Date of Hearing: April 13, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
Lori D. Wilson, Chair
AB 1557 (Papan) – As Amended March 16, 2026

SUBJECT: Vehicles: electric bicycles

SUMMARY: Redefines an electric bicycle (e-bike) as having an electric motor that is not capable of exceeding 750 watts of peak power and a class 1 and 2 e-bike as having a motor that ceases to provide assistance when the bike reaches a peak speed of 16 miles per hour (mph). Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Redefines class 1 and 2 electric bicycles to have a maximum speed of 16 mph and limits class 1 and 2 electric bicycles to 250 continuous watts.

2) Provides that an electric bicycle manufactured prior to January 1, 2027, that was equipped with a motor not capable of exceeding 750 watts of peak power and otherwise met the legal requirements for the relevant class at the time of the manufacturer shall retain its classification.

3) Prohibits a manufacturer from equipping any device labeled as an electric bicycle with a motor that is capable of exceeding 750 watts of peak power and prohibits a manufacturer from equipping a device as a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle with a motor that is capable of exceeding 250 watts of continuous power or that is capable of providing assistance to reach speeds greater than 16 mph.

4) Provides that a violation of the provision described in 3) is not a criminal offense and instead subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $15,000 for a first violation, and not to exceed $50,000 for each subsequent violation.

5) Provides that a prevailing plaintiff that brings a civil action is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and cost.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Defines an e-bike as a bicycle equipped with fully operational pedals and an electric motor that is not physically capable of exceeding 750 watts of power. (Vehicle Code (VEH) 312.5)

2) Defines a class 1 e-bike as a bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, that is not capable of exclusively propelling the bicycle, that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour (mph), and is not capable of providing assistance to reach speeds greater than 20 miles per hour. (VEH 312.5)

3) Defines a class 2 e-bike as a bicycle equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bicycle, and that is not capable of providing assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 mph. (VEH 312.5)

4) Defines a class 3 electric bicycle as a bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, that is not capable of exclusively propelling the bicycle, and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 28 mph, and equipping with a speedometer. (VEH 312.5)

5) Prohibits a person from tampering with or modifying an electric bicycle as to change the speed capability of the bicycle unless the modification keeps within the existing speed allowances of an electric bicycle. (VEH 24016)

6) Prohibits a person from selling a product, device or application that can modify the speed capability of an electric bicycle such that it no longer meets the definition of an electric bicycle. (VEH 24016)

7) Authorizes a peace officer to impound a vehicle that does not meet the definition of an electric bicycle and is both powered by an electric motor capable of exclusively propelling the vehicle in excess of 20 mph on a highway and is being operated without a license to operate that vehicle, or a person operating a vehicle that is a class 2 electric bicycle and is not 16 years of age. (VEH 22651.08)

Federal law

1) Defines a "low-speed electric bicycle" to mean a two- or three-wheeled vehicle with fully operable pedals and an electric motor of less than 750 watts (1 horsepower), whose maximum speed on a paved level surface, when powered solely by such a motor while ridden by an operator who weighs 170 pounds, is less than 20 mph.

2) Authorizes the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate new or amended requirements applicable to such vehicles.

3) Provides that this section shall supersede any State law or requirement with respect to low-speed electric bicycles to the extent that such State law or requirement is more stringent than the Federal law.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS: More than half of all trips made in the United States are shorter than three miles. To cover these distances, e-bikes are surging in popularity, evolving from recreational devices into genuine car replacements. The speed of these devices, coupled with the reduced physical strain they require, makes them a convenient, low-cost choice for short-range commuting. Furthermore, with average prices ranging from $1,000 to $3,500, e-bikes offer a significantly more affordable alternative to traditional motor vehicles. Their expanded use supports California's environmental goals while potentially reducing traffic-related injuries and fatalities—which claimed over 4,400 lives in the state in 2024.

The lack of licensing and insurance requirements has further fueled this proliferation. In fact, e-bikes are now outselling electric cars: according to Kelley Blue Book, while 800,000 electric cars were purchased in the U.S. in 2022, e-bike imports reached 1.1 million. Projections indicate U.S. sales could reach 6.4 million units by 2025 due to rising demand. A 2024 survey by the Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) found that 16% of U.S. adults had ridden an e-bike in the previous year, with 6% riding weekly. Additionally, the North American Bikeshare and

Scootershare Association (NABSA) reported that riders logged 59 million trips on 76,000 shared e-bikes in 2024.

