

From: [Edward Grossman](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Allow Class 1 e-bikes
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 11:58:27 AM

I am a longtime Marin resident and MMWD ratepayer. I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.

--

Edward Grossman

From: [Bill Abright](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Cc: [Bill Abright](#)
Subject: Dec. 12 Watershed meeting input
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 3:19:33 PM

To the Board of Directors MMWD,

I am Bill Abright, a resident of San Anselmo since 1971 and I have been riding mountain bikes on Mt. Tam since 1983. For 7 months in 2018 I was a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee on E-bikes and I am a founding member of E-Bikeaccess.org

I ride every Sunday with a group we call the Over the Hill Gang. Our Sunday ride has taken on a religious regularity and the group has expanded through mutual friendships to include about 20 men. Half of us now ride class 1 e-bikes.

Last Sunday after starting our usual ride up Shaver grade at 8 am we congregated at the lake Lagunitas dam. After a 15 min social exchange 4 of us split from the group and headed up Rock Springs past Portrero Meadows, and then rode pavement to Pantoll station, up Old Stage to the Westpoint Inn and down HooKoo e Koo to Blithdale Ridge to Crown road and then down to Woodland market for lunch. It was a 31 mile trip. Our ages are 68, 73,77, and 84. Three of us have been riding Mt. Tam together for 40 years. We practice good trail etiquette and model good behavior. We are typical of many bike riders who have transitioned to class 1 E-bikes to continue their weekly rides and maintain their health and friendships.

Under the current MMWD policy categorizing E-bikes as motorized vehicles we are considered outlaws for doing no harm other than riding our E-bikes. It is time for the MMWD board of directors to remedy a long overdue change in this policy and give class 1 E-bikes the right to ride where other bikes are allowed. E-bikes have been on Mt Tam for 16 years. I have personally been riding an e-bike for 8 years as have most of our group. We have had a trial period and have passed the test. It is time to change the policy and officially allow class 1 e-bikes where other bikes are allowed.

From: [Kevin Daly](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E Bikes
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 9:21:52 AM

Five years is too long to wait on approval of class 1 ebikes(pedal assist}. As an MMWD rate payer and 55 year resident of Marin I expect better from the board.

Please approve e bikes!

Thank you.

Kevin

Kevin Daly
Five Corners Partners, L.P.
415 464 1301
385 Woodland Road
Kentfield CA 94904

From: [Kathy Zirker-Smith](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E-bike access
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 12:44:17 PM

Hello,

I am a longtime Marin resident and MMWD ratepayer. I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.

Thank you,
Kathy Zirker-Smith

From: [Pete Pedersen](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Ebike access to MMWD water shed
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 2:46:36 PM

I am a longtime San Anselmo resident and MMWD ratepayer. I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done. In my opinion we don't need another study or delay to address this issue. It's time to act.

Best regards,

Pete Pedersen

ASLA, LEED ap

Pedersen Associates

Landscape Architecture

24 H Street • San Rafael, CA 94901

415 456 2070 voice

[https://link.edgepilot.com/s/8c2e4a37/CgYi-uvYNE2I7UbQVPo0Wg?
u=http://www.pedersenassociates.com/](https://link.edgepilot.com/s/8c2e4a37/CgYi-uvYNE2I7UbQVPo0Wg?u=http://www.pedersenassociates.com/)

Check out our [Facebook Page](#)

Featured on [Houzz](#)

BAY AREA GREEN BUSINESS

This message (including all attached Cad files) are released without warranty for information only. Officially issued documents and any associated addenda and/or bulletins shall take precedence over these files. It shall be the recipient's responsibility to verify the accuracy and suitability of the information on these drawings for any purpose other than their original intent as landscape architectural drawing. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message. **Please consider the environment before printing this email.**

From: [Howard Luria](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Ebike access
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 6:15:26 AM

“I am a longtime Marin resident, MMWD ratepayer, and over 70 years old. I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. Without their use, I would no longer be able to ride in the watershed, my backyard.

I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. 5 years of discussions with no decisions is far too long already.

It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.”

Howard Luria, MD

From: [paul daro](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E-bike access
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 11:48:09 AM

Hello,

I am a longtime Marin resident and MMWD ratepayer. I support e-mountain bikes on wherever mountain biking is currently allowed. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.

Thank you,
Paul Daro
Mill Valley

From: davidmonetta@comcast.net
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E-bike use
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 5:06:09 AM

I am a 30-year Marin resident. I and my family have hiked and biked on Mr. Tam for decades. I have attended meetings regarding bike riding and in particular Class 1 ebiking and conveyed my, my family's and scores of my neighbor's support for the same. Support for such use has been unusually significant. Those opposing have been few and basically rationalized by incorrect assessments of such use and trying to keep use of the mountain lower. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. As one who will be 70 in a few months a Class 1 ebike provides me and my friends access to the mountain away from the crowds and without having to use our cars to gain access. To limit such use is tantamount to precluding those of us longtime users such access. Such ebike use actually allows for the disbursement of use away from the points of access of most. The areas where I hike, I use my car to gain access, and I encounter many other hikers and frankly far less bikers. But when I use my e-bike I and my co-riders rarely see either. Use of the mountain should be encouraged, not discouraged. Class 1 e-bikes allow one to go up hills but do not allow us to speed up them. When we go downhill the assist cuts out and does not allow one to speed – anymore than if I was on a regular mountain bike. I am sure there are instances of speeding with both e-bike and none-bikes. Just as there are instances of some hikers and car parkers going where they should not be. Enforce the laws and rules against those that do not abide by them. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to decide in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.

From: [Michael Bloom](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: e-bikes in the Watershed
Date: Sunday, December 10, 2023 8:51:42 PM

I have been drinking MMWD water and recreating on Mt. Tam since 1973. I have hiked its trails and, since about 1980, rode mountain bikes on its fire roads. At 74 it is my class-1 pedal assist bike that will allow me to continue to ride the mountain I love.

It is a grave mistake to class all "e-bikes" as one thing. It is the industry creating these bikes that have affectuated that misleading mindset. Class 1 bikes are simply a pedal assist bike. I stop pedaling, it stops. Class 2, throttle "bikes" are simply electrified scooters and should be treated as such.

There is no reason that Class 1 bikes should not be allowed in the watershed anywhere that "acoustic bikes" are permitted. Speed is not the issue: bikes go their fastest downhill, when a Class 1 rider is not using any electric power at all.

Our numbers are growing, we pay water rates, taxes and use fees. We do not impact the mountain any more than equestrians or "acoustic" bikers. Five years is too long to wait for equal access to the recreational opportunities in the watershed. It is only fair.

Michael Bloom
gaboolle@gmail.com
415-686-0840

From: [Stu Ryan](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E-bikes
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 8:30:34 AM

Hello –

My wife and I are 25-year residents of Marin county and are MMWD ratepayers.

We generally don't ride E-bikes, but we support those who do. Please allow Class I E-bikes to ride on the MMWD's watershed just like regular bikes. It will make our community healthier.

thanks

Stu

J. Stuart Ryan

stu.ryan@rydout.com

Phone: 415-608-0080

From: [Shawn McGhie](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: E-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam
Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 9:21:53 AM

Dear Board Members:

Please allow Class 1 e-bike access on Mt. Tam. Given my age of 58 and physical condition, this allows me access to the Mt. Tam trails. I can no longer physically ride up the steep fire trails. E-bikes are one of my primary sources of exercise, and Mt. has many trails for a wonderful experience. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.”

Or even briefer: “Five years is too long already. Allow Class 1 e-bikes now.”

Here is some further background information:

The e-bike issue has been before the MMWD board for **five full years**, without any decision. The process started with the December 2018 public workshop, followed by the Community Advisory Board on E-Bikes. After seven meetings with presentations by experts and others, a majority of the Advisory Board recommended that Class 1 e-bikes be treated the same as other bicycles, consistent with California law. The Board, however, did nothing, which meant that its 2011 ordinance against e-bikes remained on the books.

