Date of Hearing: April 7, 2026
Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 2276 (Soria) – As Introduced February 19, 2026

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to establish a statewide pilot program, commencing January 1, 2027, and ending on January 1, 2033, that requires a person convicted of specified speeding offenses to install a functioning, certified active intelligent speed assistance (ISA) device on any vehicle that person operates. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Requires the DMV to establish a pilot program to reduce the number of violations for the following offenses (hereafter specified speeding offenses) by requiring the installation and use of an ISA device, as required by this bill:

   a) Reckless driving;

   b) A speed contest or aiding or abetting a speed contest;

   c) An exhibition of speed or aiding or abetting an exhibition of speed;

   d) Placing a barricade to facilitate a speed contest or exhibition, as specified;

   e) Driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 miles per hour (mph);

   f) Driving a vehicle on a highway with a speed greater than 65 mph, 55 mph (for a two-lane undivided highway), or 70 mph, as specified;

   g) Driving 30 mph over the speed limit on a freeway, or 20 mph over the speed limit on any other street or highway while driving recklessly in violation of specified driving under the influence (DUI) laws (DUI while speeding and driving recklessly).

2) Requires a court to notify a person convicted of a specified speeding offense that they must install an ISA device on any vehicle they operate and that they are prohibited from operating a vehicle unless it is equipped with an ISA device pursuant to this bill.

3) Requires the DMV, upon receipt of the court's abstract of conviction for a specified speeding offense, to inform the person of the ISA requirements, including the term for which the device must be installed, and requires DMV records to reflect the mandatory use of the device for the term required and the date the device is required to be installed.

4) Requires the DMV to advise the person that installation of an ISA device does not authorize the person to drive without a valid driver's license.

5) Requires the DMV to place a restriction on the driver's license record that states the driver is restricted to driving only vehicles equipped with an ISA device for the applicable term.

6) Requires a person notified by the DMV pursuant to the above to do all of the following:

   a) Arrange for each vehicle operated by the person to be equipped with an ISA device.

   b) Provide proof to the DMV of installation by submitting a specified form.

   c) Pay a fee, to be determined by the DMV, that is sufficient to cover the costs of administering the requirements of this ISA program.

7) Exempts a person from the above requirements if, within 30 days of being notified by the DMV, the person certifies all of the following: 1) the person does not own a vehicle; 2) the person does not have access to a vehicle at their residence; 3) the person no longer has access to the vehicle that was operated at the time of the arrest for the underlying offense; 4) the person acknowledges they must hold a valid driver's license before they can drive; and 5) the person acknowledges that they are subject to the ISA requirements when they purchase or obtain access to a vehicle.

8) Prohibits a person subject to an ISA device from doing any of the following:

   a) Tampering with the device or any components of the device, or otherwise interfering with the proper functionality of the device, by modifying, detaching, disconnecting, or otherwise disabling it to allow the restricted driver to operate the vehicle.

   b) Directing, authorizing, or requesting that another person tamper with the device or any components of the device, or otherwise interfering with the proper functionality of the device, by modifying, detaching, disconnecting, or otherwise disabling it to allow the restricted driver to operate the vehicle.

   c) Operating a motor vehicle without a required device.

   d) Failing to return the device to the vendor upon program completion.

9) Makes a violation of the above a misdemeanor, subjects a violation to an extension of the term the device needs to be installed by an additional 120 days, and provides that any period of time a person was in violation shall not be credited toward completion of the required term.

10) Requires all data collected pursuant to the below to be securely maintained by the provider, subject to the following:

   a) Data related to violations involving tampering with, circumventing, or removing the device may be shared with the DMV or the court that ordered the device, as specified.

   b) Depersonalized and aggregated data may be shared with third parties for research or evaluation purposes, as specified.

c) Data collected under this section may only be shared as required by a court order, as directed by state statute or regulation, with the DMV or the ordering court in connection with a program violation.

d) All documents, records, identifying information, monitoring data or results, and other information recorded, collected, maintained, transmitted, or stored by an ISA device provider about or concerning a speeding offender is confidential and not available for public inspection.

e) All information shall remain confidential when it is transmitted, electronically or otherwise, maintained and stored, or examined or used by a monitoring authority.

f) Only authorized employees of an ISA device provider or monitoring authority may view any document made confidential pursuant to the above.

11) Provides that only devices and providers certified by the DMV may be used to satisfy the requirements of this bill.

12) Requires, in order to be eligible to install, repair, maintain, monitor, or remove a device, a company to apply to the DMV for certification in a form and manner approved by the DMV.

13) Provides that a manufacturer, distributor, or retailer of a motor vehicle is not liable for any loss, injury, or damages caused by the design, manufacture, installation, improper installation, use, or misuse of an aftermarket ISA device.

