

- It fails to differentiate between e-bikes and e-motos
- It doesn't prevent sales of dangerous e-motos or better inform parents on the dangers of buying e-motos for their kids

- It forces kids to ride in the middle of dangerous traffic; I prefer Assemblyman Berman's approach, which establishes speed limits for sidewalk riding instead of more draconian bans on sidewalk riding
- The language is vague. What is "unsafe riding"? This seems open to confusion and litigation.
- It jumps the gun as we have several pending state bills and local education programs aimed at addressing the problem; let's see if these work before creating more complication.
- It will distract overburdened Police Departments from addressing the rising traffic violence epidemic on our streets

- It will increase unsafe pursuit of kids on bikes, placing them in incremental danger.
- It doesn't define "diversion programs". How does this differ from the many programs being established in our school districts? Why not see if these programs work before creating more, potentially conflicting education programs? If they are not working, why do we think that additional education programs will work?

It isn't data based; we have yet to quantify the scale of this problem; I believe that most e-conveyance crashes may be due to bad auto drivers.

- It fails to acknowledge that e-bikes are on the whole a positive influence on society.
- It will lead to a patchwork of regulations throughout the Peninsula instead of allowing the State to set consistent rules through the CVC, as we do with automobiles
- It does nothing to increase safe spaces for kids to ride. The fines are inappropriate and regressive. Why \$500 fines to kids riding e-bikes when distracted driving base fines start at \$20????
- It doesn't require diversion programs for adults.