

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

DUNOIR SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNIT

OBJECTION ISSUES

| | |
|---|----|
| Public Law 92-476 and “Vehicular Use” | 2 |
| Notice and Opportunity to Comment | 4 |
| Wilderness Character and Enforcement | 7 |
| Safety | 8 |
| Context for 2008 Letter from Deputy Chief | 10 |

PRIMARY OBJECTORS:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Melissa Bahleda | Charles R. Neal |
| Keith V. Becker | John Osgood |
| Judi T. Blymeyer | Jon Robinett |
| Michael Blymeyer | Al Sammons |
| Callie Domek | Howard Sanders, Shoshone Back Country Horsemen |
| David DeWitt Dominick | Land Tawney, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers |
| Marshall Dominick | Tory Taylor, Taylor Outfitters |
| Carole Genaro | Kathleen Treanor |
| William Goosman | Laurence Treanor |
| Marya Grathwohl | Sarah Walker, Wyoming Wilderness Association |
| Laney Hicks | Connie Wilbert, Sierra Club |
| Mark Hirschberger | Thomas Williams |
| Robert Hoskins | Alex Wolfer |
| Richard Inberg | George Wuerthner |
| Martha Martinez del Rio | Jim Pratt |
| Jazmyn McDonald | |
| Governor Matthew H. Mead | |
| Lisa McGee, Wyoming Outdoor Council | |

Interested Persons:

- Governor Matthew H. Mead
- Callie Domek
- James Wolf, Continental Divide Trail Society

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

OBJECTION ISSUE: PUBLIC LAW 92-476 AND “VEHICULAR USE”

ISSUE SUMMARY

Public Law 92-476 is the enabling legislation by which Congress created the Dunoir Special Management Unit. Both those opposed to, and in favor of mountain bike use within Dunoir and the Shoshone NF which proposes allowing bike use on the 6.8-mile stretch of Pinnacles Trail, know what is said in the enabling legislation. The difficulty is in interpretation. Both sides contend they are correctly interpreting the writer’s intent for using the word vehicle. The Forest Service claims the intent of the word vehicle was motorized vehicles. Those opposed to mountain bikes in the Dunoir claim the intent of the word vehicle was any wheeled vehicle motorized and non-motorized.

SAMPLES OF ISSUE (OBJECTION EXCERPTS)

- Despite the clear legislative prohibition, 132 16 U.S.C. §§ 1131--1136. “[T]here shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area.” Id. at 4(c). Draft ROD at 11. Senate Report No. 92--80 (1972) (emphasis added), Alternative G and the DROD elected to allow mountain bikes in the Dunoir. The Forest Service’s decision in this case is contrary to law and should be withdrawn.
- When Congress created the Dunoir SMU, the legislation stated that the area was for non-vehicular recreation. It did not say non-motorized. Mountain bicycles are vehicles, are illegal in the Dunoir, and must be prohibited.
- The word “vehicle” is unambiguous. By the Forest Service’s own definition, a vehicle is “any device in, upon, or by which any person or property is or may be transported, including any frame, chassis, or body of any motor vehicle, except devices used exclusively upon stationary rails or tracks.” Although a motor vehicle is one type of vehicle in a broader category, it is not the only variety. Put simply, bicycles are vehicles and it is “vehicular use” the Dunoir’s enabling legislation prohibits.
- The plain language of the Dunoir’s enabling legislation requires non- motorized and non-mechanized management prescriptions in the revised forest plan. The Dunoir’s enabling legislation broadly prohibits “public or private vehicular use....” It also instructs the Forest Service to manage the area “especially for non-vehicular access recreation.” Between the draft and final forest plans, however, the Forest Service came to believe that Congress meant to prohibit only motor vehicles, not mechanized vehicles. We are also opposed to continued mountain bike use in the Dunoir Special Management Area. As mechanized vehicles, mountain bikes are clearly excluded by the establishing law.

REMEDY PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

- We ask the Forest Service to comply with the Dunoir’s enabling legislation and accordingly, to prohibit all vehicular uses, including mountain biking in the Special Management Unit. We also ask that this accompany a decision to recommend the Dunoir as wilderness.

