

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
SUPERINTENDENT’S COMPENDIUM  
2020**

**GLACIER BAY NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE**

The compendium is a list of designations, closures, permit requirements and other restrictions adopted pursuant to authority in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) applicable to areas administered by the National Park Service (NPS). On January 15, the NPS published proposed changes for the 2020 compendium and invited public comment on those proposed changes through February 15. A summary of comments and NPS responses is provided below.

**Process Comments and Responses**

“Determination of Need for a Restriction, Condition, Public Use Limit, or Closure”

**36 CFR 13.50 Closures and restrictions, National Park System Units in Alaska**

1. Comment: A commenter suggested the definition of an e-bike be modified. The commenter noted that the proposed definition of an e-bike includes cycles with either two or three wheels. The commenter noted that a “bicycle” by definition is limited to two wheels. The commenter also stated that three wheeled devices are more likely to damage vegetation along single-track trails since the wheel base may be wider than the trail.

1. NPS Response: The definition of “low speed electric bicycle” in the Consumer Product Safety Act includes devices with two or three wheels. 15 U.S.C. 2085. The NPS also includes three-wheeled cycles within its definition of “e-bike” so that these devices are not categorically excluded from areas where they may be appropriate. Based upon existing information, the NPS believes use of three-wheeled vehicles on single track trails will be infrequent and not likely to damage vegetation. The Superintendent retains the authority to restrict these devices in certain locations to protect resources or for other reasons.

2. Comment: A commenter stated that allowing e-bikes and e-trikes on trails open to traditional bicyclists would cause conflicts with other users and consequently should only be allowed on roads and parking areas.

2. NPS Response: The NPS has evaluated the roads, parking areas, and trails where traditional bicycles are authorized and, based on existing information, does not believe user conflicts are likely with the addition of e-bikes in those locations. The Superintendent retains the authority to close areas to e-bikes to prevent user conflict or for other reasons.

3. Comment: Some commenters stated the provision proposing to allow e-bikes is inconsistent with nationally applicable NPS regulations because they do not meet the regulatory definition of “bicycle” in 36 CFR 1.4.

3. NPS Response: The NPS agrees that e-bikes do not meet the definition of bicycle in NPS regulations because e-bikes are not “solely human powered”. This means they are not specifically regulated by 36 CFR and therefore may be managed under the Superintendent’s authority in 36 CFR 1.5(a)(2) to “designate areas for a specific use or activity, or impose conditions or restrictions on a use or activity”.

4. Comment: One commenter said that the e-bike proposal was overly restrictive in limiting e-bikes to roads, parking areas, and trails in Alaska NPS units.

4. NPS Response: NPS regulations at 36 CFR 4.30 limit traditional bicycles to public roads, parking areas and designated administrative roads and trails. Under Federal law applicable to Alaska, “nonmotorized surface transportation for traditional activities . . . and for travel to and from villages and homesites” is allowed notwithstanding any other provision of law. 16 USC

3170(a). Because e-bikes have a motor, they do not fall under this provision. The NPS policy memorandum recognizes the Superintendent’s authority to manage e-bikes differently than traditional bicycles based on considerations involving public health and safety, natural and cultural resource protection, and other management activities and objectives. The decision of the NPS to limit e-bikes to roads, parking areas and trails that are open to traditional bikes (unless noted in this compendium) will ensure the NPS manages e-bikes in Alaska the way it manages e-bikes outside of Alaska. This helps achieve a consistent management framework for use of e-bikes within the National Park System. In addition, the NPS has no data on the level of bicycle use on more 20 million acres that are not in designated wilderness. Given the lack of information, NPS is not able to assess the potential impacts to park resources and associated management challenges that could occur from allowing e-bikes in those vast areas. Consequently, NPS has determined that e-bike use in Alaska NPS units will be allowed only on roads, parking areas, and trails that are open to traditional bicycles.

5. Comment: One commenter stated that prohibiting e-bikes on trails in designated wilderness would also close sport and subsistence hunting opportunities.

5. NPS Response: Because of the 1964 Wilderness Act prohibition on “motor vehicles, motorized equipment . . . [or] other form of mechanical transport,” NPS does not have authority to allow e-bikes in designated wilderness. Nothing in ANILCA modifies this prohibition with respect to e-bikes. NPS notes that e-bikes are a new and emerging form of technology. Accordingly, such devices have not been traditionally used by sport or subsistence hunters. This action does not establish any closures or restrictions on sport or subsistence hunting. These activities may continue to occur on NPS lands in the same manner as before.

6. Comment: One commenter stated the procedures for closing areas to e-bikes should be those in 43 CFR Part 36, which implements access under ANILCA (16 USC 3170 and off-road vehicles).

6. NPS Response: Department of the Interior regulations at 43 CFR 36.11 implement the special access provisions in ANILCA discussed above. They also address off-road vehicle (ORV) use. E-bikes are motorized and therefore do not fall under the special access provisions implemented by section 36.11. Neither are they ORVs. For this reason, the closure procedures at 43 CFR 36.11 do not apply.

7. Comment: One commenter stated that locations along the Tlingit Trail are places of interest and expressed concern that e-bikes may go buzzing by visitors taking in the views and points of interest.

7. NPS Response: The NPS has evaluated the roads, parking areas, and trails where traditional bicycles are authorized and, based on existing information, does not believe user conflicts are likely with the addition of e-bikes in those locations. The Superintendent retains the authority to close areas to e-bikes to prevent user conflict or for other reasons.

**36 CFR 13.1184 – Other restrictions on vessels**

1. Comment: Commenters focused on the length of the dingy allowed to be secured to the Bartlett Cove Public Use Dock. Suggested lengths of dinghies allowed to be kept at the dock were 12 feet and less, and less than 14 feet.

1. NPS Response: The identified location for dinghies to be secured to the Dock cannot accommodate dinghies of a larger length. The NPS may consider dock space allocation during next year’s compendium cycle.

**The Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve compendium is approved and all previous versions are rescinded.**

   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent Date  
Philip N. Hooge