HSJ 01: MICROMOBILITY DEVICES (E-BIKES)
STAFF ANALYSIS

PROPOSAL INFORMATION			
SUBMITTING COUNTY:	Pinellas County		
SPONSOR CONTACT:	Dr. Rene Flowers, Commissioner President, Florida Association of Counties rflowers@pinellas.gov; 727.657.5680		
FAC COMMITTEE:	Health, Safety, & Justice (HSJ)	**CROSS-CLAIMS:**	N/A
FAC STAFF:	T. Graham	**DATE:**	October 4, 2026

This staff analysis is based on the proposal as submitted and does not reflect an adopted position of the Florida Association of Counties.

POLICY PROPOSAL:

The Florida Association of Counties supports the reintroduction of SB 382 (2026), Micromobility Devices, to strengthen speed and yielding requirements for electric bicycles operating on sidewalks and shared pathways, require law enforcement agencies to track and report crashes involving micromobility devices, and create a statewide task force to recommend further improvements to micromobility device regulations.

I. SUMMARY:

Pinellas County requests FAC support for the reintroduction of SB 382 (2026), Micromobility Devices. The bill would require e-bike riders to yield to pedestrians and give an audible signal on shared pathways, limit e-bikes to 10 mph on sidewalks when a pedestrian is within 50 feet, require law enforcement agencies to track and report crashes involving micromobility devices, and create a statewide task force to recommend further improvements to micromobility device regulations. FAC staff will also work with the Legislature to add minimum age requirements for e-bike operators.

CS/SB 382 passed both chambers without a dissenting vote but was vetoed by the Governor on June 25, 2026. The veto letter cited concerns with enforcement through speed detection and surveillance devices, the lack of a sunset date for the task force, and no clear limit on how long the task force could provide policy recommendations. A reintroduced bill would need to address those concerns and update the bill's 2026 reporting and task force deadlines, which have passed. The 2026 bill preserved existing local authority over e-bikes, and the Senate's analysis identified no county mandate issue.

II. PRESENT SITUATION:

Electric Bicycle Classifications

Section 316.003(23), F.S., defines an electric bicycle as a bicycle or tricycle with fully operable pedals, a seat or saddle, and an electric motor of less than 750 watts that falls within one of three classes:

- Class 1: The motor provides assistance only while the rider pedals and stops assisting at 20 mph.
- Class 2: The motor may propel the bicycle without pedaling but stops assisting at 20 mph.
- Class 3: The motor provides assistance only while the rider pedals and stops assisting at 28 mph.

These thresholds limit motor assistance, not the speed a rider can reach by pedaling or traveling downhill. A compliant e-bike can exceed its assisted speed and keep its classification.

Existing Requirements and Local Authority

Under s. 316.20655(1) through (5), F.S., compliant e-bikes have the same rights and duties as bicycles and are exempt from driver licensing, vehicle registration, title, and financial responsibility requirements. Manufacturers and distributors must label each e-bike with its class, top assisted speed, and motor wattage, and the statute addresses modifications and adopts the federal bicycle equipment standards in 16 C.F.R. part 1512.

Florida has no statewide minimum operating age for e-bikes. Under s. 316.20655(8) and (9), F.S., local governments may set a minimum age, require government-issued photo identification, and offer safety training. Section 316.20655(1), F.S., also preserves local authority to regulate e-bikes on streets and sidewalks within the local government's jurisdiction and to restrict or prohibit them on paths, trails, beaches, and dunes under its control.

The general bicycle safety requirements in s. 316.2065(1), (3)(d), (7), and (10), F.S., also apply: riders and passengers under 16 must wear helmets, nighttime lighting is required, riders must yield to pedestrians on sidewalks and in crosswalks, and riders must obey traffic controls. State law does not set a specific speed limit for e-bikes on sidewalks or shared pathways, and it does not require law enforcement agencies to keep a separate record of crashes involving micromobility devices.

County Practice and Safety Evidence

Pinellas County's published trail guide already requires riders to maintain a safe speed, obey traffic controls and posted limits, and wear a helmet if under 16, and it explains the three e-bike classes. These practices address rider conduct and equipment on a shared public facility.

DRAFT

The county cites concerns about rider behavior, unsafe speeds, and conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians but does not provide local crash data. The Consumer Product Safety Commission's April 2026 Micromobility Products Report, 2017 through 2024 (pp. 25 and 26), estimates 59,200 e-bike-related injuries treated in emergency departments nationally in 2024, with collisions and loss of control among the hazards. Statewide Florida data on micromobility crashes is limited, which the bill's crash reporting requirement was designed to address.

III. EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:

As passed in 2026, CS/SB 382 would have:

- **Shared pathways:** Required e-bike riders on a shared pathway not adjacent to a roadway, including one in a park or recreational area, to yield to pedestrians and give an audible signal before passing them.
- **Speed near pedestrians:** Prohibited e-bike riders on a sidewalk or other area designated for pedestrian use from exceeding 10 mph when a pedestrian is within 50 feet.
- **Penalty:** Made a violation a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable as a nonmoving violation under chapter 318, F.S.
- **Crash records:** Required the Florida Highway Patrol and each police department and sheriff's office to keep a list of investigated crashes involving a micromobility device, including the date and time, the e-bike class, the operator's age, and whether the operator held a valid driver or learner's license. Agencies would report to the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (FLHSMV), which would summarize the data by device type and county for the Governor and Legislature.
- **Task force:** Created the Micromobility Device Safety Task Force, adjunct to FLHSMV and chaired by its executive director, with members representing the Department of Transportation, the Florida Sheriffs Association, the Florida Police Chiefs Association, the micromobility industry, the Florida League of Cities, FAC, the medical field, and an injury prevention organization. The task force would meet at least monthly, hold meetings in North, Central, and South Florida, and report legislative recommendations to the Governor and Legislature, expiring once its report was submitted.