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

- Prohibit mountain biking in the Dunoir Special Management Unit, as is the law.
- We recommend that the law banning mountain bikes be enforced and the Dunoir Special Management Area be recommended for Wilderness Designation.

WHAT'S REQUIRED BY LAW, REGULATION AND/OR POLICY

Public Law 88-577, The Wilderness Act

Public Law 92-476 (October 9, 1972) is the enabling legislation by which Congress created the Dunoir Special Management Unit. PL 92-476 states, "SEC 5. (a) Within the area depicted as the Special Management Unit on the map referred to in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not permit harvesting of timber or public or private vehicular use of any existing road, and shall not construct or permit the construction or expansion of any road in said Special Management Unit. The Secretary shall administer said unit in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the national forests especially to provide for non-vehicular access recreation and may construct such facilities and take such measures as are necessary for the health and safety of visitors and to protect the resources of said unit: Provided, however, that this section shall not affect such vehicular use and maintenance of existing roads as may be necessary for the administration of said unit by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Public Law 98-550 (October 25, 1984) stated that Dunoir was to remain a Special Management Unit and would be managed per the enabling legislation. It states in section 401 (e), "The provisions of this section shall not apply to the area referred to in section 5 of Public Law 92-476 (86 Stat. 792) and generally known as the Dunoir Special Management Unit, which shall continue to be managed pursuant to Public Law 92-476."

CONCLUSIONS

The Forest has defined bicycles as mechanized. Inventoried Roadless does not prohibit mechanized use. There are two management areas where mechanized use is prohibited MA 1.1—Wilderness (e.g., Washakie Wilderness) and MA 1.2—Glacier Addition to Fitzpatrick Wilderness. In addition, one area currently restricts mechanized use to system roads and trails (2.2A Line Creek).

Wilderness areas prohibit mechanized travel, however the Dunoir SMU is not designated wilderness. The Dunoir is being managed to preserve wilderness qualities, and the Forest Supervisor has stated in the draft ROD that there will be no expansion of bicycle use within Dunoir beyond the 6.8-mile section of the Pinnacle Trail.

The enabling legislation by which Congress created the Dunoir Special Management Unit (Public Law 92-476) does not permit vehicular use in the Dunoir. Although the Forest Service's current definition of "vehicle" includes mountain bikes (**36 CFR 261**; and FEIS on document page 496--Record Indexed page 530), the Shoshone National Forest (NF) draft Record of Decision contends that "vehicle" as used in PL 92-476 was intended to mean "motorized vehicles."

In the draft Record of Decision (dROD) for its Land Management Plan, the Responsible Official proposes allowing mountain bikes to utilize a 6.8-mile section of the Pinnacles Trail within Dunoir and citing

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

Senate Report, No. 92-80 (1972) and Senate testimony. The forest also cites a November 26, 2012 letter submitted by retired Wyoming Senator Alan K. Simpson stating the ‘vehicular’ as used in PL 92-476 was intended to mean motorized vehicles.

Objectors including the Wyoming Wilderness Association, Shoshone Back Country Horseman, Back Country Hunters and Anglers and private citizens contend that the word “vehicular” as used in Public Law 92-476 also includes bicycles (mechanized travel), thereby prohibiting bicycles within Dunoir.

After OGC consultation, the forest may decide to continue to allow mountain bike use on the Pinnacle Trail. The LMP is a programmatic document, thus the Forest should keep its analysis of Dunoir on a programmatic level. The Forest could consider future site specific analysis related to social or environmental issues associated with this specific trail if necessary.

There is no violation of law, regulation, or policy.

There are no current instructions.

OBJECTION ISSUE: NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Objectors contend the Forest Service failed to give the public adequate notice and the opportunity to comment on its decision to allow mountain biking in the Dunoir.