14) Provides that liability does exist if the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer of a motor vehicle knowingly engages in a repair or update to the aftermarket ISA device and the repair or update proximately causes loss, injury, or damage.

15) Provides that nothing in this bill requires a manufacturer, distributor, or retailer of a motor vehicle to manufacture, distribute, or offer for sale a motor vehicle that includes or is compatible with an aftermarket ISA device.

16) Provides that nothing in this bill prohibits a lessor or lienholder from requiring that a motor vehicle lessee or owner notify the lessor or lienholder that an aftermarket ISA device has been installed on a motor vehicle that is subject to a lease or finance agreement.

17) Requires a person to install and use an ISA device pursuant to this bill for the applicable term, as follows:

a) A person convicted of a violation of reckless driving on a highway, engaging in a speed contest on a highway or off-street parking facility, or driving a vehicle upon a highway at a speed greater than 100 mph shall be required to do the following:

i) Upon a conviction with no prior offenses punishable as reckless driving, a speed contest, aiding or abetting a speed contest, an exhibition of speed, aiding or abetting an exhibition of speed, obstructing or placing a barricade for the purpose of facilitating a speed contest or exhibition, driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 mph, driving a vehicle on a highway with a speed greater than 65, 55

mph (for a two-lane undivided highway), or 70 mph, as specified, the court may order installation of an ISA device on any vehicle the person operates and prohibit them from operating a vehicle unless it is equipped with an ISA device, as follows:

(1) If the court orders the ISA restriction described above, the term shall be determined by the court for a period not to exceed six months.

(2) The court must notify the DMV of the conviction and specify the terms of the ISA device restriction, and the DMV must place the restriction on the driver's license record of the person that states the driver is restricted to driving only vehicles equipped with an ISA device for the applicable term.

ii) Upon a conviction with one prior, as specified above, the person shall install an ISA device in any vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 12 months.

iii) Upon a conviction with two priors as specified above, the person shall install an ISA device in any vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 24 months.

iv) Upon a conviction with three or more specified priors, as specified above, the person shall install an ISA device in any vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 36 months.

b) A person convicted of reckless driving proximately causing bodily injury, reckless driving proximately causing great bodily injury (GBI) as specified, a speed contest that proximately causes bodily injury, or of a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly, shall install an ISA device, as follows:

i) Upon a conviction with no prior offenses punishable as a speed contest, an exhibition of speed, placing a barricade for the purpose of facilitating a speed contest or exhibition, or a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly, the person shall install an ISA device in the vehicle, as ordered by the court, that is operated by that person for a mandatory term of 12 months.

ii) Upon a conviction with one prior, as described above, the person shall install an ISA in the vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 24 months.

iii) Upon a conviction with two priors, as described above, the person shall install an ISA device in the vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 36 months.

iv) Upon a conviction with three or more priors, as described above, the person shall install an ISA device in the vehicle operated by that person for a mandatory term of 48 months.

c) Provides that if a person fails to comply with any of the requirements regarding ISA devices, the period in which the person was not in compliance shall not be credited toward the mandatory term for which the ISA device is required to be installed.

18) Every manufacturer and manufacturer's agent certified by the DMV to provide ISA devices, as specified, shall adopt the following fee schedule that provides for the payment of the costs

of the ISA device by persons subject to this bill in amounts commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level, as follows:

a) A person with an income at 100 percent of the federal poverty level or below and who provides income verification, as specified, is responsible for 10 percent of the cost of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.

b) A person with an income at 101 to 200 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification, as specified, is responsible for 20 percent of the cost of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.

c) A person with an income at 201 to 300 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification, as specified, is responsible for 40 percent of the cost of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.

d) A person who is receiving CalFresh benefits and who provides proof of those benefits, as specified, is responsible for 50 percent of the provider's standard active ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.

e) A person with an income at 301 to 400 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification, as specified, is responsible for 90 percent of the cost of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.

f) All other offenders are responsible for 100 percent of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements

19) Makes the provider responsible for the costs described above that the offender is not responsible for pursuant to the above fee scale.

20) Requires the active ISA device provider to verify the offender's income to determine their share of cost for the ISA device, as specified, by verifying one of the following documents:

a) The previous year's federal income tax return.

b) The previous three months of weekly or monthly income statements.

c) Employment Development Department verification of unemployment benefits.

21) Requires an ISA device provider to do all of the following:

a) Conspicuously post the fee scale information described above on its internet website, in its contracts, and at every installation, service, and repair location.

b) Give verbal notification of the fee schedule and how to apply for reduced costs prior to the execution of a contract for, and installation or repair of, an ISA device.

22) Requires the DMV to post the fee schedule information on its internet website, and to also include the fee schedule information in any mailed notice of revocation or suspension that notifies an individual of the requirement to install an ISA device.