The 2026 bill's deadlines (task force report by October 1, 2026, local crash reports by October 15, 2026, and the FLHSMV summary by October 31, 2026) have passed, so a reintroduced bill would need new dates. To respond to the veto letter, the Legislature could consider an operating standard that does not depend on precise speed measurement, express limits on the use of speed detection or surveillance devices for enforcement, a fixed sunset date for the task force, and a defined period for its recommendations. The veto letter also questioned adopting substantive rules before the

DRAFT

task force reports, which the Legislature may need to address in sequencing the bill's provisions.

FAC staff will work with the Legislature to add minimum age requirements for e-bike operators. A bill would need to specify the minimum age, which vehicles it covers, how age would be verified, and whether a statewide age is a minimum floor that local governments may exceed or a uniform standard that replaces local rules. Retaining s. 316.20655(1), (8), and (9), F.S., would preserve existing local operational restrictions, higher local age requirements, identification ordinances, and voluntary training.

IV. COUNTY IMPACT:

The bill would apply in all 67 counties and their municipalities. Counties with extensive trail networks, busy sidewalks, significant student bicycle commuting, or heavy visitor traffic would feel greater practical effects.

- Sheriff's offices would need to keep lists of micromobility crashes and report them to FLHSMV, which may require changes to reporting practices and coordination with state systems.
- Counties that manage sidewalks, shared paths, trails, and parks may need to review signage, public education, and enforcement procedures for the new speed and yielding rules.
- FAC would have a seat on the task force, giving counties a voice in statewide recommendations.
- The 2026 bill did not limit existing local authority, so counties could continue to adopt their own e-bike ordinances, including age and identification requirements.
- A statewide minimum age requirement could affect local authority depending on its preemption language.

Protective of Home Rule: Yes. As passed in 2026, the bill preserved the authority counties hold under s. 316.20655, F.S., and added state standards without limiting local ordinances. Any minimum age provision should preserve the ability of counties to set higher local standards.

V. FISCAL IMPACT:

Indeterminate. Costs and revenues depend on the final enforcement approach, crash reporting requirements, and any minimum age provision.

State Government

The Senate's February 4, 2026, fiscal analysis of CS/SB 382 (p. 6) stated that FLHSMV's costs to staff and support the task force could be absorbed within existing department resources. FLHSMV would also compile the statewide crash summary.

DRAFT

Local Government
Sheriff's offices and police departments would incur costs to track and report micromobility crashes, and counties may incur costs for signage, public outreach, and enforcement on facilities they manage. Fine revenue from nonmoving violations would depend on compliance, collections, and statutory distribution under chapter 318, F.S. A minimum age provision could add training, verification, and outreach costs.

Private Sector
E-bike riders who violate the speed or yielding requirements would be subject to fines for a nonmoving violation. The micromobility industry would have a seat on the task force. Retailers and rental providers may need to inform customers of any new operating or age requirements.

Unfunded Mandate (Art. VII, s. 18, Fla. Const.): No. The Senate's analysis of CS/SB 382 identified no county mandate issue.

VI. LEGISLATIVE & FAC HISTORY:

Enacted Legislation
- 2020: Section 8, chapter 2020-69, Laws of Florida, created s. 316.20655, F.S., establishing the e-bike regulatory framework, labeling requirements, and licensing exemptions, and section 2 revised the definitions to create the three-class system.
- 2021: Section 2, chapter 2021-20, Laws of Florida, amended s. 316.20655(1), F.S., to preserve the authority of the government with jurisdiction over beaches and dunes to regulate e-bikes there.
- 2025: Section 5, chapter 2025-149, Laws of Florida, granted local governments express authority to establish minimum ages, require photo identification, and provide safety training.

2026 Legislation
CS/SB 382: Micromobility Devices (Truenow) passed the Senate 37 to 0 on February 25, 2026, and the House 112 to 0 on March 9, 2026, and was vetoed by the Governor on June 25, 2026. The Senate received the veto message on October 28, 2026, for the 2027 Regular Session; a veto override requires a two-thirds vote of each chamber. The related CS/HB 243, Electric Bicycles (Benarroch), was laid on the table on March 9, 2026.

The veto letter stated that the 10 mph standard would be difficult for a rider to measure, that the violation would inevitably be enforced with speed detection and surveillance devices, that the task force lacked a sunset date, and that the bill made substantive changes before the task force could make recommendations. A new Governor takes office in January 2027, before the 2027 Regular Session.

DRAFT

Stakeholders

- **May support:** FAC, the Florida League of Cities, the Florida Sheriffs Association, the Police Benevolent Association, and metropolitan planning organizations, as identified by the submitting county.
- **May oppose:** E-bike companies and bicycle groups, as identified by the submitting county.

BoCC Action

The Pinellas County BoCC has voted to support the proposal.

DRAFT