



Outlook

Fw: Public Comment - City Council Meeting 4/28/26 - Item 3.4 - Please Adopt Vice Mayor Foley's 4/27/26 Memo on E-Bike Access

From City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Date Tue 4/28/2026 8:21 AM

To Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

 1 attachment (65 KB)

Public Comment City Council Meeting 4/28/26 Item 3.4 Please Adopt Vice Mayor Foley's 4/27/26 Memo on E Bike Access;

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Jack Ketcham <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 4:53 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Cc: District3 <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Public Comment - City Council Meeting 4/28/26 - Item 3.4 - Please Adopt Vice Mayor Foley's 4/27/26 Memo on E-Bike Access

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment - City Council Meeting 4/28/26 - Item 3.4 - Please Adopt Vice Mayor Foley's 4/27/26 Memo on E-Bike Access

JK

Jack Ketcham <[REDACTED]>



To: City Clerk

Mon 4/27/2026 4:54 PM

Cc: District3



The digital signature on this message can't be verified. This message has a digital signature, but it wasn't verified because the S/MIME extension isn't installed. Please contact your IT administrator for help installing the extension.

Dear City Clerk,

Please attach this comment to the record for Item 3.4 (Spring 2026 Intergovernmental Relations Report) at the April 28, 2026 City Council meeting.

I'm writing in strong support of Vice Mayor Foley's memorandum dated April 27, 2026, and respectfully urge the full Council to adopt its two directions:

1. That the City not take a supportive position on legislation that unduly restricts access to e-bikes as a transportation mode, and that staff weigh equity and mobility impacts alongside safety benefits before adopting any position.
2. That staff and the state lobbying team engage local stakeholders — including the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition and the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) — before taking formal positions on e-bike legislation.

This matters to my household directly. My wife and I relocated to the Bay Area from Tempe, AZ, and chose Downtown San José specifically for its walkability, bike infrastructure, and transit access. We brought two e-bikes with us, and they are the reason we went from a two-car household to a one-car household. The Vice Mayor's memo identifies exactly why that access needs to be protected: e-bikes are "an affordable alternative to car ownership," and as her memo correctly notes, automobile crashes — not e-bikes — represent the vast majority of fatal and severe injury collisions in San José.

Several state bills currently in motion would undermine legal e-bike access without addressing the actual problem on our streets, which is e-motos (illegal motorbikes) being falsely advertised and sold as e-bikes:

- SB 1167 (Blakespear) is the right approach. It defines e-motos as mopeds, motor-driven cycles, or motorcycles and applies dealer licensing, registration, insurance, and consumer disclosure where they belong — on motor vehicles, not on bicycles.
- AB 1557 (Papan) would redefine California's Class 1 and 2 e-bike standards, creating market confusion, hurting local bike shops, and putting residents like me — who relocated here with existing legal e-bikes — in legal limbo overnight.
- AB 1942 (Bauer-Kahan) would impose impractical DMV-style requirements on bicycles that often

a more targeted fix.

- AB 2346 (Wilson) imposes restrictive speed limits that invite pretextual policing of children on any bike and disproportionate civil penalties on the small businesses that sell and service bikes in our neighborhoods.

Adopting Vice Mayor Foley's recommendations would ensure San José's voice in Sacramento reflects both safer streets and preserved mobility for the residents who chose to drive less. Please support the memo as written.

Thank you,
Jack Ketcham
Downtown San José, 95112

 Reply

 Reply all

 Forward

Fw: Support Foley Memo - Ebike memo for IGR report - Item 3.4 Council 4/28

From City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Date Tue 4/28/2026 8:50 AM
To Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Jordan Moldow <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 8:48 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Support Foley Memo - Ebike memo for IGR report - Item 3.4 Council 4/28

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Honorable City Councilmembers,

Please approve the [Memorandum from Vice Mayor Foley, 4/27/26](#) regarding access to electric bikes as a transportation mode.

I strongly agree with all Councilmembers, that we must take bold steps to prevent more loss of life on our streets. Some of the specific bills cited in the group memo will increase car dependency and may not have safety benefit in the long run (they may even hurt safety), and I recommend that the City NOT adopt supportive positions on AB 2346, AB 1557, or AB 1942.

AB 2346 has the well intentioned goal to make legal e bikes less powerful, which improves one kind of safety risk but creates other safety risks. The 250 watt restriction, in particular, will make it much more difficult to use e bikes to climb hills, especially for heavier riders and ADA riders. For some, it would mean crawling up hills, putting them at risk of a massive speed differential compared to cars. For

others, it would mean staying reliant on cars, which are by far the most dangerous devices on our roads.