SAMPLES OF ISSUE (OBJECTION EXCERPTS)

- At no time between the draft forest plan and the final forest plan did the Forest Service seek specific comment on its newfound interpretation of the Dunoir’s enabling legislation. It never provided the public with any of the legislative history or other documents it relied on to inform its decision. It never sought public comment on its proposal to allow mountain biking to continue in some parts of the Special Management Unit, but not in others.
- The draft Record of decision claims that the decision to include mountain bikes in the DuNoir SMU is based on public comment. This is an inaccurate and unfair statement, especially to the large majority of the public that supported wilderness for the DuNoir and were not afforded the opportunity to comment on this unanticipated proposed action.
- At the time the draft plan was released, there was no reason to believe the Forest Service was considering allowing mountain bike use in the Dunoir. Throughout the entire forest planning process the only decision the public understood was pending for the Dunoir was whether it would be recommended wilderness or whether the Forest Service would strictly enforce the statutory prohibition on vehicle use as its enabling legislation directs. Although Alternative A (the no action alternative representing the 1986 forest plan) technically included mountain bike use in the Dunoir, the Forest Service had stated repeatedly that this was not a viable or legal alternative.

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

- To bring forth a proposal allowing mountain biking in the area at this stage in the process is disingenuous and regrettable. It amounts to a significant reversal of policy, breaks faith with those who commented on the original plan proposal and will lead to confrontation.

REMEDY PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

- Open the public written comment period again, with adequate public meetings, to educate the public on the significant changes in the new alternative G, and solicit new comments on these changes moving to alternative G. Or, remove Alternative G in its entirety, and publish a revised SNF Final Plan.
- It is necessary for stakeholders to engage in meaningful conversations to determine an appropriate management strategy for [the Dunoir].

WHAT'S REQUIRED BY LAW, REGULATION AND/OR POLICY

Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions Of The National Environmental Policy Act: 40 CFR 1500-1508;

Forest Service NEPA Regulations: 36 CFR 219

Forest Service NEPA Regulations: 36 CFR 220

Forest Service Manual – NEPA Environmental Policy and Procedures: FSM 1950

Forest Service National Environmental Policy Act Handbook: FSH 1909.15

40 CFR §1503.4 Response to comments.

(a) An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to:

- (1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action.
- (2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.
- (3) Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.
- (4) Make factual corrections.
- (5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

CONCLUSIONS

Alternative G's proposed management for this area falls within the range of alternatives for alternatives A through F, and Alternative G does include components of these other alternatives. Several public meetings were held between the DEIS and FEIS which highlighted the issues and potential changes to motorized and non-motorized recreational activities.

Regarding the preferred alternative's allowance of mountain biking in the Dunoir Special Management Area, this issue has a continuum of discussion in the DEIS, Response to Comments, FEIS and in the Draft ROD (DROD). The DROD maintains the existing use and extent of mountain biking in the Dunoir recreation area. Mountain biking is limited to the 6.8 miles of the Pinnacle Trail and use is prohibited on the remaining 21.6 miles of trail in the Dunoir SMU and is prohibited off the designated trail in the Dunoir SMU. Alternative G excludes snowmobiling (over-snow motorized recreation) in this area.

The Franc's Peak IRA, Wood River IRA, and Dunoir SMU received strong support for wilderness recommendation, by people advocating for more wilderness. As compared to Alternative A, Alternative G changes the management of these four areas by decreasing the acres suitable for active vegetation management from 12 percent to 5 percent, decreasing the acres suitable for winter motorized recreation from 96 percent to 38 percent, and decreasing the acres suitable for summer motorized recreation from 12 percent to 11 percent. Therefore, Alternative G increases the back country protection for the Shoshone, while maintaining the opportunity for a variety of activities.

The DEIS management activities proposed in the Franc's Peak, Wood River, Trout Creek, and Dunoir SMU generated substantial public comment both for and against activities, particularly motorized and non-motorized recreation. In accordance with 40 CFR 1503.4, the Forest Supervisor weighed these public comments, as acknowledged in the DROD, along with other information when coming to his proposed alternative modifications. The issues on which Alternative G were crafted did receive adequate public notice, public comment, and environmental analysis.

