

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
SUPERINTENDENT'S COMPENDIUM
2020
KLONDIKE GOLD RUSH NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK**

The compendium is a list of designations, closures, permit requirements and other authorizations and 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 substantive comments and NPS responses is provided below. No response or summary is provided for general statements of support, or "votes" either for or against a proposed change. The NPS welcomed feedback received during the comment period and notes that many suggestions received during that period have been incorporated into final compendiums.

E-bike Comments and Responses

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 than 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.

Park Specific Comments and Responses

13.1404 Klondike Gold Rush: authorization to collect mushrooms

The NPS received three comments concerning the compendium proposal to reduce the daily amount of mushrooms that may be gathered on park administered lands. The proposed change would reduce the quantity gathered from three gallons to one gallon per person per day.

Comments: KLGO received comments on park-specific, proposed changes to the 2020 Superintendent's Compendium from three parties. All comments were opposed and related to the proposal to reduce the daily amount of mushrooms that may be gathered on park administered lands for personal consumption, from (3) three gallons per 24 hours to (1) gallon per day. One comment stated that this proposal is not based on resource concerns, other than the potential for the development of social trails, but rather a concern that the park be consistent with restrictions in lower 48 park units. Mushroom picking in Alaska is seasonal and determined by the weather. They state that based upon subsistence mushroom harvest data from other areas of Alaska, the collection of three gallons of mushrooms per day per person for personal use is not unreasonable. Alaskans must maximize the efficiency of their harvests in the limited times and weather they have available. It is because of these natural limitations that Parks in Alaska have more liberal harvest restrictions than park units in other Lower 48 parks that have better harvest conditions. Another commenter stated they would like to see the modification as one gallon plus 1 mushroom per person per day. Another commenter disagreed with the proposed reduction stating they do not see three gallons as a commercial amount and does not see three gallons as degrading the resource.

Response: Upon consideration of the comments received, NPS has decided not to implement the proposed reduction on the amount of mushrooms that can be gathered for the 2020 compendium update. NPS may consider re-proposing this provision in the future to address concerns regarding commercial activity, resource impacts, or other management concerns..

The compendium for Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park is approved and all previous versions are rescinded.

Superintendent

Date