23) Requires the DMV, on or before July 1, 2031, to report data to the California Transportation Agency (CalSTA) regarding the implementation and efficacy of the ISA program established by this bill for the period covering January 1, 2027, to January 1, 2031, inclusive.

24) Requires this report to include, at a minimum, all of the following:

a) The number of individuals who killed or injured any person in a crash relating to violations of specified speeding offenses while required to have an ISA device installed.

b) The number of individuals who were convicted of specified speeding offenses while required to have an ISA device installed.

c) The number of injuries and deaths resulting from vehicle crashes relating to violations of specified speeding offenses during the reporting period and during periods of similar duration prior to the implementation of the ISA program established by this bill.

d) The number of individuals who have been convicted more than one time for violations of specified speeding offenses during the reporting period and during periods of similar duration prior to the implementation of the ISA program established by this bill.

e) Any other information requested by CalSTA to assess the continued effectiveness of the ISA device program in reducing recidivism for violations of specified speeding offenses.

25) Authorizes CalSTA to contract with educational institutions to obtain and analyze this data.

26) Requires CalSTA to conduct an assessment of the program based on the data described above and report to the Legislature on the outcomes of the program by July 1, 2032.

27) Requires the assessment to include recommendations on how to further reduce violations of specified speeding offenses.

28) Requires the report to be submitted in compliance with specified procedures.

29) Provides that the requirements of this bill shall only apply to a person convicted of reckless driving, reckless driving that proximately causes bodily injury, reckless driving that proximately causes GBI, as specified, a speed contest, aiding or abetting a speed contest, an exhibition of speed, aiding or abetting an exhibition of speed, obstructing or placing a barricade for the purpose of facilitating a speed contest or exhibition, as specified, driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 mph, driving a vehicle on a highway with a speed greater than 65 mph, 55 mph (for a two-lane undivided highway), or 75 mph, as specified, and a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly, that occurred on or after January 1, 2027.

30) Provides that the requirements of this bill shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2033, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2033, deletes or extends that date.

31) Defines "active intelligent speed assistance device" to mean an aftermarket device that uses location-based technology to actively limit a motor vehicle's speed to posted or preset speed limits, is tamper-resistant, and is capable of reporting attempts to disable or circumvent functionality. This does not include technology provided by a motor vehicle manufacturer as a component of a new motor vehicle that controls or affects the speed of a motor vehicle.

32) Defines "provider" to mean a person or entity certified by the DMV to install, service, monitor, repair, or remove an ISA device.

33) Makes specified findings and declarations.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Provides that a person who drives a vehicle on a highway in willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property is guilty of reckless driving, punishable in county jail for five days to 90 days, or a fine of $145 to $1,000. (Veh. Code, § 23103, subd. (a).)

2) Punishes reckless driving that proximately causes bodily injury to a person other than the driver by imprisonment in county jail for 30 days to six months or by a fine of $220 to $1,000, or by both that fine and imprisonment. (Veh. Code, § 23104.)

3) Prohibits a person from engaging in a motor vehicle speed contest on a highway or in an off-street parking facility, and from aiding or abetting a speed contest. (Veh. Code, § 23109, subds. (a) & (b).

4) Punishes a person convicted of engaging in a speed contest by imprisonment in a county jail for 24 hours to 90 days or by a fine of $355 to $1,000, or by both. (Veh. Code, § 23109, subd. (e)(1).)

5) Prohibits a person from engaging in a motor vehicle exhibition of speed on a highway or in an off-street parking facility and from aiding and abetting an exhibition of speed. (Veh. Code, § 23109, subd. (c).)

6) Prohibits a person from driving a vehicle upon a highway at a speed greater than 100 mph, and makes this punishable as an infraction, by a fine of up to $500, and an up to 30 day license suspension at the court's discretion. (Veh. Code, § 22348 (b).)

7) Prohibits, generally, a person from driving a vehicle on a highway with a speed limit of 65 mph, a two-lane undivided highway with a speed limit of 55 mph, or a highway with a speed limit of 70 mph, as specified, at a speed greater than that speed limit. (Veh. Code, §§ 22348 (a); 22349; 22356.)

8) Provides that any person who drives 30 or more mph over the speed limit on a freeway, or 20 or more mph over the speed limit on any other street or highway, and with willful or wanton

disregard for the safety of persons or property, and during the commission of a DUI or DUI causing bodily injury, shall, in addition to the punishment for the DUI, be punished by an additional and consecutive term of 60 days in county jail. (Veh. Code, § 23582 (a.)

