

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2023 12:31:58 AM

First name: Richard

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: With regard to the proper use of e-bikes on trails, which raises several questions to me.

Usage of the forest lands is increasing steadily, and Teton Pass in particular has been one area experiencing a very significant amount of it on a year round basis. Currently the forest service reported struggling with over crowded parking on Teton Pass. It seems contradictory to that problem to be looking for ways to be further increasing usage there. Before they try to encourage more cars/parking problems, perhaps you should consider putting a hold on expanding use there to e-bikes. I do not feel that it is a good idea to start opening up trails to motorized vehicles. This can only lead to more hiker or horseback conflicts, of which there is more than enough already, and add to the pressure to expand this permission to more types of vehicles. Another consideration is that e-bikes are considerably heavier than regular mountain bikes. When one hikes on trails used by bikers the wear and destruction caused by these machines is very obvious, the trails quickly become deeply v-grooved and difficult to walk on. Heavier e-bikes will only increase this problem. This will result in more trail deterioration requiring additional cost for reparations. Teton Pass especially is home to moose, bear, elk deer and other wildlife, as are many of the other areas under consideration and imposing more, mechanized use will only have deleterious effects on all of these. In short, mechanized travel. Especially urge you to take these and motor or power assisted should remain limited to dirt roads or 4 wheel drive venues, like the other forms of transport permitted there. Also e-bikes can, and do, travel at a higher rate of speed. It is naive to think this won't be a problem. It could be argued that by allowing this sort of use that the Forest service is knowingly creating a danger to both the bikers and other trail users, which could lead to unpleasant costs and other results. It will be a lot easier to impose a doctrine of limitation now, than to try to rescind this sort of use down the road after negative impacts arise. For these reasons I strongly suggest that you not allow these expansions or at the least table them until there have been further research on what impacts they might have.