The public comment process is not a voting process by which the highest number of comments for or against a topic wins and is included in the Agency's decision. Yet, it is clear from a review of the public comments of the DEIS (FEIS, Volume II, Appendix A. Content Analysis Report) that "the SNF failed to yield to the clearly expressed wishes of the public and were not responsive to comments on how lands should be managed."

The fundamental objection question in front of the Forest Service is not whether the Forest was contradictory in its view of public sentiment towards Francs Peak IRA, Wood River IRAs and Dunoir SMU, or is the failure of the Forest Service to respond to the clearly expressed wishes of the public. The question for the objection review is whether the Forest adequately documented the incorporation of public comment into the environmental analysis and decision making.

The objection process allows the public to again express their views on the direction the SNF proposed in its DROD. It is clear that a substantial portion of interested and affected parties lack a clear understanding how their comments were used in the development of the Alternative G.

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

INSTRUCTION BEING CONSIDERED

Clarify in the final Record of Decision how public comment was incorporated in the final decision regarding Dunoir.

OBJECTION ISSUE: WILDERNESS CHARACTER AND ENFORCEMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Objectors contend that the use of mountain bikes within the Dunoir Special Management Unit will damage its wilderness character to the point that it will not qualify for recommendation as wilderness. Objectors are also concerned that the inability of the Forest to enforce management direction within this area will further exacerbate impacts to wilderness character in the Dunoir SMU.

SAMPLES OF ISSUE

- Opening this area to wheeled activity will compromise the wilderness characteristic of the area and the potential of the unit from ever becoming wilderness.
- The Dunoir would enhance the wilderness character of the contiguous Washakie and Teton Wilderness areas. These are major components of the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem. There is negligible sign of the Tie Hack logging from a century ago, as the skid trails and camps have been grown over.
- The SNF failed to recommend these areas for formal wilderness designations in spite of overwhelming public support and with an inaccurate evaluation of need.
- Because of the limited enforcement capacity there is little hope of the agency managing bicycle use to just the three trails identified for that use. Past management history has shown that enforcement to curtail non-authorized use in the Dunoir has been little to none. The inability to enforce current trespass into the trails in Dunoir is causing resource damage to soil and native vegetation.

REMEDY PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

- The Dunoir Special Management Unit should be recommended for wilderness.
- Prohibit mountain biking in all IRAs/MA 1.3 as well as those parts of IRAs that have been shaved off into MA 3.5 or at least conduct a Supplemental EIS to assess environmental impacts of allowing mountain biking in MA 1.3. This SEIS must clearly differentiate mountain bikes as mechanized vehicles with different impacts on the human environment from non-mechanized hikers and horses.

WHAT'S REQUIRED BY LAW, REGULATION AND/OR POLICY

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

FSH 1909.12, Chapter 70 – Wilderness Evaluation

Public Law 88-577, Wilderness Act

CONCLUSION

The Dunoir is not designated wilderness; it is being managed to preserve wilderness qualities. The Forest Supervisor has stated in the draft ROD that there will be no expansion of bicycle use within Dunoir beyond the 6.8-mile section of the Pinnacle Trail.

The LMP is programmatic. Site specific analysis would be conducted on trails to determine their suitability as bicycle trails.

Although law enforcement patrols are not forest plan issues, the Forest recognizes the need for continued and potential increases in enforcement to reduce unauthorized uses.

There is no violation of law, policy or regulation.

There are no current instructions.

OBJECTION ISSUE: SAFETY

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Objectors assert there are safety concerns for users on the 6.8 mile section of Pinnacle Butte Trail in the Dunoir. Sections of this trail are steep and narrow with short sight distances for horses and hikers. Objectors contend that allowing bicycles on the same trails with hikers and horses can create user conflicts and dangerous situations. Objectors also contend that bike use on this trail will cause increased conflict with grizzly bears resulting in more grizzly bear take.

