To be reviewed	New comment	Comment #	Comment # Label	NPS Original Commenter	NPS Original Comment
	1	51	NPSCmt51	ELJ - NPS Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	The NPS requests that global climate change be analyzed for cumulative impacts to surface water as global climate change (regional drought) would have a cumulative impact on surface water levels when considered with additional water withdrawals from Lake Powell.
1	1	113	NPSCmt113	RS - IMR-NR	The NPS requests further analysis regarding withdrawals and what withdrawals might indicate about the variation/fluctuations in reservoir levels that will occur in addition to what already exists from normal operations and climate change. The effects, including cumulative effects, to cultural resources along the reservoir shoreline need to be considered and addressed in this document.

UDWRe March 31, 2017 Response (NEED TO CROSS CHECK THESE RESPONSES WITH SUBMITTAL)

Please see the Extended Narrative document for the response to NPS Comment No. 51.

Please see the Extended Narrative document for the response to NPS Comment No. 113.

NPS Comment Disposition	NPS Disposition Reviewer
OK, NPS to review and provide any additional comments in the impact analysis portion of the EIS.	E. Janicki
NPS asks for additional clarification as to whether the cumulative effects between the action and no action are indeed the same, and if so, how. NPS asks for additional clarification on the influence of climate change on cumulative effects. The NPS understands that the "No Action" alternative assumes the existing water right is being utilized. However, the on-the-ground conditions today are that the water right is not currently being utilized. Therefore, effects from a utilization are not being seen on the ground. The "No Action" alternative should reflect present day conditions (that being the ~86,000 a-f which is not currently being utilized anywhere in the system). We understand that the modeling for the "No Action" alternative is assuming the utilization of the ~86,000 a-f at undisclosed locations within the watershed. The analysis does not reflect what changes would be seen between the current conditions today (water right not currently being utilized) with the Action Alternative (water right being utilized and withdrawn at a disclosed location). Perhaps, multiple scenarios under the "No Action" alternative which depicts the current on the ground conditions (water right not being utilized) as well as the utilization of the 86,000 a-f water right could help more accurately demonstrate what the true on-the-ground impacts will be of utilizing the existing water right compared to the on-the-ground conditions of the right not being utilized today. If absent the multiple scenarios, a statement in the EIS document which discloses very clearly that the current on-the-ground (no utilization) condition is not being represented in the "No Action" alternative should be included for clarity for the readers and to prevent confusion.	E. Janicki

UDWRe Updated Response	For District Review	Notes	NPS Comment Disposition to be addressed
Comment noted.		maybe mov	1
			1