



- 6) 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)
- 7) 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)
- 8) 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)

**This bill:**

- 1) Authorizes local authorities to, by ordinance, set speed limits of 20 or 15 mph on bicycle paths or bike trails and 10 mph in limited areas with high pedestrian volumes or sight distance challenges.
- 2) Requires local authorities that set a speed limit detailed above to place appropriate signs that indicate the limits of the restricted zone and the applicable speed limit within 400 feet of each end of the restricted zone.
- 3) Specifies that any speed limit on a bicycle path or multiuse trail established prior to January 1, 2027 shall remain in effect.
- 4) Establishes the prima facie speed limit on sidewalks at 10 mph and specifies that a violation of this provision will not result in a negligent operator point.
- 5) Clarifies that manufacturers and distributors of e-bikes must 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.
- 6) Requires sellers and distributors of e-bikes 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;
  - f) A written description of California's e-bike laws; and,
  - g) The website for the California Highway Patrol's (CHP) e-bike safety course.
  - h) A recommendation that persons under 16 years of age should not ride an e-bike at a speed greater than 15 miles per hour.
- 7) Requires sellers and distributors of electric bicycles to provide a disclosure at or before the point of sale stating 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 (DMV).
- 8) Specifies that a violation of the labeling and disclosure requirements is an infraction punishable by a fine up to \$500 for the first conviction, \$750 for second conviction in three years, and \$1,000 for two or more convictions within five years.
- 9) Requires all class 2 e-bikes manufactured or sold on or after January 1, 2029, to be equipped with a speedometer.
- 10) Requires all e-bikes sold on or after January 1, 2029, to have an integrated or detachable 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 500 feet behind, and from the sides, of the bicycle.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* 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.”

- 2) *What’s an e-bike?* Electric bicycles, or e-bikes, typically look similar to regular bicycles but include an electric motor and battery. In California, e-bikes must be equipped with fully operable pedals and an electric motor that does not exceed 750 watts of power. E-bikes fall into the following classifications based on their technical specifications:
  - a) Class 1 e-bikes provide assistance only while being pedaled and only at speeds under 20 mph.
  - b) Class 2 e-bikes provide power assistance up to 20 mph with a throttle that allows the rider to engage the motor without pedaling.
  - c) Class 3 e-bikes provide pedal assistance up to 28 mph. Class 3 e-bikes may only be ridden by people who are 16 years old or older and who are wearing helmets. Class 3 e-bikes must be equipped with a speedometer.

A device that is capable of going faster than 20 mph using a throttle alone, or faster than 28 mph with pedal assist, is not an e-bike under California law.

- 3) *Benefits of e-bikes.* Shifting trips from personal vehicles to active transportation is a key strategy for achieving the state’s environmental goals. E-bikes are an increasingly popular tool to reduce car travel, particularly given that more than half of all trips in the United States are under three miles. Research indicates that even modest use can have significant impacts—for example, riding a bicycle once per day can reduce an individual’s transportation emissions by up to 67%, and surveys show many e-bike users purchase them as a substitute for a car. Evidence also shows that e-bikes are used by a diverse range of individuals, including children, older adults, and people with disabilities who may be unable to drive or use a conventional bicycle. In addition to expanding mobility, e-bikes present an opportunity to address persistent transportation challenges, including vehicle traffic injuries and fatalities, transportation-related emissions, and roadway congestion.
- 4) *Growing concerns with e-bikes and other devices.* Californians have seen a surge of news headlines in recent years about the dangers of e-bikes. Many places where conventional bicycles were common have experienced a proliferation of e-bikes, such as schools, coastal communities, and bike trails. The rapid growth in the visibility of faster devices has resulted in a swift

backlash against e-bikes across the country, including calls for increased restrictions and, in some cases, bans.

- 5) *Illegal, overpowered devices a key problem.* A fundamental challenge in evaluating and implementing e-bike policy is differentiating between legal e-bikes and illegal, overpowered devices, such as electric motorcycles. Historically, much of the news coverage of “e-bike” crashes fails to differentiate between these types of devices, labeling nearly every two-wheeled electric device as an e-bike. For example, in June 2026 the Los Angeles Times published an article with the headline *California’s new Hell’s Angels: Teens on e-bikes cut a path of danger*. Only upon opening the article would a reader learn that many of the devices in question are illegal electric motorcycles that can reach speeds over 50 mph.

The Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) at San Jose State University released a report commissioned by the California Legislature titled: *Exploring Electric Bicycle Safety Performance Data and Policy Options for California* in December 2025. The report found, “many devices marketed in California as electric bicycles have much higher motor power and/or faster motor-assisted speed than the law allows. While nobody knows how many of these illegal electric bicycles are on the road, the percentage might be quite high. Counts of electric two-wheelers parked at a dozen northern California middle and high schools found that almost 90% may not meet the standards for legal electric bicycles. Some of these devices have as much as eight times more power than legal limits.” The study went on to report that many consumers unknowingly purchase illegal devices, believing them to be legal e-bikes.

- 6) *Snapshot of crash data for kids on e-bikes.* A 2026 study from the University of California, San Diego titled *E-Bike Orthopaedic Injuries Amongst Pediatric and Adolescent Patients at a Level 1 Trauma Center* found that injuries in San Diego among e-bike riders under the age of 18 rose by 300% from 2019 to 2023.<sup>1</sup> Researchers conducted a retrospective review of 338 e-bike and traditional bicycle trauma activations at a pediatric Level I trauma center in San Diego between 2017 and 2023. The study found that compared with traditional bicycle riders, e-bike riders were more likely to sustain extremity injuries and fractures, and patients tended to be older and from more socioeconomically advantaged backgrounds. In contrast, riders involved in traditional bicycle crashes were less likely to wear helmets and more likely to suffer head injuries. These findings suggest that while traditional bicycle crashes continue to pose significant risks for head trauma, the rapid growth of

---

<sup>1</sup> [E-bike injuries among youth surge over 300% as micromobility market expand - AAOS 2026 Annual Meeting Press Kit](#)

e-bike use among youth is contributing to an increasing number of serious orthopedic injuries. It is unclear to what extent, if any, the study differentiated between legal e-bikes, and illegal, overpowered devices.

The San Jose State University MTI e-bike report found that, “[m]ost people involved in electric bicycle incidents are adults, although some local data points to particularly high rates of children in crashes. Also, the medical experts we interviewed are concerned older adults are more likely than children or younger adults to suffer serious medical consequences from crashes. In the national NEISS [National Electronic Injury Surveillance System] dataset, seniors had the highest rates of both hospitalizations and head injuries.”<sup>2</sup> Of the nine devices MTI studied with NEISS data, patients with e-bike-related injuries had the oldest median age (34) and second lowest share of patients who were minors (20%).

- 7) *Speed limits on bike paths, trails, and sidewalks.* This bill authorizes local jurisdictions to establish additional speed limits on bicycle and multi-use paths. A local authority that sets a new speed limit must place appropriate signs that indicate the limits of the restricted zone and the applicable speed limit within 400 feet of each end of the restricted zone. Additionally, the bill establishes a statewide speed limit of 10 mph on all sidewalks.

Writing in support, the City of Carlsbad explains, “[t]he bill's provision granting local authorities the ability to set speed limits on bicycle paths and multiuse trails is of particular importance to Carlsbad. Currently, cities lack clear statutory authority to establish enforceable speed limits on these facilities, even as electric bicycles capable of speeds well in excess of what is safe for shared environments become increasingly common... This flexibility will enable Carlsbad and other cities to tailor speed limits to the specific conditions of individual facilities — accounting for factors such as trail width, sightlines, pedestrian volume, and proximity to schools or parks — rather than relying on a one-size-fits-all approach.”

Opponents, including bicycle advocates, raise concerns primarily with the 10 mph speed limit on sidewalks, questioning the practicality of a statewide speed limit. Instead, they suggest that bicyclists be required to slow when pedestrians are present on a sidewalk or yield to pedestrians on sidewalks.

- 8) *Disclosures provided at point of sale.* The MTI report made comprehensive recommendations for actions the state can take to improve e-bike safety, several of which are included in this bill. Among these recommendations, the

---

<sup>2</sup> [Exploring Electric Bicycle Safety Performance Data and Policy Options for California](#)

researchers suggested that the state require e-bike sellers to disclose the device type they are selling and laws on how that device may be used. In accordance with this recommendation, AB 2346 requires e-bike sellers and distributors to provide purchasers with written information at or before the point of sale. The disclosure must identify the bicycle's classification, maximum speed, continuous and peak motor wattage, applicable age restrictions, helmet requirements, a summary of California's electric bicycle laws, and the web address for CHP's e-bike safety course. The disclosure must also recommend that those under the age of 16 should not ride over 15 mph. In addition, sellers and distributors must provide a separate disclosure warning that modifying an e-bike to exceed legal speed limits is prohibited under California law and may subject the rider to licensing, registration, and insurance requirements applicable to motorized bicycles or motorcycles.