AB 2346 also does not address the macro trend being observed across the state. In response to SB 381 (Min, 2023), the Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) at SJSU published *Exploring Electric Bicycle Safety Performance Data and Policy Options for California*. This paper reports that, "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." While hospitals have reported an alarming rise in trauma related to "e-bikes", it is quite likely that much of this trauma is actually related to the proliferation of what would better be described as e-motorcycles or e-mopeds. I encourage Council to adopt Support for SB 1167, which was written to regulate these e-motos and prevent them from being marketed as "e-bikes" to children.

At the end of my email is a list of active state bills that will improve safety for everyone on the road. None of these bills are currently Monitored by IGR. I suggest adopting a Support position, or at least adding them to your Monitor list.

Devices meeting the specifications of AB 2346 largely do not exist today in the North American market. Rather than prohibiting today's legal e-bikes and mandating that they all change, a different approach might be to encourage such devices to be brought to market, and provide subsidies for trading in more powerful devices for less powerful ones.

AB 1614 is a fine bill, and I recommend a Support position. I would like to note for the record that it has nothing to do with e-bikes. It takes an existing restriction - limiting one rider to any bicycle (unless there is a properly affixed passenger seat) on roads - and applies that same restriction on Class I trails and multi-use paths.

Thanks for your consideration,
Jordan Moldow (speaking on my own behalf)
Chair, San Jose Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (for identification only)

[SB 1167 - Regulate e-motos and e-mopeds, and prevent them from being sold/advertised as e-bikes](#)

- [Senator Blakespear Fact Sheet](#)
- [Attorney General Bonta, California District Attorneys Issue Consumer Alert on E Bike Safety, Legal Requirements](#)
- [Enforce illegal e motos that are pretending to be legal e bikes](#)
- [Protect the Promise of E Bikes](#)
- [Bringing Clarity, Safety, and Honesty to California's E Bike Landscape](#)

[AB 2276 - Stop Super Speeders](#)

- [Coalition Letter](#)
- "Requires the DMV to establish a pilot program, beginning January 1, 2027, in the counties of Los Angeles, San Diego, Fresno, Santa Clara, Shasta, Kern, and San Bernardino to reduce the

number of violations extreme speed violation, as specified, by requiring the installation and use of an active intelligent speed assistance (ISA) device."

- "requirement for persons convicted of specified driving offenses relating to excessive speed, reckless driving, and exhibitions of speed"
- "The bill would make the installation of an ISA discretionary for a first offender"

[AB 1569 Require K 12 student e bike riders to complete CHP e bike safety program as a condition to park on campus.](#)

[AB 2168 Improve the ATP, which would lead to more safety projects being implemented.](#)

[AB 1830 Ignition interlock devices for DUI drivers Make program permanent, and extend it to more cases](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Support Foley Memo - Ebike memo for IGR report - Item 3.4 Council 4/28

From City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Date Tue 4/28/2026 9:33 AM
To Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Jordan Moldow <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 9:10 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Support Foley Memo - Ebike memo for IGR report - Item 3.4 Council 4/28

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Correction to my previous email: AB 1557 is the bill that changes the speed and power requirements of legal e bikes, not AB 2346.

Jordan Moldow

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Item 3.4 - E-bike Legislation / Spring 2026 Intergovernmental Relations Report

From City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Date Tue 4/28/2026 9:34 AM
To Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Amy Thomson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 9:24 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Item 3.4 - E-bike Legislation / Spring 2026 Intergovernmental Relations Report

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Honorable City Council,

The Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition strongly supports legislation that makes it safe and convenient to use a legal e bike with specific attention to youth riders having access to devices appropriate for their age. Thank you to all Councilmembers for your attention to this matter.

We have [a blog here outlining why we support SB1167](#), which would distinguish legal e bikes from illegal e motos and create clear consequences for selling an e moto under the guise of an e bike.

The post also outlines why we oppose AB1557 and AB1942, because these bills create new rules and enforcement that do NOT address the root of the problem: illegal e motos on our streets being ridden by youth and adults.

We support the [Memorandum from Vice Mayor Foley, 4/27/26](#) re: legal e-bikes as an important and safe transportation mode.

Legal e-bikes are a transformative travel option that give youth and adults freedom to move without the high cost of car ownership or needing a ride from their parents. [We have a 2-part series](#) outlining our stance on e-bike safety for youth and adults.

Thank you for your consideration,

--

Amy Thomson | she/her
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Policy Director

[Book 30 minutes with me](#)

Please note I will be on maternity leave from May 26 - Sept 1



[Sign up to volunteer for our May 30 El Camino Real Ride to support a complete street for people biking, walking and taking transit!](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.