Date of Hearing: April 20, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
Lori D. Wilson, Chair
AB 1569 (Davies) – As Amended April 13, 2026

SUBJECT: Pupil safety: electric bicycle: safety and training program

SUMMARY: Requires the State Department of Education (CDE), in consultation with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to develop a standardized electric bicycle safety and training program for pupils in grades 7-12. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Requires the program to be completed on or before March 1, 2028.

2) Requires the program to include an online component consisting of instructional videos and a knowledge-based comprehensive assessment covering rules of the road, operating differences between the classes of e-bikes, required safety equipment, and the civil and criminal implications of operating non-compliant electric bicycles that exceed legal speed limits.

3) Allows, in developing the program, the State Department of Education and the Department of the California Highway Patrol to collaborate with local law enforcement agencies or local governments that have already implemented their own electric bicycle training programs to ensure the state program reflects proven best practices.

4) **S**pecifies that a local educational agency or parent organization is encouraged to offer training demonstrations to students and parents on electric bicycle operations in collaboration with local law enforcement agencies or local governments related to safe mounting, braking, signaling, yielding and riding protocols. This component may be administered on school grounds or at a designated community facility.

5) Defines electric bicycles to have the same meanings as "electric bicycles" in the Vehicle Code.

6) Defines "local educational agency" to mean a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

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) Requires CHP to develop statewide safety standards and training programs for e-bikes (Streets and Highway Code Section 894).

6) Authorizes the governing board of any school district to provide time and facilities to public agencies or other organizations that provide bicycle, scooter, electric bicycle, motorized bicycle, or motorized scooter safety. (Education Code 51860)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS: More than half of all trips made in the United States are less 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 permitted 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-bike 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 led 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.

MTI recommendations for educational material. According to the Mineta report, the CHP produces some education materials through its California Pedestrian and Bicyclist Enforcement and Education Project and its online "Electric Bicycle Safety and Training course" (California Highway Patrol, n.d.). These materials are a useful starting point, but there is considerable room for refining and expanding them to create age-appropriate variations, providing text materials to use with or instead of the video course, and creating lesson plans for school teachers and bike instructors.

The Mineta report finds that "It is critical that the education materials produced are age-appropriate. The content, instructional medium, and language will all likely need to be somewhat different for elementary
school, middle-school, high-school students, college students, and adult learners."

This bill is consistent with the Mineta report and requires CDE, in conjunction with CHP, to develop online educational materials that include instructional videos and a knowledge-based comprehensive assessment for pupil instruction.

According to the author, "The rapid rise of high-speed e-bikes on our campuses has outpaced our current safety laws, leading to a preventable surge in student injuries. We cannot continue to allow minors to operate motorized vehicles in heavy school-zone traffic without the fundamental road safety knowledge required to protect themselves and others. AB 1569 creates a common-sense standard by requiring the Department of Education and the California Highway Patrol to develop a new comprehensive online training program for students to take. By passing this measure, we are providing our youth with the essential tools for responsible riding and ensuring that the commute to school is safe for every student, pedestrian, and driver in our community."

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.

SB 1167 (Blakespear) redefines motor driven cycle and mopeds, and creates disclosure requirements for selling such devices**.** That bill is pending before Senate Appropriations 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 2028 (Davies) Chapter 166, Statutes of 2022 Authorized the governing board of any school district to provide time and facilities to public agencies or other organizations that provide bicycle, scooter, electric bicycle, motorized bicycle, or motorized scooter safety.

AB 1946 (Boerner) Chapter 147, Statutes of 2022 Required the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to develop statewide safety standards and training programs for electric bicycles (e-bikes).

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
Auto Club of Southern California
City of Fillmore
Streets for All

Opposition

None on file

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