

Lindsey Schreier

From: Michael Kenosh <mkenosh@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2026 7:30 PM
To: Lindsey Schreier
Subject: [External] 25-P045 - Vermont Use of Public Waters Rules

[External]

Please distribute to the entire LCAR Committee.

I am writing to respectfully and strongly oppose any additional restrictions to the wakeboat rule that went into effect in 2024. As a 20-year resident of one of our state's beautiful lakes, with a science background, I am confused and upset at additional unfair targeting of our recreational pursuits. The conclusions previously drawn have no grounding in reliable scientific method and are fraught with bias and poorly drawn inferences. Well-designed studies surrounding wakeboat wave dynamics compared to traditional motorboats and nature do not support the need for additional restrictions and limitations above the current rule.

As I reside directly on lake frontage year round, I often observe waves crashing over my seawall. The most egregious perpetrator is a moderate wind from the west. Non-wakeboat motorboats and pontoon vessels constantly disregarding no wake zones within 200 feet from shore are next, and these cause much more distress to land and my family than the small number of wakeboats that are surfing in the middle of the lake. These direct observations coincide with data from studies like Goudy and Girod, 2015.

Wakeboats accounted for **just 1.1% of all motorized boat launches statewide in 2024**. It is not reasonable or fair to single out such a small portion of the boating community with further restrictions when the existing rule has been in place for such a short time; especially without objective evidence of problems. Your own review of the first boating season found no violations of the wakesports rule and very few complaints — all of which were unfounded. I did notice that complaints of violations of the shoreline safety zone were registered that turned out to be complaints of the behavior of traditional motorboats and not wakeboats. This further supports a misunderstanding and targeting of our population.

After review of the proposed rule amendments, supporting materials, and the scientific research commonly cited in this rulemaking, I formally specifically oppose the following proposed standards:

- Increase to 100 contiguous acres
- Requirement of a 3,000-foot straight run
- Expansion of the buffer to 500 feet from any object while in the wakesport zone
- Normal Use Definition
- Vermont Use of Public Waters Rules—Section 3.7 Wakesports Section 4.3 Temporary Use Restrictions.

These newly proposed restrictions are **not scientifically based** and instead are speculative and make broad assumptions. Policy should not exceed evidence. Although I do not currently agree with the rule as written, I respectfully ask that you allow the current rule to remain as written and not move forward with additional changes.

I have included the scientific references which support my opposition to the new proposals including the 3,000 foot straight run, the 500 foot restriction from any object, the 100 Acre minimum, and the non-normal use claim. Please reference the following at your discretion:

Scientific References

University of Minnesota — St. Anthony Falls Laboratory

Research on wake wave characteristics, energy, and attenuation relative to distance and depth

<https://cse.umn.edu/safl/news/umn-researchers-study-waves-created-recreational-boats>

Marr et al., Characterization of Boat-Generated Wake Waves (2022)

Wave height, energy, and attenuation study

https://coalitionnavigation.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/BoatGeneratedWakeWaveReport_Feb12022_Final.pdf

Lake Waramaug Task Force — Shallow Water Environment Wave Impact Study (2024)

Wave energy propagation and shoreline distance findings

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5852df852e69cfa768783fd0/t/6791117b64c0e95b7061fb1b/1737560444987/LWTaskForce%2BShallow%2BWater%2BEnvironment%2BWave%2BImpact%2BStudy%2BFinal%2BReport%2B010825.pdf>

Daeger et al., Impacts on Nutrient and Sediment Resuspension by Various Watercraft

Depth-dependent sediment disturbance findings

<https://lakes.grace.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Impacts-on-Nutrient-and-Sediment-Resuspension-by-Variou-Watercraft-Proceedings-of-the-Indiana-Academy-of-Science-2023.pdf>

Goudey & Girod — Characterization of Wake-Sport Wakes and Their Potential Impact on Shorelines

(2015)Goudey, C. A., & Girod, L. G. https://www.wsia.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/WSIA_draft_report_Rev_II.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

MacFarlane — Wake Characteristics from Recreational and Wake Boats (2025)

MacFarlane, G. J. (2025) <https://mymlsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/wake-macfarlane-2025-wakesurfing-wakeboarding-and-waterskiing-a-comparison-of-wake.pdf>

Sincerely,

Michael J. Kenosh, MD

Sent from [Outlook](#)

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.