SAMPLES OF ISSUE (OBJECTION EXCERPTS)

- The Forest's Revised Land Management Plan (e.g. Table 22; page 122) allows the use of non-motorized bicycles on all forest trails outside of designated Wilderness Areas. This is a very short sighted decision. Many trails (e.g. #6 above, Forest Trails 628 and 761 within the Clarks Fork Wild and Scenic River Corridor, etc.) are totally unsuited for bicycle travel. In addition, all of the trails in the northern part of the forest were constructed for use by hikers and livestock, and they are ill suited for the different usage demands of bicycles.
- Putting bicycles on the same trails with hikers, saddle horses, pack horses, and cattle will create conflicts and potentially dangerous situations. The current situation with bicycles is identical to that created by ATV and ORV usage in national forests over the last 15 or 20 years. Initially, the ATVs were present in small numbers, and forest service personnel were not concerned with their potential damaging impacts. However by the time the forest service recognized the ATVs were

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

becoming a major problem, it was often too late to implement reasonable regulations. If the Shoshone National Forest follows a similar, "head in the sand" approach with bicycles, it will have to deal with another preventable problem which will have huge, detrimental, environmental consequences for the forest in the future.

REMEDY PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

- Prohibit mountain biking in MA 1.2 while encouraging foot and horse traffic.
- Prohibit mountain biking in all IRAs/MA 1.3 as well as those parts of IRAs that have been shaved off into MA 3.5) or at least conduct a Supplemental EIS to assess environmental impacts of allowing mountain biking in MA 1.3. This SEIS must clearly differentiate mountain bikes as mechanized vehicles with different impacts on the human environment from non-mechanized hikers and horses.
- The forest needs to be proactive and develop a comprehensive plan for bicycles instead of being reactive to future problems after the "train has already left the station."

CONCLUSIONS

The Forest Service manages for multiple uses and provides a wide variety of options on National Forest System Lands. The agency strives to manage user conflict by allowing certain recreational uses within certain management areas. For example, motorized and mechanized are prohibited in wilderness. However, the agency does not specifically try to eliminate all user conflicts. Hikers and horseman may use the same trail and at times conflicts may occur. The forest cannot eliminate all conflicts. User conflict could be described as a degraded recreational experience.

Similarly, the agency cannot eliminate all potential risk for user-wildlife conflict. On the Shoshone National Forest, mountain biking and other recreational uses occur on trails occupied by grizzly bears.

The draft LMP contains desired conditions, goals, standards and guidelines designed to reduce or eliminate risks to grizzly bears in a multiple-use setting. Desired conditions state that "Suitable habitats for threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species are managed consistently with established and approved recovery plans and conservation strategies" (LMP, pg. 38). Goal statements (TES Goals 01 to 03) emphasize providing well-distributed habitat capable of contributing to the survival and recovery of listed species, management to retain white bark pine, management to sustain grizzly bear populations in the primary conservation area (PCA), and accommodation of grizzly bear populations outside the PCA to the extent compatible with other uses (pg. 38).

The Forest Service strives to keep the public safe, yet cannot guarantee safety. The agency is managing a vast natural environment and informs the public of the challenges to safety in such an environment. The Forest Service' Safety homepage advises persons visiting the national forests that they are responsible for their own safety and provides tips for public safety at <http://www.fs.fed.us/safety/>.

There is no violation in law, policy or regulation.

There are no instructions.

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

OBJECTION ISSUE: CONTEXT FOR 2008 LETTER FROM DEPUTY CHIEF

ISSUE SUMMARY:

The draft ROD states,

Those advocating for continued mountain bike access state that the law never intended to exclude mountain bikes. Support for this position included reference to a 2008 letter from USDA Forest Service Deputy Chief Joel Holtrop to the Regional Foresters stating “ mountain biking is a non-motorized use of National Forest System trails, along with hiking and horseback riding.”

The Objector is concerned that not all readers will understand that though the Deputy Chief is correct that mountain biking is a non-motorized use, it does not mean that mountain biking is allowed in *all* National Forest System Trails.

