

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/25/2020 11:58:53 PM

First name: Dylan

Last name: Carney

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I believe that non-motorized trails should remain non-motorized, so as to not jeopardize the access that cyclists, hikers, and equestrians currently have. By categorizing e-MTBs as motorized vehicles and then subsequently allowing e-MTBs onto previously non-motorized trails, we will be completely changing the user experience of the existing non-motorized user community.

It is my understanding that the proposed USFS solution will jeopardize funding sources to maintain traditionally non-motorized trails, once a trail is opened to e-MTB use (and therefore other motorized uses).

I would rather see the USFS adopt the approach advocated by my local MTB advocacy group, the Evergreen MTB Alliance, which is as follows:

- Adopt Class 1 e-bikes as non-motorized transportation.
- Adopt Class 2 and 3 e-bikes as motorized transportation.
- Allow Class 1 on non-motorized trails upon completion of an environmental review and public comment process, driven by local forests and/or districts.
- Prohibit Class 2 and 3 on non-motorized trails.
- Encourage programmatic NEPA review of eMTB impact on non-motorized trails, at the District, Forest or Regional level, to ease the review burden on a trail by trail basis.
- Approach eMTB access by using a "Closed Unless Signed Open" basis.

Thank you for allowing public comment on these issues!