

ASSEMBLY THIRD READING
AB 1614 (Dixon)
As Introduced January 21, 2026
Majority vote

SUMMARY

Expands existing law to require that bicycle operators and passengers be properly seated when riding on bicycle paths, as is already required on local streets and roads.

COMMENTS

Since 1963, California law has required a person operating a bicycle or a passenger to be properly seated on the bicycle. SB 527 (Kehoe) Chapter 594, Statutes of 2009, amended that section to allow a person to stand if the bicycle is designed to be ridden without a seat.

In June of 2017, a Sacramento runner was hospitalized with serious injuries after being hit by a bicyclist on a local bike trail or Class I bikeway. The bicyclist fled the scene, leaving the injured runner on the trail. The cyclist did not report the accident nor render assistance to the runner. While California law at the time applied all the rules of the road to bicycles on highways, case law made it unclear if a bicycle path qualified as a "highway" for the purposes of the Vehicle Code. As a result, the Legislature passed AB 1755 (Steinworth), Chapter 139, Statutes of 2018, which extended all the rules of the road applicable to a vehicle to also apply to a bicycle on a bicycle path.

However, that statute did not make corresponding changes to rules that only applied to bicycles. As a result, the law requiring a person to be seated on a seat while riding a bicycle may only apply on a highway, which includes sidewalks and streets, but may not apply on a bicycle path.

According to the Author

"The increased speed and accessibility of e-bikes have consistently led to higher rates of injury. More needs to be done to address the safety of e-bike riders, pedestrians and drivers. Assembly Bill 1614 will expand existing law and prohibit piggybacking on Class 1 bikeways."

Arguments in Support

According to the League of California Cities, "Cities across California have invested significantly in bicycle and active transportation infrastructure, including Class I bikeways—multiuse paths that are physically separated from motor vehicle traffic and heavily used by cyclists, pedestrians, families, and recreational users. As the use of bicycles and electric bicycles (e-bikes) continues to increase, local governments are increasingly focused on ensuring that these shared spaces remain safe and accessible for all users. AB 1614 requires riders to remain seated on bicycles that are designed with seats, which promotes stability and control, particularly on multiuse paths where riders frequently encounter pedestrians, children, and other cyclists traveling at varying speeds. Riding without proper seating can reduce control and increase the likelihood of collisions or falls."

"Cal Cities strongly support efforts that promote safe and responsible use of active transportation infrastructure and by extending well-established safety standards to Class I bikeways, AB 1614 ensures that the basic rules governing safe bicycle operation apply on these heavily used shared-use paths."

Arguments in Opposition

According to PeopleForBikes, "This bill unnecessarily expands existing bicycle operation requirements to Class I bikeways in a way that does not reflect how people actually ride bicycles and risks creating new barriers to safe and accessible riding. By prohibiting common, low-risk behaviors, such as briefly riding out of the saddle, carrying a second rider in informal situations, or using bicycles in ways not strictly tied to a fixed seat, the bill would effectively criminalize everyday use, particularly among youth, families, and lower-income riders who rely on bicycles for transportation and recreation. These changes do not meaningfully improve safety outcomes, but instead increase the likelihood of unnecessary law enforcement interactions on shared-use paths, spaces that are intended to be welcoming and low-stress environments. California has been a national leader in promoting bicycling as a safe, practical, and inclusive mode of transportation, and AB 1614 runs counter to those goals by imposing rigid and impractical restrictions on riders without clear safety justification."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, negligible direct state costs.

The state is not obligated to compensate local governments for any costs that result from this bill because any such cost would be the result of the creation of a new crime or infraction.

VOTES

ASM TRANSPORTATION: 16-0-0

YES: Wilson, Davies, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Carrillo, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, Lackey, Macedo, Papan, Ransom, Rogers, Sharp-Collins, Ward

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 13-0-2

YES: Wicks, Hoover, Arambula, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ABS, ABST OR NV: Calderon, Muratsuchi

UPDATED

VERSION: January 21, 2026

CONSULTANT: David Sforza / TRANS. / (916) 319-2093

FN: 0002408