9) Establishes an ignition interlock device (IID) pilot program until January 1, 2033, as follows:

   a) Authorizes a court to order a person convicted of their first DUI offense to install a functioning, certified IID on any vehicle that the person operates and prohibit that person from operating a motor vehicle for up to six months unless that vehicle is equipped with a functioning, certified IID. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A)(i).)

   b) Requires a court to order the installation of an IID for repeat DUI offenders and DUIs causing bodily injury to another person, as specified (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (h); 13352; 13352.4; 13353.3; 13353.6; & 13353.75.)

   c) Requires IID manufacturers to adopt a fee schedule under which the manufacturer will absorb a varying amount of an offender's cost for the IID based on the offender's income, relative to the federal poverty level. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (r).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

1) **Author's Statement**: According to the author, “California is facing a growing traffic safety crisis. Every day, approximately 12 people are killed on our roads, and speeding is a leading factor in roughly one-third of those fatalities. Thousands more suffer serious, life-altering injuries each year. While traffic fines influence the behavior of many drivers, they have proven insufficient to deter super speeders. License suspension is likewise ineffective, as the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators estimates that 75% of those suspended continue to drive during their suspension period. These are not just statistics—they represent families, communities, and lives forever changed.

   “AB 2276, the Stop Super Speeders Act, takes a targeted, evidence-based approach to directly address the harm caused by the most dangerous drivers by requiring individuals convicted of egregious speeding offenses, such as reckless driving or speeding over 100 mph, to install an active Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) device in their vehicles before returning to the road. Active ISA devices are designed to prevent dangerous speeding behavior by limiting a vehicle’s ability to exceed posted speed limits. AB 2276 uses cutting-edge technology to save lives in a way that is fair, targeted, and focused on the drivers who pose the greatest risk to public safety, without inconveniencing most everyday Californians.”

2) **ISA Technology:** ISA technologies use sensors such as GPS or cameras to monitor a vehicle's speed and provide real-time feedback or intervention to ensure adherence to speed limits. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), “[I]ntelligent speed assistance or intelligent speed adaptation (ISA) involves in-vehicle technologies that use GPS data interacting with accurate, digitally mapped speed limit data for the entire network or vehicle-based speed limit sign recognition. ISA systems can vary

from minimal systems that provide information to active speed limit control that could be mandatory or voluntary (i.e., with on/off activation switches).[1] Systems may:

- Provide information only (display the speed limit and changes);
- Provide visual or audible alerts when the speed limit is exceeded, but the driver can decide how to react (termed open system);
- Provide accelerator resistance to make speeding more difficult, but still possible (termed half-open). This system is like cruise control, except the speed limit (not the driver) determines when to engage speed resistance. Drivers may be able to turn off the system with a switch; and
- Automatically prevent speeding above the speed limit (mandatory speed compliance).[2]

ISA technology is distinct from other forms of speed limitation technology that simply limit the maximum speed. As stated by NHTSA, "Compared to speed governors, which can only limit the maximum speed of vehicles, ISA has the potential to help control speed of all motor vehicle types according to the prevailing limit at a location."[3]

ISA technology is typically classified as either passive or active. "Passive ISA allows drivers to override the system and drive in excess of the local speed limit, but drivers are alerted as they exceed the local speed limit by a certain amount, for example between 0 and 10 mph above. Active ISA cannot be overridden except in limited cases, such as with the press of an override button or with kickdown of the accelerator pedal, which removes the ISA limitations for a defined period."[4]

ISA technology has been explored in various forms for over two decades, although it has received limited trials in the U.S.[5] Research suggests that ISA technology may be effective at reducing speeding and associated speeding-related fatalities and injuries.[6] In 1999, the Swedish National Road Administration conducted a three-year trial of ISA technologies in urban areas.[7] Thousands of vehicles were equipped with different ISA systems, some active and some passive. Participants used these devices for over a year, and researchers observed reductions in speeding violations for all participants and no change in travel times in urban

---

[1] NHTSA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance* (accessed April 17, 2025), available at: https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures-that-work/speeding-and-speed-management/countermeasures/other-strategies-1#:~:text=This%20system%20is%20like%20cruise,limit%20(mandatory%20speed%20compliance.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services, New York City Intelligent Speed Assistance Pilot Evaluation (Oct. 2024), at p. 7, available at: https://www.nyc.gov/assets/dcas/downloads/pdf/fleet/nyc-intelligent-speed-assistance-pilot-evaluation-2024-oct.pdf
[5] NHTSA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance, supra* note 1.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Swedish National Road Administration, *Intelligent Speed Adaption (ISA)* (2002), at p. iv, available at: https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1363740/FULLTEXT01.pdf

areas.[8] The researchers estimated that if all drivers had ISA systems, road injuries in urban areas could be reduced by as much as 20%.[9]

A 2010 study by the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure found that ISAs have "the potential to improve road safety by reducing the level of speeding, mean speed, as well as the standard deviation of speed."[10] In 2022, New York initiated a pilot program to equip their city fleet vehicles with ISA technology.[11] Specifically, they equipped approximately 500 vehicles with a device that prevents acceleration beyond a set parameter over the speed limit.[12] The findings of the pilot program were as follows:

> In an analysis of 270 vehicles equipped with ISA, there was a 64.18% relative decrease in the time driven [greater than] 11 mph over the posted speed limit following ISA activation compared to before activation, and a similar decrease was observed in the ISA-equipped vehicles compared to non-equipped control vehicles. Speeding drive time reduction ranged from ~50% on 25 mph local roads, which have speed safety cameras set to the same enforced speed threshold, to 82% reduction on 50 mph roads. In addition, the impact of ISA on speeding behavior of habitual speeders in 130 vehicles was similar to that on the primary cohort, indicating ISA is effective at significantly reducing severe speeding across a wide range of drivers and fleet.[13]

According to NHTSA, the largest safety benefits will likely be provided by systems requiring mandatory speed limit compliance that cannot be overridden and requiring ISA for higher risk groups, such as younger drivers, professional drivers, and drivers convicted of serious speeding offenses, may be the most cost-effective approach.[14]

That said, ISA technology has its limitations. The Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure study found that users show few signs of learning after the systems are turned off, and serious offenders frequently used the option to override the system, which may seriously impact the efficacy of these systems.[15] "Like other speed control measures, there seems to be little potential for a lasting educational benefit or 'training' of drivers to control their speed once the systems are deactivated."[16]

Further, access to accurate speed limit information is critical to the functioning of the device. According to NHTSA, "there is a need to provide current and accurate maps of speed limits (Carsten, 2012), and to have reliable speed limit sign-reading camera and related technologies… as well as to have the technologies installed in new vehicles or retrofitted to older vehicles."[17] Updated maps may not be regularly purchased by owners, and may only be

---

[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] van der Pas, et. al., *Intelligent speed assistance for serious speeders: The results of the Dutch Speedlock trial* (Nov. 2014), 72, 78-94, available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001457514001742?via%3Dihub
[11] NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services, *supra* note 4.
[12] *Ibid*.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] NHTSA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance, supra* note 1.
[15] van der Pas, et. al., *supra* note 10.
[16] NHTSA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance, supra* note 1.
[17] *Ibid.*

updated once a year.[18] As a result of such outdated speed limit information, some ISA systems may present false warnings.[19] Alternatively, camera-based systems, which detect the limit by reading posted signage, may be limited by visibility, such as when traffic signs are covered.[20]

Further, ISA technology may have challenges determining specialized speed limits in school zones, as well as other areas with temporarily reduced speed limits, such as construction zones. Additionally, preventing vehicles from exceeding the speed limit could contribute to unintended consequences. For example, if a person is driving a vehicle on the freeway at 65 mph, with an ISA device that prevents them from exceeding 65 mph, and another driver swerves into their lane, they may need to temporarily exceed the 65 mph limit to avoid a collision. Some ISA technology permits temporary overrides; however, this may require that a person separately identify and push the override button, which they may not have the time to do in emergencies. Finally, active ISA technology may be difficult to install on older vehicles.

On the NHTSA scale of the effectiveness of speeding countermeasures, which ranges from one to five stars, ISA technology receives three stars.[21] This suggests the countermeasure is "likely to be effective based on the balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations."[22] This can be compared with other speeding countermeasures, such as speed safety camera enforcement or lower speed limits, which receive five stars.[23]

3) **Increased Use of ISA Technology:** Use of ISA technology has expanded in recent years. Most notably, in 2019, the European Union required all new vehicles sold, beginning in 2024, to be fitted with ISA technology.[24] Specifically, the ISA required to be adopted by the European Union will function similarly to a cruise control, by preventing vehicles from travelling in excess of the posted speed limit by limiting engine power, but not utilizing automatic braking. Such systems will include off switches and can be overridden by the driver at any time.[25] Just in the last year, several states, including Virginia, Washington, and Washington DC, enacted laws establishing various forms of ISA device programs for specified speeding offenses.[26]

4) **Effect of this Bill:** This bill creates a statewide pilot program, commencing January 1, 2027, and until January 1, 2033, requiring an individual convicted of specified speeding and reckless driving offenses to install an ISA device on any vehicle that person operates. This