Growth in e-bike use has been accompanied by a rise in e-bike-related injuries and frustration from communities about potentially dangerous use of these devices. A new wave of high-speed electric motors has entered the California market, often exceeding the speed capabilities originally intended by California law. In response to the rising number of hospitalizations across the state, several bills have been introduced this year to address safety and regulation.

Meeting California's environmental goals. In California, the transportation sector is the leading contributor of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and is responsible for about 40% of the state's emissions with light-duty passenger vehicles being the single leading contributor. The Legislature has set several goals to reduce greenhouse (GHG) emissions and address climate change. The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 [AB 32 (Nunez), Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006] and subsequent companion legislation SB 32 (Pavley), Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016, requires California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 40% below the 1990 level by 2030.

Reducing the number of miles people drive every day will have a significant impact on reducing GHG emissions. Providing alternative modes of transportation such as public transit, e-bikes, or other shared ride approaches could significantly reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in California. California has targeted a 15% reduction in VMT by 2050 as part of its larger strategy to reduce GHG emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050.

In the 2023 study titled *"Impacts of E-bike Ownership on Travel Behavior: Evidence from three Northern California rebate programs,"* researchers from UC Davis found that e-bike ownership leads to a measurable reduction in vehicle use. E-bike owners reported replacing one to three car trips per week with an e-bike, diverting between 12 and 44 kilograms of CO2 per month, or roughly equivalent to not burning five gallons of gasoline or the total emissions produced by running an average refrigerator for four months. If 1 million Californians (roughly 3% of the population) used e-bikes at the "high end" rate of this study, the state would reduce emissions by 528,000 metric tons of CO2 per year, The equivalent of taking 125,000 gas-powered cars off the road entirely.

Electric bicycle safety. As electric bicycle popularity has gone up, so have injuries. In 2023, the Legislature passed SB 381 (Min), Chapter 869, which directed the MTI at San Jose State University to study electric bicycles and the safety of riders and pedestrians.

MTI released the report *Exploring Electric Bicycle Safety Performance Policy Options for California* in December of 2025. That report provided a comprehensive review of how California and other states and countries regulate electric bicycles, a review of the electric bicycle safety literature, and strategies that the state could adopt to promote the safe use of electric bicycles.

According to the report, "In 2023, a total of 461,062 patients were treated at California hospitals with transportation-related injuries. Only 4,757 patients were identified as electric bicycle riders. Thus, electric bicycle riders comprised just 1% of all patients with transportation-related injury. Comparatively, 44,039 patients were identified as conventional bicycle riders, or 10% of all transportation-related patients. Overall, there were more than 9 times more injured conventional bicycle riders than injured electric bicycle riders. By far the most patients were injured in motor vehicle incidents: 62%."

The report found that electric bicycle-related injuries may result in slightly more hospitalizations than conventional bicycle incidents, specifically "In the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) injury dataset of U.S. hospital patients, electric bicycle patients were hospitalized at only a three-percentage point greater rate than conventional bicycle patients (16% vs. 13%). Also, that gap disappeared when making an apples-to apples comparison of only those injuries occurring on streets. Finally, while the California hospital data did show more electric bicycle than conventional bicycle hospitalizations, the difference was a relatively modest six percentage points (17% vs. 11%). Looking at just injuries that took place on streets, conventional bicycles and electric bicycles had virtually identical hospitalization rates (18% vs 17%, respectively)."

In addition, most of the people involved in electric bicycle incidents are adults. NEISS reported that one in five electric bicycle patients (20%) were minors, almost identical to their share of the U.S. population. In comparison, 43% of conventional bicycle patients were minors. Slightly over half of the electric bicycle patients (54%) were adults aged 18 to 49 years. Electric bicycle patients had the oldest median age (34 years), a full decade higher than conventional bicycles (24 years). Mopeds/power-assisted cycles have the second highest median age, 30 years.

Most e-bike injuries are caused by the operators of the devices. According to NEISS data, 92% of patients were operating the device when injured, while 4% were bystanders. Bystanders struck by electric bicycles were hospitalized 12% of time, and bystanders struck by conventional bicycles were hospitalized 5% of the time.

The cause of the injuries while on an e-bikes was found to be nearly identical to the cause of injuries for riders of traditional bicycles. For e-bikes, 20% of injuries were caused by a collision with a motor vehicle, 4% were caused by a collision with another road user, and 51% were solo crashes. (The report notes that some of the solo crashes may have been caused by cyclists trying to avoid collisions with vehicles.) Twenty-five percent of the collisions were unspecified.

