poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH). Additionally, to understand whether current sediment conditions and aquatic health of the benthic community is altered from the historical baseline, the monitoring plan should include benthic population sampling, and bioassay of these sediments. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should identify whether there is potential for these sediment deposition areas to be dredged. If so, it may merit implementing management practices to reduce or eliminate release of toxic constituents from PWC use.

NPS Response: Text has been added to the Final Environmental Impact Statement in the "Alternatives" section to describe the monitoring plan that was added to the modified preferred alternative B. A report is presently being completed for a study that was done to determine the chemical content of sediment at the main inflow area of the Colorado River. Funding is currently being sought for another study to do the