---

[18] *Ibid.*
[19] ACEA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance: why ISA cannot become mandatory today* (Nov. 2018), available at: https://www.acea.auto/news/intelligent-speed-assistance-why-isa-cannot-become-mandatory-today/
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] NHTSA, *Countermeasures* (accessed April 2, 2026), available at: https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures-that-work/speeding-and-speed-management/countermeasures
[22] *Ibid.*
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] NHTSA, *Intelligent Speed Assistance, supra* note 1.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] Ashley Knight, *Va.'s speed-limiting legislation to take effect July 1*, Wavy News Stream (March 20, 2026), available at: https://www.wavy.com/news/local-news/va-s-speed-limiting-legislation-to-take-effect-july-1/; Jake Goldstein-Street, *Washington to rein in fast drivers with speed limiters,* Washington State Standard (May 12, 2025), available at: https://washingtonstatestandard.com/2025/05/12/washington-to-rein-in-fast-drivers-with-speed-limiters/; Jake

bill pertains to active, rather than passive, ISA technology. It defines "active intelligent speed assistance device" to mean an aftermarket device that uses location-based technology to actively limit a motor vehicle's speed to posted or preset speed limits, is tamper-resistant, and is capable of reporting attempts to disable or circumvent functionality. This does not include technology provided by a motor vehicle manufacturer as a component of a new motor vehicle that controls or affects the speed of a motor vehicle. This definition may broadly cover a wide range of ISA devices, including those with or without override options. This pilot program is substantially similar to the IID pilot program currently in place in California. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (h); 13352; 13352.4; 13353.3; 13353.6; & 13353.75.)

The bill generally requires a court to notify a person convicted of reckless driving, a speed contests, an exhibition of speed, placing a barricade for the purpose of facilitating a speed contest or exhibition, as specified, driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 mph, driving a vehicle on a highway with a speed greater than 65 mph, 55 mph (for a two-lane undivided highway), or 75 mph, as specified, and a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly, that they are required to install an ISA device on any vehicle they operate. This provision applies not only to serious speeding crimes, but also to low-level speeding violations, such as driving in excess of 55 mph, 65 mph, and 70 mph, as specified. The author may wish to remove this bill's application to low-level speeding violations.

Additionally, it specifically authorizes a court to order a person, with no priors, who is convicted of reckless driving, engaging in a speed contest, or driving a vehicle at a speed greater than 100 mph, to install an ISA device for up to six months from the date of conviction. If a person has one, two, or three or more priors, that person would be required to install an ISA device for a mandatory 12 months, 24 months, or 36 months, respectively. This bill defines "prior" to include a broad category of driving offenses, including low-level speeding violations such as driving on a highway in excess of the 55, 65, or 70 mph speed limit. Unlike the IID framework, which contains a 10-year washout period for prior offenses, this bill does not provide for a washout period. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(3).) This means that a "prior" offense includes any eligible offense, even if it occurred decades ago. Under this bill, a person convicted of driving over 100 mph at age 60, who previously received two speeding tickets for driving over a 55 or 65 mph speed limit during their lifetime, could be required to install an ISA device for two years. The author may wish to establish a 10-year washout period, consistent with the IID framework, and remove low-level speeding violations from the list of eligible priors.

This bill also requires ISA installations for a more serious class of speeding offenses that result in injury or involve impaired driving. It requires a court, for a person convicted of reckless driving proximately causing bodily injury, reckless driving causing GBI with certain priors, a speed contest that proximately causes bodily injury, or a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly, who has no prior convictions, to install an ISA device for 12 months. If a person has one, two, or three or more priors, they would be required to install an ISA device for 24 months, 36 months, and 48 months, respectively. Eligible priors for purposes of this requirement include a speed contest, an exhibition of speed, placing a barricade for the purpose of facilitating a speed contest or exhibition, or a DUI while speeding and driving recklessly. As stated above, there is no washout period for eligible priors.

In terms of the procedures contemplated by this bill, it requires a court to notify a person convicted of a specified speeding offense that they must install an ISA device and that they

are prohibited from operating a vehicle without an ISA device. The DMV is then required to inform the person of the ISA requirements and restrict the person's license to state that the driver is restricted to only driving vehicles equipped with an ISA device for the applicable term. An individual required to install an ISA device is required to: 1) arrange for each vehicle operated by the person to be equipped with an ISA device; 2) provide to the DMV proof of installation; and 3) pay a fee, determined by the DMV, that is sufficient to cover the costs of administration of this section. Like the IID statute, certain individuals, such as those who do not own a vehicle, among other conditions, are exempt from these requirements.

This bill makes tampering or interfering with the ISA device, directing another to tamper or interfere with the device, operating a vehicle without a required ISA device, and failing to return the device to the vendor upon program completion a misdemeanor. These provisions are largely consistent with the misdemeanors that exist for non-compliance or tampering with an IID. (Veh. Code, §§ 23573, subd. (i), 23247, subds. (a)-(g).) The only exception is the misdemeanor for failing to return the device. There is no similar provision in the IID statute, and establishing a misdemeanor for this conduct as applied to ISAs creates a certain degree of inconsistency in the law. Further, the point in time at which a person is required to return the device is unclear. This could authorize misdemeanor charges against a person subject to an ISA, who unintentionally forgets to return the device or who returns the device months after the term is completed. The author may wish to remove this provision or consider alternative non-criminal penalties.