Eventually, in December 2020, the MMWD staff formally proposed that the Board authorize a three-year trial period for e-bikes on fire roads. A main purpose was to “collect information relating to E-bike usage on the watershed and observe how E-bikes integrate into the broader recreational community,” specifically, “information relating to the total number of E-bikes and bicycle users, traffic patterns along watershed roads, dynamics among watershed visitors, and potential impacts from all recreational activities on the watershed facilities and natural resources.”

The Board, as then constituted, deferred the staff recommendation in favor of hiring a consultant for \$250,000 to prepare a Recreation Management Plan that would address e-bike access and other recreational use issues. In June 2022, the Final Recreation Management Plan was promised by Fall 2023.

At some point and for undisclosed reasons, the scope of the RMP was changed to a Recreation Management Planning Feasibility Study. From what we can tell, the renamed study is no longer intended to address the e-bike issue and the staff does not even intend to renew its recommendation of a three-year trial period for e-bikes.

This further delay in approving Class 1 e-bikes is unacceptable from multiple perspectives.

First and foremost, failing to act now perpetuates the antiquated, unwarranted 2011 policy against “motorized bicycles.” That policy was adopted with no public comment or board discussion, with only three directors present, only one of which remains on the Board today. It was expressly intended to comply with the definition of motor vehicles in the California Vehicle Code. But four years later in 2015, the Board failed to revisit the issue when California state law was changed and three classes of electric bicycles were deemed bicycles rather than motor vehicles.

If the Board’s inaction and indecision over the ensuing years has any upside, it is that we have now had the equivalent of a multi-year trial period for Class 1 e-bikes which now account for an

estimated 25%-50% of bicycles on Mt. Tam. (Note that the GGNRA expressly allows Class 1 e-bikes on most roads and trails where other bicycles are allowed.)

Class 1 e-bikes have passed this trial with flying colors. Marin continues to enjoy high quality water—which of course is the top priority. And in the recent 1,060-person survey (where hikers took the survey three times more often than cyclists), 63% of visitors favored allowing e-bikes. Only a quarter wanted to “restrict” e-bikes. More generally, the vast majority of those surveyed rated the condition of the trails and fire roads — and interactions with other visitors — as “good” or “great.” Over 90% feel safe, up from 60% a decade ago.

These survey results suggest that tensions between hikers and cyclists have calmed down. Even the Marin Conservation League acknowledges that most hikers have come to accommodate the “culture differences” with “mountain bikers, and the majority of bikers, in turn, have learned to acknowledge the different experiences sought [by hikers] and accommodate their behavior.” That’s good progress. It shouldn’t be undone by the handful of dissenters who repeat the same anecdotes about the occasional rude cyclist (typically, not e-bikes).

While the current Board is not to blame for the previous Board’s lack of leadership in this area, allowing this issue to continue to fester would be counter-productive and would not inspire confidence in the Board’s ability to make decisions. And excluding visitors who need pedal-assist to obtain the undeniable health benefits of bicycling and recreation is the opposite of the inclusive approach that Marin Water strives to embrace.

The specter of a lawsuit by MCL is no cause for further delay. MCL’s lawsuit against the National Park Service for allowing e-bikes on the GGNRA and other national parks has not fared well for MCL. The federal court in Washington DC rejected all the claims but one, and declined to set aside the NPS’s regulation allowing e-bike access while litigating the remaining claim. In the meantime, the NPS has submitted an environmental report concluding generally that e-bikes have no greater environmental impact than other bicycles.

In short, now is the time for the Board to find out if and how staff intends to address the e-bike issue in the upcoming RMP and for the Board to make its wishes in this regard known to the staff. Five years is more than enough time to decide this issue. At a bare minimum, it would be a major step backwards for the RMP to propose anything less than a trial period. But with the MMWD’s and GGNRA’s extensive experience with e-bikes during the last several years, there is clearly enough data and evidence to forgo another trial period, to vacate the 2011 ordinance and adopt the California Vehicle Code’s definition of bicycles to include at least Class 1 e-bikes.

