Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/11/2020 3:29:36 PM
First name: Kristina
Last name: Schomer
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I am strongly opposed to allowing e-bikes on non-motorized trails.

1. There should be different trails for people wanting/needing to use different methods of accessing them. For example, not all public land access is available for anyone of any physical fitness level. I can't take a tram to the top of every 14-er in Colorado because I don't feel like hiking it, or am physically unable. Similarly, not all trails should have to be paved so that even the person least able to walking can access the toughest locations. In this example, not all trails should be accessible for anybody who wants to use a motor to access them.

2. Faster speeds and higher usage, along with people getting to places with a motor, which they are otherwise incapable of accessing will invariably result in higher injury/search and rescue requirements for the rider themselves. Has this added cost/risk been considered?

3. Mixing human-powered use and motorized use (regardless of a class designation) is a mistake from a safety perspective for everyone else on the trail with that rider. The effort and focus involved in regular mountain biking is far greater than the effort and focus involved in e-biking, which will lead to accidents. If people want to use a motor to access trails, keep them on the same trails. If people want to enjoy a trail that is truly non-motorized, keep separate trails available for them.

4. This proposal is a slippery slope for what's defined as motorized vs non-motorized...and opens up the opportunity for future use of trails to other motorized new technology. Once we allow e-bikes on what are currently defined as non-motorized trails, what's to stop the next electric motor invention from joining the argument and saying "well, electric motors are allowed already, so what does it matter if my wheels are set up differently, or my pedals don't actually function"?

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment...