

Date of Hearing: April 6, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Lori D. Wilson, Chair

AB 2346 (Wilson) – As Amended March 26, 2026

SUBJECT: Vehicles: electric bicycles and speed limits

SUMMARY: 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. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits a person under the age of 16 from riding an electric bicycle at a speed greater than 15 miles per hour (mph).
- 2) Authorizes local authorities to set speed limits on bicycle paths of 20 or 15 mph and on multiuse trails at 20, 15 or 10 mph.
- 3) Sets a prima facie speed limit of 10 mph on sidewalks and specifies that a violation of this provision does not result in a negligent operator point.
- 4) Requires manufactures and distributors of electric bikes to apply a permanent label to each electric bike specifying the classification number, top assisted speed, and motor wattage of the electric bicycle, in Arial font in at least 9-point type.
- 5) Requires manufacturers and distributors of electric bicycles to include a written description of California’s electric bicycle laws with the bicycle’s packaging to provide to the consumer.
- 6) Requires sellers and distributors of electric bicycles to disclose, in writing, all of the following information at or before the point of sale of each electric bicycle:
 - a) The classification of the electric bicycle;
 - b) The maximum speed of the electric bicycle;
 - c) The continuous and peak wattage of the electric bicycle;
 - d) Any age restrictions on the use of the electric bicycle;
 - e) The helmet use requirements for an electric bicycle; and,
 - f) A specified disclosure that it is against California law for a person to tamper with or modify an electric bicycle to achieve speeds greater than permitted and that doing so may require a M1 or M2 license, insurance, and registration with the Department of Motor Vehicles.
- 7) Specifies that a failure to make such a disclosure is not a criminal violation but is subject to civil penalties up to \$15,000 for the first offense and up to \$50,000 for a second offense upon an action brought by the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel, or a district attorney.
- 8) Provides that a prevailing plaintiff in an action brought for a violation is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs.

- 9) Requires class 1 and 2 electric bicycles sold on or after January 1, 2029 to be equipped with a speedometer.
- 10) Requires all electric bikes sold on or after January, 1 2029 to have an integrated front lamp emitting a white light that, while the bicycle is in motion, illuminates the highway, sidewalk, or bikeway in front of the bicyclist and is visible from a distance of 300 feet in front, and from the sides, of the bicycle and a rear lamp emitting a red light that, while the bicycle is in motion, illuminates the highway, sidewalk, or bikeway behind the bicyclist and is visible from a distance of 300 feet behind, and from the sides, of the bicycle..

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 Section (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)

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. 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 Mineta Transportation Institute at San Jose State University (MTI) 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 notes that electric bicycle-related incidents typically have more severe outcomes than conventional bicycle incidents. According to that report, “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).”

Moreover, 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 the operators of the devices. According to NEISS data, 92% of patients were operating on the device when injured, and 4% of electric bicycle patients were injured by the struck by the move. 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 to e-bikes was found to be nearly identical to the cause of injuries for 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. Not every bicycle with an electric motor is a legal electric bicycle, and writing laws targeting electric bicycles does not address 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 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 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.

In addition, there are two ongoing legislatively authorized pilots with age prohibition on persons allowed to ride e-bikes. AB 2234 (Boerner) Chapter 823, Statutes of 2024, authorized cities 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 1557 (Papan) makes changes to the definition of an electric bicycle around their speed capabilities and the wattage of the motor. 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 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.

In the Senate, SB 1167 (Blakespear) redefines motordriven cycle and mopeds, and creates disclosure requirements for selling such devices. SB 956 (Choi) would authorize 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. This bill implements several recommendations made by the Mineta Institute Report or are based on recommendations from the report. The Mineta Institute recommended all electric bicycles, not just class 3 electric bicycles, to have speedometers. The Mineta Institute report recommending following Switzerland's lead in requiring integrated lights for electric bicycles. This bill implements both of those recommendations and gives e-bike manufacturers two years to change the design of their devices.

The Mineta report recommended to “require that if local governments ban bicycles or electric bicycles from sidewalks or bike facilities, or add speed limits for micromobility devices, then these rules must be prominently signed at any location where a rider would enter the sidewalk or path.” To address that provision, this bill sets a statewide speed limit of 10 mph on sidewalks and requires signs to be posted if a city opts to have a different sidewalk speed. The city of Irvine recently set a 10-mph speed limit on its sidewalks and a 5 mph speed limit in school zones.

Finally, the Mineta Institute report focuses heavily on the fact that e-bikes in the United States are far more powerful than e-bikes in other countries. Europe, Japan and Australia cap e-bikes at 250 continuous watts and a 15.5 mph speed. In contrast, the US permits a 750-watt e-bike with a maximum speed of 28 mph. Those higher speed devices are permitted in Europe, but unlike in California, require a driver's license. When California created the 3- class system, it set an age limit of 16 years or older for those riding a class 3 electric bicycle. However, it is becoming increasingly common for electric bicycle manufacturers to make devices that “change classes” allowing the bike to greatly exceed in some cases maximum allowed speeds. For example, parents are purchasing a bicycle for their child that they think is a class 1 electric bicycle can easily be modified with an app to go 28 mph.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission recommends children under the age of 12 should not ride a vehicle with a motor capable of going faster than 10 mph. As the Mineta Institute report indicated, higher speeds produce more serious injuries. To address the concern that law enforcement cannot simply look at an electric bicycle and determine what class it is, this bill sets a 15-mph speed limit for those under the age of 16, aligned with the speed electric bicycles outside the United States are generally capped at before they require a driver's license to operate.