From: [Rodger Jacobsen](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Finally get around to allowing ebike legal access
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 8:52:38 AM

Ebike access

I have been riding an ebike in Marin County California since 2007 when I turned 68 years old because I needed the extra power assist to keep up with the riding habits I had formed since I began riding mountain bikes in 1982. I think electric bikes are just about the same as a regular bicycle except the rider gets a power assist the he needs it. I see no need to regulate them any differently from a regular bicycle.

I don't see any need to go into specifics addressing perceived problems with mountain bike in general or ebikes specifically, after attending many meetings and writing countless letters defending bike riders right to ride public roads and paths safely with other users in the great American outdoors. I would add that after years of riding my bike it was classified as a class two electric bike so I would add that all electric bicycles should be allowed wherever regular bikes are allowed.

Thanks for Reading This,

Rodger Jacobsen

From: [John Boeschen](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 9:21:32 AM

Board Members

I'm a supporter of ebikes on Mt. Tam. I believe the Recreation Management Plan should treat Class 1 ebikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on for 5 years. It's time for the Board to make a decision in favor of ebike access, same as the GGNRA has done.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely
John Boeschen
San Rafael resident

From: [Kevin Conger](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: MMWD should not ban e-bikes
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 6:40:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please do not prohibit e-bike on MMWD trails. E-bikes have been very effective in helping older riders continue to enjoy nature and exercise. I have been an e-biker for 5 years and can confirm that the “e” in the bike does not make the rider go faster than is safe. E-bike assist going uphill at slow speeds. Downhill speeding is where biking becomes unsafe, and the elderly ladies and gentlemen on e-bikes are not speeding down hills! Prohibiting e-bikes would simply keep older riders off the trails to allow the faster bikers to have the trails all to themselves. Please stop delaying action and resolve this by going on record to allow e-bike on MMWD trails.

Thank you for your good work.

Kevin Conger

CMG Landscape Architecture
444 Bryant
San Francisco, CA 94107

t (415) 495-3070

cell (415)265-3884

https://link.edgepilot.com/s/1560ad48/PhLAee_2mUiclbGCskJ4AQ?u=http://www.cmgsite.com/

Watch our [CMG Studio Video](#)



From: [Walt Meservey](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Please allow electric Mountain Bikes on MMWD Fire Roads
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 9:45:49 PM

Dear MMWD Board,

My name is Walter Meservey. I have been a Marin homeowner for the last 35 years and a mountain biker for 34 years. I turn 72 on this Wednesday. I wish it were otherwise, but the health issues of old age require me to ride an electric mountain bike if I want to enjoy the beauty of the MMWD.

I do not believe that e-bikes ridden by senior citizens on the fire roads threaten water quality, the Environment, or the serenity of other recreational users.

I would prefer it if Class 1 e-bike riders were treated the same way as regular mountain riders. in any case, I hope you will allow senior citizens permission to continue riding their e-bikes on MMWD property.

Walter Meservey
241 Los Angeles Blvd, San Anselmo, CA 94960
San Anselmo, CA 94960

From: [jeffrey knaus](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: RE: The Water Board's e-Bike decision
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 8:49:31 AM

Dear Marin Water Board,

"I am a longtime, 23-year Marin resident and MMWD ratepayer. I have supported e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes like other bicycles.

At 65 years old, I am a nonstop walker, hiker, and someone who enjoys good health and our beautiful environment in Marin. While I continue to do hikes, I would be limited in my ability to pedal up some of the terrain on the mountain that I've always loved and enjoyed.

I've been involved in early discussions about this process for quite some time and feel that it is time for the board to decide in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done."

Sincerely,

Jeff Knaus

Jeff Knaus
415-699-3682

From: [Miles Raphael](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Recreation Management Plan
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 4:47:06 AM

Dear MMWD Board,

It is unconscionable that 5 years after initial public meeting to allow access to fire roads for class 1 e-bikes, we still have no decision. As a Marin County resident and MMWD ratepayer, I encourage you to decide on a trial period in the Recreation Management Plan, or adopt a policy which grants access to class 1 e-bikes on all roads where bikes are allowed, in accordance with the GGNRA policy which allows access in adjacent lands.