This bill also subjects a violation of any of the above to an extension of the required term the device needs to be installed by an additional 120 days. The need for a mandatory four-month extension for non-compliance is unclear. There is no comparable provision in the IID statute. Further, the bill already separately states that any period of non-compliance cannot be credited towards the mandatory term, and establishes certain misdemeanors for non-compliance. Establishing a mandatory four-month extension for noncompliance creates inconsistency in the law and appears unnecessary given the existing penalties for noncompliance. The author may wish to remove this provision.

In terms of the costs of the device, an individual subject to an ISA is required to pay for the costs of the provider's standard ISA device, all device program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements in amounts commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level, upon income verification. For example, an individual with an income at 100 percent of the federal poverty level or below is responsible for 10 percent of all ISA costs. The ISA device manufacturer is responsible for any remaining costs.

This bill also establishes procedures governing the collection of data pertaining to ISA devices. Among other provisions, it requires collected data to be securely maintained by the provider, permits data related to be shared with the DMV or court that ordered the device, and permits depersonalized and aggregated data to be shared with third parties for research or evaluation purposes. Such data may only be shared pursuant to a court order, state statute, or regulation, or with the DMV or ordering court. The bill also prohibits manufacturers and retailers of vehicles from being liable for any loss, injury, or damage caused by the design, installation, improper installation, use, or misuse of an ISA, except as specified.

Finally, this bill requires CalSTA to analyze the effectiveness of this pilot program and submit a report to the Legislature containing its assessment by July 1, 2032. The provisions of this bill will sunset on January 1, 2033.

5) **History of IID Pilot Programs in California:** Given the novel nature of this type of active intelligent ISA technology that can accurately track and enforce speed limits across a given region, its lack of widespread use in California, and the Legislature's history of collecting data on comparable vehicle safety technology through county-wide pilot programs, the author may wish to consider limiting this bill to a multi-county pilot program. The Legislature has enacted numerous IID pilot programs that have generated associated statistical studies analyzing the effectiveness of that technology. For example, in 1986, the Legislature established a temporary four-county pilot program authorizing judges to order DUI offenders to install IIDs as a condition of probation, and required the evaluation of this program to determine its effectiveness.[27] This was the first use of IIDs in California.[28] AB 91, Chapter 217, Statutes of 2009, established another four-county pilot program, which required first-time and repeat DUI offenders to install IIDs to obtain a restricted driver's license from 2010-2016. Other pilot programs were later enacted to create the state-wide pilot program that exists today. Given the relatively novel nature of this type of ISA technology, the limitations of the technology, and to maintain consistency with the data-driven approach the Legislature has taken with IID technology, the author may wish to consider limiting this bill to a multi-county, rather than a statewide, pilot program.

6) **Argument in Support**: According to *Steersafe Partnership*, "Active ISA devices are vehicle-based technologies that use location-based systems to identify posted speed limits and actively limit a vehicle's speed to those limits. Once the preset threshold is reached, the vehicle cannot accelerate further, directly preventing dangerous speeding behavior before it results in tragedy. This preventive approach aligns squarely with public health principles: identify the highest-risk behaviors, intervene early, and reduce harm at the population level.

"ISA technology has been used for more than 30 years on commercial fleets and is emerging as an innovative countermeasure for super speeders. This technology is a proven effective countermeasure to prevent speeding. In New York City, early results from a pilot program with 300 municipal vehicles saw 99 percent compliance with speed limits over 1 million miles, a 37 percent drop in hard braking. The most recent report on the program found a 64 percent reduction in overall time spent speeding (more than 11mph over the limit), including an 82 percent decrease in time spent speeding on higher-speed roads (50 mpg).

"National organizations, including the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA), have developed model legislation supporting technology-based interventions for high-risk drivers. Other states have begun implementing similar measures to reduce recidivism among dangerous speeders. California should lead, not lag, in deploying innovative safety tools that save lives.

"For families across California, this issue is deeply personal. Advocates with Families for Safe Streets have shared heartbreaking stories of loved ones killed by speeding drivers,

---

[27] California Department of Motor Vehicles, *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Ignition Interlock in California* (Sept. 2005), p. 4, available at: https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/an-evaluation-of-the-effectiveness-of-ignition-interlock-in-california/
[28] *Ibid.*

tragedies that were entirely preventable. As they have emphasized, speeding is not an accident, it is a choice. When drivers repeatedly choose to engage in extreme speeding, the state has a responsibility to intervene before another family's life is permanently altered.

