Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2020 3:38:31 PM First name: Devon Last name: O'Neil Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thanks for putting so much thought into these changes as e-bike popularity grows. I think it is important to treat e-bikes the same way other vehicles powered by motors have been and continue to be treated: as motorized transport. This is fundamentally different from human-powered transport, and access should reflect these differences. If motorcycles can't access non-motorized trails, the trail designation should not be reclassified to accommodate e-bikes; e-bikes should simply be steered toward motorized routes. They still get to enjoy the forest. They still are welcome. If users would rather stick to non-motorized routes, they can enjoy them under human power, on a traditional mountain bike. Too many ripple effects are at stake when considering reclassifying non-motorized routes to motorized routes simply because e-bikes are more popular now. Funding earmarked for non-motorized projects won't be available. Thousands of volunteer stewards who ride mountain bikes and maintain non-motorized trails won't be as willing to help maintain those same trails if they're reclassified as motorized routes to e-bikes simply due to popularity growth. E-bikes are easier to ride, plain and simple. Going uphill with the assistance of a motor is completely different from having to propel oneself up that same hill. To attempt to blur those lines is unrealistic and not worth the detrimental effects it would have on human-powered recreation throughout the forest.

At the very least, please distinguish between Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes when evaluating access designations. They are starkly different vehicles whose permissions on certain routes should reflect those differences. As well, it is critical to let these decisions be made on a local level, by local ranger districts (not Forest Supervisor offices), with input from local users.

Thank you for your consideration. Devon O'Neil