- 9) *Speedometers and lights required.* The MTI report recommended that the state establish standards for appropriate device characteristics for e-bikes, including, among other things, speedometers and lighting for "high-speed" e-bikes. This bill requires class 2 e-bikes to be equipped with a speedometer. Current law already requires class 3 e-bikes to be equipped with speedometers. It is reasonable to expand this requirement to include additional classes of e-bikes. The bill additionally adds new lighting equipment requirements for all e-bikes sold or manufactured after January 1, 2027.
- 10) *Double referral.* This bill has been double referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

#### **RELATED/PREVIOUS LEGISLATION:**

**SB 1167 (Blakespear, 2026)** – Revises the definitions of e-bikes, motor-driven cycles, and mopeds, and updates labeling and disclosure requirements for manufacturers and sellers of these devices. It also expands prohibitions on false advertising related to e-bikes. The bill additionally establishes new operational and safety requirements, as specified, expands reckless driving provisions to include bicycles, and imposes additional reporting requirements on law enforcement. *This bill is currently in the Assembly Transportation Committee.*

**AB 2595 (Papan, 2026)** – Would authorize cities within San Mateo County and the county of San Mateo to prohibit a person under the age of 12 from riding a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle. *This bill is currently in the Senate Transportation Committee.*

**AB 1569 (Davies, 2026)** – Requires, on or before March 1, 2028, the State Department of Education, in consultation with CHP, to develop a standardized e-bike safety and training program for pupils in grades 7 to 12, and would encourage local educational agencies and parent organizations to offer training demonstrations to pupils and parents. *This bill is currently in the Senate Transportation Committee.*

**AB 875 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 168, Statutes of 2025)** – This bill authorized a peace officer to either impound a bicycle with an electric motor capable of going speeds greater than what is permitted by an e-bike or a class 3 e-bike if the person operating it is under the age of 16.

**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, Chapter 1005, Statutes of 2024)** – 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.

**SB 381 (Min, Chapter 869, Statutes of 2023)** – This bill required MTI 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.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Appropriation: No    Fiscal Com.: Yes    Local: Yes

**POSITIONS:** (Communicated to the committee before noon on Wednesday, June 17, 2026.)

**SUPPORT:**

California Medical Association (CMA) (source)  
AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah  
American Academy of Pediatrics, California  
American College of Surgeons, Southern California Chapter  
Association of California Cities - Orange County (ACC-OC)  
Auto Club of Southern California (AAA)  
Brea; City of  
California Academy of Preventive Medicine  
California Contract Cities Association

California Emergency Nurses Association  
California Orthopedic Association  
California Police Chiefs Association  
Children's Specialty Care Coalition  
Chino Hills; City of  
City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County  
City of Carlsbad  
City of Huntington Beach  
City of Laguna Niguel  
City of Lakewood CA  
City of Orinda  
City of Pico Rivera  
City of Rocklin  
City of San Luis Obispo  
City of San Mateo  
City of Vacaville Police Department  
City of Walnut Creek  
Fillmore; City of  
Goleta; City of  
Irvine; City of  
Lafayette; City of  
Lakewood; City of  
League of California Cities  
Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers  
National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners (NAPNAP)  
Newport Beach; City of  
San Francisco Marin Medical Society  
Santa Barbara; City of  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
Town of Truckee

**OPPOSITION:**

California Bicycle Coalition  
Ecology Action  
Peopleforbikes  
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE)  
Streets for All

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** Writing in sponsorship of AB 2346, the California Medical Association states, "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.

“Pilot programs in San Diego County and Marin County are currently evaluating whether limiting access to throttle-assisted e-bikes can help reduce the growing number of severe youth injuries. While these programs are important for evaluating the efficacy of those interventions, the rapid rise in injuries among children demonstrates that California must take additional steps now to improve safety.

“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.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** Writing in opposition, Ecology Action states, “Effective policy should therefore focus on clarifying definitions, improving labeling, and targeting higher-risk vehicles. Unfortunately, AB 2346 moves in a different direction by applying broader constraints to the legal e-bike market without directly addressing the misclassification and sale of higher-powered devices.

“From an implementation perspective, these impacts are significant. Through Ecology Action’s e-bike rebate programs in Santa Cruz County, we have helped hundreds of residents access affordable, climate-friendly transportation since 2021. These programs support mobility for working families, reduce emissions, and provide viable alternatives to driving.

“Policies that introduce new barriers or restrict commonly used e-bike models risk undermining these investments and limiting access—particularly for communities that benefit most from low-cost transportation options. This raises concerns about equity, effective use of public funds, and progress toward California’s climate goals.”

-- END --