Sincerely,

Miles Raphael

From: [Mark Sachs](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Regarding the Water District Meeting on EBikes
Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 7:02:10 AM

I'm a longtime Marin resident and appreciate the wonderful natural gifts we have.
I support the use of ebikes to be treated as any other bike on Mt. Tam Water District. This discussion has gone on far too long.
Please vote to allow the use of ebikes on the water shed.
Thank you.
Regards,
Mark Sachs
222 Ridgewood Dr, San Rafael, CA 94901

From: [Jim Miller](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Support for e-bikes on MMWD
Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 11:18:52 AM

I am a longtime Marin resident and MMWD ratepayer. I support e-mountain bikes on Mt. Tam. I encourage you to ensure that the Recreation Management Plan treats Class 1 e-bikes the same as other bicycles. This discussion has gone on far too long already. It is time for the Board to make a decision in favor of e-bike access just like the GGNRA has done.

From: [Bob Mittelstaedt](#)
To: [Board Comment](#)
Subject: Watershed Committee/Board meeting, Dec. 12, Agenda Item 4 e (Update on the Watershed Recreation Management Planning Feasibility Study)
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 7:37:10 AM

This comment is submitted on behalf of the Board of Directors of E-Bike Access.Org, a non-profit entity dedicated to the safe, environmentally-responsible riding of Class 1 e-bikes on Mt. Tam. The basic thrust of this Comment is to encourage the Board to ensure that the upcoming Recreation Management Plan includes access for Class 1 e-bikes where other bicycles are allowed.

Thanks to the laudable efforts of the MMWD staff over the last five years -- coupled with the years of experience with Class 1 e-bikes on the GGNRA and MMWD -- the Board now has more than enough data and evidence to take definitive action now. It should rescind the outmoded 2011 ordinance treating "motorized bicycles" as "motor vehicles." The intent of the 2011 ordinance was to conform to California law. But since 2015, California law has treated Class 1 e-bikes as bicycles, not motor vehicles. The MMWD should now conform to California law with respect to Class 1 e-bikes. There is no need to wait until the Recreation Management Plan (now referred to as the Recreation Management Planning Feasibility Study) is completed. At a bare minimum, the Board should approve without further delay the three-year trial program treating Class 1 e-bikes as regular bicycles which the staff proposed three years ago.

HISTORY:

The e-bike issue has been before the MMWD board for **five full years**, without any decision. The process started with the December 2018 public workshop, followed by the Community Advisory Board on E-Bikes. After seven meetings with presentations by experts and others, a majority of the Advisory Board recommended that Class 1 e-bikes be treated the same as other bicycles, consistent with California law. The Board, however, did nothing, which meant that its 2011 ordinance against "motorized bicycles" remained on the books.

Eventually, in December 2020, the MMWD staff formally proposed that the Board authorize a three-year trial period for Class 1 e-bikes on fire roads. It was designed to "collect information relating to E-bike usage on the watershed and observe how E-bikes integrate into the broader recreational community," specifically, "information relating to the total number of E-bikes and bicycle users, traffic patterns along watershed roads, dynamics among watershed visitors, and potential impacts from all recreational activities on the watershed facilities and natural resources."

Instead of adopting that sensible proposal, the Board (as then-constituted) decided to hire a consultant for \$260,000 for a year-long process of preparing a Recreation Management Plan to address e-bike access and other recreational uses. The Final Recreation Management Plan was promised by Fall 2023.

At some point, the scope of the RMP was changed to a Recreation Management Planning Feasibility Study. We are concerned that the renamed study no longer intends to address the e-bike issue and will not even include the previous recommendation of a three-year trial period for e-bikes. If so, the RMPFS will be a major step backwards. We urge the Board to clarify whether and how the upcoming plan/study will address e-bikes and to make clear the Board's wishes in that regard.