Illegal e-bikes are likely the problem. Illegal e-bikes are electric bicycles that exceed 750 watts of motor power, have a top speed greater than 20 mph (for Class 1 and 2) or 28 mph (for Class 3), or lack fully operable pedals. These vehicles are generally legally classified as electric motorcycles or mopeds, requiring registration, insurance, and proper licensing.

The e-bike landscape today is very challenging because many of the e-bikes that are causing crashes and creating a perceived nuisance in communities are illegal and it is very difficult to determine if an e-bike is legal or illegal by simply looking at it. In addition, illegal e-bikes, while they can be a nuisance and dangerous may not be the highest priority of local law enforcement. As a result, passing legislation targeting electric bicycles is unlikely to address the problems caused by illegal devices.

As part of the Mineta Institute report, surveys were conducted at Marin and San Mateo County middle and high schools to see what types of devices children were riding. Those surveys found that 88% of the devices at Marin County Schools and 87% of the devices at San Mateo County Schools were bicycles with electric motors that did not meet the definition of an electric bicycle, suggesting a significant proliferation of illegal devices into the marketplace, particularly for devices marketed towards children.

Legislative attempts to address electric bicycles and bicycle-shaped devices. The increased popularity of e-bikes and the rise of bicycle-shaped devices with electric motors has lead to an influx of legislation. Over the last several years this committee has heard many bills trying to address e-bike safety and curb the abuse of devices that look like an electric bicycle, but travel at speeds much greater than permitted by existing law.

State law prohibits people from modifying their e-bikes to operate at speeds greater than what is allowed. AB 1774 (Dixon), Chapter 55**,** Statutes of 2024 prohibited a person from selling a product or device that can modify the speed capability of an e-bike. AB 545 (Davies), Chapter 37, Statutes of 2025 prohibited the sale of applications that can boost an electric bicycle's speed greater than permitted by law. SB 1271 (Min), Chapter 891, Statutes of 2024 modifies the definition of an e-bike to make it clear that it cannot be capable of going greater than 20 miles per hour (class 1 or 2) or 28 miles per hour on pedal assist (class 3). AB 965 (Dixon), Chapter 65, Statutes of 2025 prohibits the sale of a class 3 electric bicycle to a person under the age of 16.

AB 875 (Muratsuchi), Chapter 168**,** Statutes of 2025 Authorized a peace officer to remove a vehicle with fewer than four wheels that does not meet the definition of an e-bike and is powered by an electric motor capable of exclusively propelling the vehicle in excess of 20 mph and is being operated without a current vehicle registration or by an operator who is not licensed to operate the vehicle.

In addition, there are two ongoing legislatively authorized pilots with age prohibitions on persons allowed to ride e-bikes. AB 2234 (Boerner), Chapter 823, Statutes of 2024 authorized cities within San Diego County and the county of San Diego to prohibit a person under the age of 12 from riding a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle. AB 1778 (Connolly) authorized cities in Marin and the county of Marin to prohibit persons under 16 from riding a class 2 electric bicycle and require everyone riding a class 2 electric bicycle to wear a helmet.

This year at least nine bills have been introduced to address concerns surrounding electric bicycles and bicycle shaped devices with electric motors. AB 1942 (Bauer-Kahan) requires class 2 and 3 electric bicycles to have a license plate. AB 2284 (Dixon) requires the Attorney General's office to create a list of devices that do not meet California's specifications to be an electric bicycle. AB 2346 (Wilson) sets speed limits for electric bicycles and various equipment requirements. AB 2595 (Papan) expands the San Diego pilot program to San Mateo, prohibiting those under 12 years old from riding a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle. AB 1569 (Davies) requires students to pass an electric bicycle safety course from the CHP to park their bicycles at school.

SB 1167 (Blakespear) redefines motor driven cycle and mopeds, and creates disclosure requirements for selling such devices. SB 956 (Choi) authorizes local authorities to adopt and enforce speed limits, age requirements, and equipment requirements for electric bicycles.

This bill and recommendations from the Mineta Institute Report. The Mineta Institute report recommends making changes to the definition of an electric bicycle. First, the report recommends moving away from the three class system and adopting the European definition of an electric bicycle, which caps electric bicycles at 250 continuous watts and at 15.5 mph instead of 20 mph.

