

Memorandum

TO : Gordon Hammon, Division of Recreation
and Land Uses

File No. 2320

FROM : George W. Tourtillott, Division of
Legislative Reporting and Liaison

Date: November 5, 1964

SUBJECT: Near Natural Areas (Implementing the
Wilderness Act).

Your reference:

Regarding your inquiry of November 2, I believe the second definition is better but should be expanded perhaps--to exclude bicycles. I suggest the following language be added to the definition: "It does not include contrivances that are pushed or pulled on land by a living power source not riding thereon."

Until such time as our experience with this legislation indicates a tighter definition it will permit a "reasonable" approach to the uses of wilderness. In some areas, the use of this type of equipment has already become established. To exclude this type of equipment, which to me is compatible with the wilderness concept, would in effect tend to "tie" our own hands in administering the areas. In addition, the use of this equipment may be of help in reducing the requests for motorized equipment for access to private lands and valid occupancies.

I have reviewed the draft "Ingress and Egress" (2366) and have made a few comments of a technical nature.

I believe it would be helpful to discuss the 2364 draft in more detail with you, at your convenience.

G. W. Tourtillott

11/6

I talked to George Tourtillott today concerning the reason for excluding bicycles. He said they had no real definite reason for excluding bicycles but suspected that some groups might object to an interpretation of the law which would seem to allow them. After further discussion he agreed that it might be better to not raise the issue at this time and that it might be as well to allow the 2nd definition to stand as proposed in our memo of Nov. 2.

RU to A. P. S. H.

*EDW
GWH
GWH*

*on new
disc*