

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/9/2020 4:23:36 PM

First name: Phillip

Last name: Simon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The use of low power, class 1 e-bikes on federal land is appropriate anywhere that the use of traditional bikes is appropriate.

This is supported by scientific research such as the IMBAs study on e-bike trail impact, (see [https://b.3cdn.net/bikes/c3fe8a28f1a0f32317\\_g3m6bdt7g.pdf](https://b.3cdn.net/bikes/c3fe8a28f1a0f32317_g3m6bdt7g.pdf))

as well as legal definitions of both state and federal law such as HR 727 and California AB 1096.

(see <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-bill/727/text> and [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB1096](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB1096))

The common term "motor vehicle" predates the invention of e-bikes and is thus irrelevant. The legal definition of a "motor vehicle" does not include e-bikes. (see above)

Arguments holding that the impact of e-bikes is different than traditional bikes are emotional rather than rational and should not be used to determine USFS policy.

It is in opposition to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and is just plain unfair to say that people who do not possess the same physical ability as those who can pedal a traditional bicycle up steep terrain should not be on the same trail.

The Forest Service policy should follow the guidance of the National Park Service and state policy such as that of California Vehicle Code.

The