SAMPLE OF ISSUE (OBJECTION EXCERPTS)

- The reference to a letter from the Deputy Chief to the Regional Foresters in 2008 is alarming when a portion of it is printed out of context (I, as an advocate for Wilderness, at least hope it is out of context). I think that Forest Service officials should be concerned about semantics and language when they print something like this: "...a 2008 letter from USDA Forest Service Deputy Chief Joel Holtrop to the Regional Foresters stating, "...mountain biking is a non-motorized use of National Forest System trails, along with hiking and horseback riding." I, as a former employee, realize that the Deputy Chief didn't mean all National Forest System Trails, including those trails that are in designated Wilderness, but not all readers will.

REMEDY PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

- If the agency continues with this draft decision, that language should be corrected.

CONCLUSIONS

The letter in question is within the Record, **Record Indexed Document #02356:**

File Code: 2350

Date: June 18, 2008

Route To:

Subject: Forest Service and Mountain Biking

To: Regional Foresters, Station Directors, Area Director, IITF Director and Deputy Chiefs

In 2006, the Forest Service renewed its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA). Our agency has a strong partnership with IMBA and continues to work with IMBA to address issues of concern. The Forest Service provides thousands of miles of premier mountain biking trails. Of the 145,000 miles of National

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

Forest System trails, we estimate that over 100,000 miles of our trails are open to mountain biking. As this use grows, I anticipate the Forest Service will have the opportunity to manage an increasingly significant number of miles of trails for mountain biking.

I want to emphasize that mountain biking is a non-motorized use of National Forest System trails, along with hiking and horseback riding. In our planning and policy documents, a distinction between mountain biking and motorized uses on our national forest system lands should be made.

The Forest Service and IMBA are implementing our renewed MOU. IMBA provides numerous hours of volunteer labor to assist us in maintaining trails for mountain biking. IMBA and our agency trail staff have worked with the Missoula Technology and Development Center in producing a handbook and DVD for sustainable mountain biking trails. Our trails program is increasingly dependent on volunteers and partnerships to maintain our network of trails. I encourage you to work with IMBA and its chapters to identify projects that will advance our MOU and mutually benefit our agency trails program.

If you have any questions about this Service-wide MOU or having IMBA members work with your local units, please contact Jonathan Stephens at (202) 205-1701.

/s/ Joel D. Holtrop

JOEL D. HOLTROP

Deputy Chief for National Forest System

The objection is based on the reference from the **draft ROD**:

In the DEIS it was proposed that management of the Dunoir SMU would exclude mountain bike use. The proposal generated significant public comment both for and against allowing mountain bikes. Those against mountain bike use argue that it better protects wilderness values and better maintains the area for future wilderness designation. Those advocating for continued mountain bike access state that the law never intended to exclude mountain bikes. Support for this position included reference to a 2008 letter from USDA Forest Service Deputy Chief Joel Holtrop to the Regional Foresters stating, "...mountain biking is a non-motorized use of National Forest System trails, along with hiking and horseback riding." In addition, retired Wyoming Senator Alan Simpson who co-sponsored the 1984 Wyoming Wilderness Bill submitted a comment on the Draft LMP stating that the intent of the enabling legislation for Dunoir was to restrict motorized use in the SMU, but not to restrict bicycles. After careful review of the enabling legislation and accompanying Senate Report, No. 92-80 (1972), I believe it is a reasonable interpretation that the focus of the law was on motorized vehicle use, given language referring to "motor vehicles" and "roads."

The Forest has defined bicycles as mechanized. Inventoried Roadless does not prohibit mechanized use. There are two management areas where mechanized use is prohibited. These include designated MA 1.1—Wilderness (e.g., Washakie Wilderness) and MA 1.2—Glacier Addition to Fitzpatrick Wilderness. In addition, one area currently restricts mechanized use to system roads and trails (2.2A Line Creek).

Shoshone Forest Plan Revision Objection Responses

The Deputy Chief did not misuse the phrasing that mountain biking is non-motorized. He was not addressing wilderness within the letter as this was not the context. Also the draft ROD uses this reference to demonstrate that mountain bikes are non-motorized. This portion of the draft ROD is not referencing wilderness. Dunoir is not wilderness and does not specifically prohibit mechanized.

INSTRUCTIONS BEING CONSIDERED

Define where mechanized use is allowed in Dunoir in the final ROD.