Second, out of the concern of the existence of 750 watt electric bicycles without a driver's license component, the report recommends capping electric bicycles at 750 peak watts instead of continuous watts.

In international regulatory frameworks, electric bicycles are almost exclusively defined by their maximum continuous rated power rather than their peak wattage. In engineering terms, continuous wattage represents the power a motor can safely sustain for an extended period without overheating or sustaining internal thermal damage. Conversely, peak wattage is a transient measurement of the maximum output a motor can produce during short-term "stressed" conditions, such as accelerating or climbing a steep grade.

While United States federal law and many state statutes currently cap electric bicycle motors at 750 watts, the statutes often lack a technical definition of how that wattage is measured. To address this ambiguity, industry experts and testing bodies often look to standards such as the Society of Automative Engineers (SAE) J2907, which provides the protocols for distinguishing between sustainable continuous power and short-term peak bursts.

In practice, many electric bicycles with a low continuous rating can achieve peak outputs well exceeding 750 watts; however, they cannot maintain those levels without risking device failure. Consequently, advertising a vehicle by its peak power rather than its continuous power is often considered a misleading business practice, as it suggests a level of sustained performance that the motor is not engineered to provide.

This bill implements those recommendations in two ways. First, the bill is consistent with the recommendation from the Mineta Report and caps electric bicycles at 750 peak watts. Second, the bill limits class one and two electric bicycles to 250 continuous watts and 16 mph.
250 watt continuous watt motors are more likely to achieve speeds under 20 mph, while 750 watt devices are capable of achieving speeds of 28 mph.

This bill allows for the legal use of devices above 250 watts but it reclassifies them as a class 3 device. As a result, under current law this reclassification requires a person operating it to be 16 years of age or older, users of all ages to wear a helmet, and the device to have a speedometer.

Federal pre-emption? A court may interpret federal statute as limiting electric bicycles to having an electric motor capable of operating at less than 750 continuous watts. This is the more commonly accepted interpretation by bicycle manufacturers. By this interpretation, limiting electric bicycles to 750 peak watts would likely be preempted by federal law, which would prohibit states from having a definition of an electric bicycle that is more stringent than federal law.

According to the author, "AB 1557 closes a loophole in existing law that allows manufacturers to sell high-powered devices, and lowers power and speed limits for class 1 and class 2 e-bikes.

"California has seen a dramatic rise in e-bike-related accidents resulting in severe trauma as a result of the speed and power of the device. The current 750 watt power restriction in code fails to distinguish whether the law refers to "peak" or "continuous" power. Certain manufacturers have taken advantage of this ambiguity by selling devices that have peak power thresholds far higher than 750 watts, putting riders, drivers, and pedestrians in danger.

AB 1557 closes the loophole by clarifying the 750-watt limit as a peak power limit while aligning ourselves with Europe and establishing a new 250-watt continuous power limit for class 1 and class 2 e-bikes and capping their top assisted speed at 16 miles per hour. These changes' ensure e-bikes are properly classified while improving safety for riders, drivers, and pedestrians."

California Orthopedic Association, writing in support of this bill, argues " Orthopedic surgeons across California are increasingly treating serious injuries associated with electric bicycle use, particularly among children and adolescents. The rapid expansion of the e-bike market, combined with inconsistent product standards and higher operating speeds, has contributed to a rise in fractures, head injuries, and other traumatic musculoskeletal conditions. Many of these injuries are preventable and stem from excessive speed, lack of rider control, or the use of devices that exceed intended performance thresholds.

AB 1557 takes a targeted and practical approach to improving safety. By lowering the maximum assisted speed for Class 1 and Class 2 electric bicycles from 20 miles per hour to 16 miles per hour, the bill directly addresses one of the primary risk factors associated with injury severity: speed. The bill also clarifies power standards by distinguishing between peak and continuous wattage and establishes clear guardrails to prevent the sale and distribution of overpowered devices marketed as electric bicycles."

PeopleforBikes, writing in opposition to this bill, argues " The federal government has already established a clear national definition of "low-speed electric bicycle" under 15 U.S.C. § 2085, which defines a low-speed electric bicycle as a two- or three-wheeled vehicle with fully operable pedals, a motor of less than 750 watts (1 horsepower), and a maximum speed of 20 mph when powered solely by the motor. This definition was essentially adopted by California in 2015 and the federal operable pedal requirement and motor power limits are reflected in the current language of CVC 312.5(a). Since that time virtually every other state has adopted both the federal definition and the three defined classes of electric bicycles as their state law, and the federal government also recognizes these classes for purposes of access to certain federal lands. *E.g.*, 23 U.S.C. § 217(j)(2) (recognizing the three classes of electric bicycles for the purposes of providing access to bicycle facilities constructed with federal funds).