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 1909 helped prevent local governments from taking a draconian step of prohibiting electric bicycles from using infrastructure that was designed to protect cyclists from cars. Locals today already have the authority to set speed limits on bicycle paths to prevent dangerous speeds on these roadways, similar to how we manage car speeds in sensitive areas with speed limits. This bill creates a clearer process of authorizing locals to set a speed limit of 15 or 20 mph on a bicycle path, or 20, 15 or 10 mph on a multiuse trail. The State Parks Department has defined a multiuse trail as one that allows bicycles, pedestrians and equestrians, similar to the American River Trail, which currently has a 15-mph speed limit.

Finally, the Mineta Institute report recommended that the California Legislature requires better disclosures for the sale of e-bikes so that consumers know what they are purchasing. The report further recommends Attorney General enforcement of such rules. This bill requires the sellers of electric bicycles to disclose certain specifications and laws related to an e-bike, as well as a

mandatory disclosure that it is illegal to modify the device to go faster and a warning that if they do so the device may no longer be considered an electric bicycle under the law.

According to the author, “As e-bikes become a bigger part of daily life in our communities, we must ensure they are used safely and responsibly. AB 2346 strikes a balanced, commonsense approach - creating clear rules, strengthening safety standards, and improving rider education to protect pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers alike.”

The California Medical Association, *the sponsor of this bill*, argues “Across California, physicians are seeing a sharp increase in severe e-bike injuries, particularly among youth. Emergency physicians and trauma surgeons report that these crashes often result in significant head injuries, fractures, and other serious trauma. A report commissioned by the California Legislature and conducted by Mineta Transportation Institute¹ found a 334% increase in traumatic e-bike injuries among children at Rady Children’s Hospital of Orange County between 2022 and 2025. These are the most seriously injured patients who require the activation of a trauma team. National research reflects a similar pattern, with pediatric e-bike injuries rising sharply among and frequently resulting in more severe trauma than traditional bicycle injuries.

“This trend is not surprising. E-bikes can reach speeds far greater than traditional bicycles, increasing both the likelihood of crashes and the severity of injuries. Physicians across California are increasingly concerned that many young riders are operating e-bikes that are capable of motorcycle-like acceleration without adequate safety protections or clear information about rules of the road.

“AB 2346 proposes practical, commonsense reforms that address these risks of e-bikes while still allowing Californians to continue benefiting from their use as a convenient and environmentally friendly mode of transportation....Together, these reforms will help ensure consumers have clear information to protect themselves and their children; provide communities with tools to address local safety concerns; and reduce the growing number of injuries associated with high-speed e-bikes, particularly among young riders.”

PeopleForBikes, *writing in opposition to this bill*, argues “PeopleForBikes has concerns about the OEM lighting requirement in the bill. California law (CVC §21201) already requires all bicycles operated in darkness (darkness to dawn) to have a white front light/lamp (visible from 300 ft), a rear red reflector (visible from 500 ft), and white/yellow reflectors on pedals/ankles and sides (visible from 200 ft). There are many reasons why e-bikers would not want factory lighting systems on their bikes, including additional weight for competitive riding and the loss of the ability to select their own lighting systems. E-mountain bikers and e-gravel riders are also unlikely to ride at night. Additionally, this requirement would increase manufacturing costs.

“California represents a large portion of the U.S. e-bike market. As a result, manufacturers would likely add integrated lighting systems to all bikes rather than produce a separate model specifically for California....Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes are limited to a maximum assisted speed of 20 mph and should be regulated similarly to traditional bicycles, which are not required to have speedometers or integrated lighting systems.

“PeopleForBikes supports reasonable consumer notification requirements, but would prefer that this happen at the federal level to avoid multiple conflicting state requirements, not to mention the annual and seemingly endless changes to those requirements in CA. For example, some local

jurisdictions now have age limits that do not apply elsewhere in the state. Importantly, Congressman Dave Min will be introducing a bill to direct the CPSC to adopt standard classification and labeling requirements for e-bikes and electric dirt bikes, which multiple national advocacy groups, including PeopleForBikes, support.”

Unlike PeopleForBikes, the California Bicycle Coalition and Streets for all support the speedometer and lighting requirements in this bill. They also support the disclosure requirements. However, writing in opposition, they both take issue with the speed limit provisions of the bill. Since their letters have been submitted the author has removed the 15-mph speed limit in class IV bike lanes and has increased the speed limit on sidewalks from 5 mph to 10 mph.

Related and previous legislation:

AB 1557 (Papan) of 2025 makes changes to the definition of an electric bicycle around their speed capabilities and the wattage of the motor. That bill is pending before this committee.

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 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.

In the Senate, SB 1167 (Blakespear) redefines motordriven 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

California Medical Association (sponsor)
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
California Orthopedic Association
Children's Specialty Care Coalition
City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
City of Carlsbad
City of Huntington Beach
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Orinda
City of Santa Barbara
League of California Cities

Opposition

California Bicycle Coalition (unless amended)
PeopleforBikes (unless amended)
Streets for All (unless amended)

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