Below are my comments on the proposed changes:

I) In general, I support the efforts and intent of the USFS to increase access to USFS lands for e-bikes. I have and use both a traditional mountain bike and a fat-tire e-bike. But, as I’ve gotten older—(I’m currently 70)—I find my preference for my e-bike increasing. I use each bike only where it is permitted. And, currently, I cannot use my e-bike on the non-motorized trails where I can use my standard mountain bike. I would like to be able to use my e-bike on those same trails. I believe this change in permitted uses is appropriate because e-bikes are bikes or, more specifically, because e-bikes:

1. Are quiet and have no emissions.
2. Feel and behave like a standard bike.
3. Operate in the same low speed range as standard bikes. And,
4. Have trail and road impacts that are similar to those of standard bikes.

My situation and preferences are not unique. I believe expanded access for e-bikes would be a benefit enjoyed by many.

II) I also agree with and support the use of the proposed three different categories of e-bikes and the proposal to allow land managers the discretion to allow e-bike categories on trails and roads that are currently designated as non-motorized on a case by case basis.

III) There are two parts of the current proposal that I believe should be changed. They are:

1. E-bikes should be managed as a special class of bike (or three special classes of bikes) and not as motor vehicles. And, the designation of a trail or road as non-motorized should not be changed to motorized if e-bike use on it is approved. Rather, it should simply remain as a non-motorized trail or road where e-bike use is allowed along with other appropriate uses. These changes are needed for the following reasons:
   1. I believe this will be less confusing for trail and road users because it will be more in line with what people commonly consider to be non-motorized uses. (I.e., people who want to avoid the vehicle noise and emissions typically associated with motorized trails and roads will not misperceive the nature of e-bike trails and roads and shy away from them.)
   2. User groups (including bike user groups) that build and maintain non-motorized trails will not lose funding that is specifically for non-motorized trails.
2. There should be a slight modification of the definition of “e-bike”. Instead of defining an e-bike as having an electric motor of less than 750 watts, I believe an e-bike should be defined as having an electric motor of no more than 750 watts. This change in definition would be in line with the definition used by the state of Washington. It would also be in line with the market place since many manufacturers use Bafang 750 watt motors, (e.g., Rad Power Bikes).—It would be a shame to disallow the use of some of the most popular e-bikes because they used a 750 watt motor instead of a 749 watt motor.

Thank you for considering my comments.