The advantages of a uniform, national approach to vehicle classification and regulation should be familiar to the committee, because that is how other types of vehicles are regulated. A passenger automobile or commercial truck must meet the same safety standards to be sold, registered and used in any state. Vehicles sold and registered in one state may be freely operated across state lanes and states may not unduly burden such interstate use under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution….If passed and signed into law, AB 1557 would be subject to immediate, and likely successful, litigation to invalidate it on preemption grounds."

Streets For All, the California Bicycle Coalition and Streets are for Everyone have taken an *oppose unless amended position*. They support capping electric bicycles at 750 peak watts but oppose limiting class 1 and 2 e-bikes to 16 mph instead of 20 mph. They are also seeking amendments to grandfather in electric bicycles that currently meet the 750 continuous watt standard, but would be illegal under this bill because they can reach an output of greater than 750 peak watts. They also propose delaying the changes in this bill until January 1, 2029 to align with AB 2346 (Wilson), which gives e-bike manufacturers additional time to install

speedometers and integrated lights. In addition, the coalition is asking for a cargo bike exemption from the 750 peak watt requirement.

E-bike Access opposes this bill and instead calls for the Legislature to outlaw class 2 electric bicycles.

Committee concerns. Several electric bicycle manufacturers are selling 750-watt electric bicycles as multi class devices (class 1, 2 and 3). This has led to parents potentially buying children devices they think are capped at 20 mph (the speed cap for a class one and two device) but instead are easily and intentionally unlocked to achieve speeds of 28 mph. By limiting class one and two e-bikes to the wattage that matches the intended speeds, this bill effectively prohibits mislabeled electric bicycles, that can achieve faster speeds, from being marketed to children.

Under this bill, significant portions of the current e-bike market would be rendered obsolete or illegal for road use in California. Starting January 1, 2027, any device with a motor exceeding 250 watts that lacks a speedometer would no longer be classified as an electric bicycle. Furthermore, if these devices lack mirrors and integrated lighting, they would fail to meet the statutory definition of a motorized bicycle or moped.

This creates a critical regulatory "dead zone." Because these devices lack Vehicle Identification Numbers (VINs), owners cannot register them with the DMV to receive license plates. Consequently, thousands of devices that are street-legal today would become effectively un-operable on public roads, as they would meet neither the definition of an electric bicycle nor the equipment standards for a moped.

The "750-Watt Peak" Constraint: The shift to a cap of 750-watt peak power, as opposed to the industry-standard continuous power rating, would make many of the most popular e-bike models currently on the market illegal. This change would have an immediate impact on consumer choice and manufacturers.

According to 2025/2026 buyer guides from CNET, only four of their nine top-recommended e-bikes would remain legal. Similarly, Bicycling Magazine would see three of its top picks banned, and Electrek would see only five of its 14 recommended devices retain legal status. The Lectric XP 3.0, which is the third best-selling electric vehicle in the nation (trailing only the Tesla Model Y and Model 3) with over 400,000 units sold, features a peak wattage exceeding 750 watts.

With the changes implemented under AB 875 last year, these widely-owned devices would become illegal, and potentially subject to confiscation by law enforcement despite being purchased legally at the time.

Unintended Consequences for Cargo and Urban Delivery: A 750-watt peak cap poses a significant hurdle for the burgeoning electric cargo bike sector. These vehicles are essential for "last-mile" urban deliveries and transporting additional passengers; however, their weight and utility require short bursts of power (peak wattage) to safely navigate inclines or heavy loads. The Mineta Transportation Institute has previously highlighted that a strict peak-power cap could inadvertently stifle the shift toward these sustainable delivery models.

To prevent large-scale consumer disenfranchisement, the committee recommends the following amendments:

- Grandfathering Clause: Amend the bill to grandfather in all electric bicycles purchased prior to the effective date, regardless of peak wattage capabilities.
- Cargo Bike Definition: Establish a distinct legal category for Electric Cargo Bicycles to account for the higher power requirements necessary for transporting heavy loads and multiple passengers.