NO FURTHER DELAY:

In our view, any further delay in approving Class 1 e-bikes is unacceptable from multiple

perspectives.

First and foremost, it would perpetuate the out-of-touch 2011 policy against “motorized bicycles.” That policy was evidently adopted with no public comment or board discussion, with only three directors present, only one of which remains on the Board. As noted, it was expressly intended to comply with the definition of motor vehicles in the California Vehicle Code. But four years later in 2015, California state law changed and three classes of electric bicycles were deemed bicycles rather than motor vehicles. Yet the Board did not revisit or update its ordinance--and has failed to do so for the ensuing eight years.

If the past Board’s inaction and indecision over the ensuing years has any upside, it is that we have now had the informal equivalent of a multi-year trial period for Class 1 e-bikes. Those bicycles account for an estimated 25%-50% of bicycles on Mt. Tam. (Note that the GGNRA expressly allows Class 1 e-bikes on most roads and trails where other bicycles are allowed.) Class 1 e-bikes have passed this trial with flying colors. Marin continues to enjoy high quality water—which of course is the top priority. And in the recent 1,060-person survey, 63% of respondents favored allowing e-bikes even though the respondents included three times as many hikers than cyclists. Only a quarter of respondents wanted to “restrict” e-bikes.

More generally, the vast majority of those surveyed rated the condition of the trails and fire roads — and interactions with other visitors — as “good” or “great.” Over 90% felt safe, up from 60% a decade ago.

These survey results suggest that tensions between hikers and cyclists have calmed down. Even the Marin Conservation League acknowledges that most hikers have come to accommodate the “culture differences” with "mountain bikers, and the majority of bikers, in turn, have learned to acknowledge the different experiences sought [by hikers] and accommodate their behavior.” That’s good progress. It shouldn’t be undone by the handful of dissenters who repeat the same anecdotes about the occasional rude cyclist (typically, not e-bikes).

While the current Board is not to blame for the previous Board’s lack of leadership in this area, allowing this issue to continue to fester would be counter-productive and eventually might undermine public confidence in the Board. And to exclude visitors who need pedal-assist to obtain the life-enhancing health benefits of bicycling and recreation is the opposite of the inclusive approach that Marin Water strives to embrace. Marinites who ride Class 1 e-bikes on Mt. Tam tend to be older citizens and those with physical issues (whether or not amounting to a "disability"). By nature, we are polite, environmentally-conscious men and women who are good stewards of the watershed. Studies show that we tend to ride slower than younger riders and that our bicycles do not cause more impact than regular bicycles. Continuing to treat us as outlaws is indefensible.

The elephant-in-the-room is MCL's threat of a CEQA lawsuit. But that's no reason for further delay. The staff's trial program proposal in December 2020 set forth the applicable CEQA exemptions, presumably based on legal advice. And adopting California's legal definition of bicycles might not trigger CEQA in any event. Beyond that, MCL has not fared well in its lawsuit against the National Park Service for allowing e-bikes on the GGNRA and other national parks. The federal court in Washington D.C. rejected all the claims but one, and declined to set aside the NPS’s regulation allowing e-bike access while litigating the remaining claim. In the meantime, the NPS has submitted an environmental report concluding that e-bikes have no greater environmental impact than other bicycles.

* * * * *

In short, now is the time for the Board to find out if and how the upcoming RMP/RMPFS intends to address the e-bike issue and for the Board to make its wishes in this regard. Five years is more than enough time to decide this issue. At a bare minimum, anything less than the trial period proposed by the staff three years ago would be a major step backwards. But with the MMWD's and GGNRA's extensive experience with e-bikes during the last several years, there is clearly enough data and evidence to forgo another trial period, and to vacate the 2011 ordinance and adopt the California Vehicle Code's definition of bicycles to include at least Class 1 e-bikes.

As always, we appreciate the Board's and staff's attention to this important issue.

https://link.edgepilot.com/s/53548fe3/vGYa4FX0oEqYyAr_poXVwA?



[u=https://www.ebikeaccess.org/](https://www.ebikeaccess.org/)