"License suspension alone has proven insufficient. National data indicates that 75 percent of suspended drivers continue to drive. AB 2276 offers a more effective alternative: maintaining mobility only when lifesaving safeguards are in place.

"AB 2276 treats reckless speeding with the seriousness it deserves - as a preventable public health emergency - and provides a focused, evidence-based strategy to reduce fatalities, protect vulnerable road users, and promote long-term behavior change."

7) **Argument in Opposition**: According to *Initiate Justice*, "If AB 2276 is passed, drivers convicted of certain traffic offenses would be required to install a certified active intelligent speed assist (ISA) device in their vehicles—initially at the court's discretion, and then mandatorily for repeat offenses. More specifically, AB 2276 requires those individuals to install costly monitoring technology in their vehicles and maintain regular servicing and recalibration, or face further legal consequences. While we applaud the effort to address excessive speeding, Initiate Justice opposes AB 2276 because the devices are unreliable and do not get at the root causes of unsafe driving in California.

"We understand and support efforts to improve road safety. However, this bill, in its current form, imposes punitive and unnecessary financial burdens on low-income individuals, many of whom already struggle to make ends meet. Even with the proposed sliding scale, individuals would still be responsible for a portion of these fees, as well as any charges for noncompliance or missed maintenance. These proposed statutory obligations could significantly impact their ability to meet their basic needs.

"California's traffic fines and fees are among the highest in the nation, disproportionately impacting low-income individuals. The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area found that a $100 base fine can increase to $490 after additional fees, and up to $815 if deadlines are missed. These escalating costs can lead to license suspensions, job loss, and further entrenchment in poverty.

"Furthermore, the California State Auditor has found that penalties and fees added to traffic fines have mainly gone unpaid because they pose a significant financial burden to the driving public, particularly low-income individuals. Traffic infractions that carry a base fine of $35 can cost an individual $237 after penalties and fees are included.

"These financial penalties do not just punish people for their mistakes—they also perpetuate cycles of poverty and criminalization. AB 2276 fails to consider the economic realities of many Californians and risks disproportionately harming communities of color and marginalized populations who are more likely to be policed for traffic violations in the first place.

"The socioeconomic effects of policies like this one could pose challenges for families struggling to meet their basic needs, limiting their mobility and access to essential services. We should be investing the state's time and money in education, public transportation

alternatives, and restorative justice measures that promote safety without deepening inequality, rather than creating new barriers and expenses."

8) **Prior Legislation**:

a) AB 981 (Gipson) would have created a five-county pilot program that requires an individual convicted of specified reckless driving and speed offenses to install an ISA device on their vehicle. AB 981 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

b) AB 366 (Petrie-Norris), Chapter 689, Statutes of 2025, extended the sunset of the IID pilot program currently in place, from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2033.

c) SB 961 (Wiener), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have required, beginning with the 2030 model year, every passenger vehicle, motor truck, and bus manufactured, sold as new, or leased as new in the state to be equipped with a passive ISA system that provides a brief one-time signal to alert a drive each time they exceed the speed limit by more than ten miles per hour. SB 961 was vetoed by the Governor.

d) AB 2210 (Petrie-Norris) of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session would have required the DMV to operate a five-county pilot project for installation of an IID in the vehicle of a first-time DUI offender. AB 211 was held in Assembly Appropriations.

e) SB 1046 (Hill), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2016, extended the IID pilot program in certain counties and required installation of IIDs for specified DUI offenses.

f) SB 61 (Hill), Chapter 350, Statutes of 2015, extended the IID pilot project in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties until July 1, 2017.

g) AB 91 (Feuer), Chapter 217, Statutes of 2009, established a pilot program in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties, administered by DMV to require the installation of IIDs on the vehicles of all persons convicted of a DUI, as specified.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
Aaa, Automobile Club of Southern California
Aaa, Mountain West Group
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety
Alliance for Automotive Innovation
America Walks
Auto Club of Southern California (AAA)
Beautiful Pacific Beach
Bike East Bay
Bike LA
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Bicycle Coalition
California Walks

Circulate San Diego
City of Kerman, CA
City of Mendota
Coalinga Police Department
Families for Safe Streets San Diego
Families for Safe Streets USA
Fccla
Fia Foundation
Los Angeles Walks
MADD California
Mendota Police Department
Mothers Against Drunk Driving
National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving
National Safety Council
National Transportation Safety Board
Responsibility.org
Ride of Silence
Riverside County District Attorney
Safe Streets Encinitas
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
Steersafe Partnership
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE)
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE) (ORG)
Streets for All
Sylvia Bingham Fund
Vision Zero Network
Walk San Francisco

Opposition

ACLU California Action
California Public Defenders Association
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
Debt Free Justice California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Initiate Justice
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
San Francisco Public Defender

Analysis Prepared by: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744