The committee recommends the following amendments:

1) VEH 312.5(a)(5) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), an electric bicycle manufactured prior to **January 1, 2027,** that was equipped with a motor that is not capable of exceeding 750 watts of ~~**peak power**~~ **continuous power** and otherwise met the legal requirements for the relevant class at the time of manufacture shall retain its classification.

2) **Notwithstanding subdivision (a) a cargo electric bicycle may be equipped with an electric motor with a maximum continuously rated power of 750 watts. For the purposes of this section, a cargo electric bicycle is an electric bicycle that is built with a reinforced frame and integrated rack or platform designed to transport goods or additional persons.**

Related and previous legislation. AB 1942 (Bauer-Kahan) requires class 2 and 3 electric bicycles to have a license plate. That bill is pending before this committee.

AB 2284 (Dixon) requires the Attorney General's office to create a list of devices that do not meet California's specifications to be an electric bicycle. That bill is pending before this committee.

AB 2595 (Papan) expands the San Diego pilot program to San Mateo, prohibiting those under 12 years old from riding a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle. That bill is pending before this committee.

AB 2346 (Wilson) sets speed limits for electric bicycles (e-bikes) and bicycle paths, requires certain disclosures when selling an e-bike, and requires all e-bikes to have a speedometer and integrated lights. That bill is pending before Assembly Judiciary Committee.

AB 1569 (Davies) requires students to pass an electric bicycle safety course from the CHP in order to park their bicycles at school. That bill is pending before Assembly Education Committee.

SB 1167 (Blakespear) redefines motor driven cycle and mopeds, and creates disclosure requirements for selling such devices. That bill is pending before Senate Transportation Committee.

SB 956 (Choi) would authorize local authorities to adopt and enforce speed limits, age requirements, and equipment requirements for electric bicycles. That bill is pending before Senate Transportation Committee.

AB 965 (Dixon) Chapter 65, Statutes of 2025 prohibits the sale of a class 3 electric bicycle to a person under the age of 16.

AB 875 (Muratsuchi) Chapter 168**,** Statutes of 2025 authorized a peace officer to remove a vehicle with fewer than four wheels that does not meet the definition of an electric bicycle (e-bike) and is powered by an electric motor capable of exclusively propelling the vehicle in excess of 20 mph and is being operated without a current vehicle registration or by an operator who is not licensed to operate the vehicle.

AB 545 (Davies) Chapter 37, Statutes of 2025 prohibited the sale of applications that can boost an electric bicycle's speed greater than permitted by law.

AB 1774 (Dixon), Chapter 55, Statutes of 2024 prohibits the sale of a device that makes it someone can increase the speed of an e-bike beyond the speed permitted by law (28 mph).

SB 1271 (Min), Chapter 891, Statutes of 2024 modifies the definition of an e-bike to make it clear that it cannot be capable of going speeds greater than 20 miles per hour (class 1 or 2) or 28 miles per hour on pedal assist (class 3).

SB 381 (Min), Chapter 869, Statutes of 2023 requires the Mineta Transportation Institute at San Jose State University, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to conduct a study on electric bicycles and the safety of riders and pedestrians by January 1, 2026.

AB 1909 (Friedman) chapter 343, Statutes of 2022, removed the prohibition against class 3 electric bicycles on bicycle paths and removed the authority for locals to prohibit class 1 and 2 electric bicycles on bicycle paths.

AB 1096 (Chiu), Chapter 568, Statutes of 2015 established the definitions, classification, and requirements for the operation, sale, and manufacturing of e-bikes.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
American College of Surgeons: Southern and San Diego Chapters
Automobile Club of Southern California
California Emergency Nurses Association
California Medical Association
California Orthopedic Association
City of Carlsbad
City of Foster City

City of Irvine
City of Moreno Valley
City of Mountain View
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Town of Hillsborough

Opposition

ATV Wholesale Outlet
Bicycle Discovery Pacific Beach
Bird Rock
Brompton Bicycle Incorporated
Bullet Bike Corporation
Electric Ridez
Helen's Cycles
Last Mile San Francisco, Marin, NYC
Lauf Cycles
Pedego Electric Bikes
North Rim Adventure Sports
Pacific Cycle
Peopleforbikes
Practical Cycle
The New Wheel
Trek Bicycle Corporation
Yeti Cycles

Oppose Unless Amended

Area 13
California Bicycle Coalition
Ebikeaccess.org
Streets are for Everyone
Streets for All

Analysis Prepared by: David Sforza / TRANS. / (916) 319-2093