



BPAC Policy Subcommittee Meeting
December 03, 2025, 10:15 am to 11:10 am
Online Zoom Meeting

Attendance (in chat):

- **Lyndsey Scofield (Chair), City of Jersey City**
- Peter Bilton, NJTPA
- John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia
- Elise Bremer-Nei, NJDOT
- Gabbie Cain, Rutgers-VTC
- Sarah Chelli, RideWise
- Kathleen Ebert, GMTMA
- Michael Elling, Deep Cycle and HCCS
- Tim Evans, New Jersey Future
- Corey Hannigan, Tri-State Transportation Campaign
- Mike Manzella, City of Jersey City
- Sean Meehan, Rutgers VTC
- Paul Mickiewicz, NJBWC
- Mackenzie Piggott, NJDEP Green Acres Program
- Sam Rosenthal, Rutgers-VTC
- Ayla Schermer, Federal Transit Administration
- Lyndsey Scofield, City of Jersey City
- Kenneth Wedeen, Somerset County Planning

Agenda:

- Topic Discussions
 - Micromobility/E-bike Proposed Legislation
 - What do you want to see? What needs to be addressed?
 - 2026 Goals

Meeting Notes:

- **Sam Rosenthal (Rutgers-VTC)** facilitated a discussion about municipal micromobility policies, including what might be incorporated into model policy language.
 - The discussion informed a research project currently being undertaken by VTC on behalf of NJDOT and is a continuation of the Micromobility Guide research.
 - The research involves two phases: the first is an overview of existing municipal micromobility policies, and the second is a look at model language for what best practices and goals might entail in municipal micromobility policy.

- On the topic of municipal micromobility policies, participants discussed the following:
 - One big issue is the misunderstanding of the classification system, which equates low-speed e-bikes with e-motos or other out-of-class e-bikes. They state the importance of prioritizing the clarification of this.
 - One participant proposed creating a single class of low-speed e-bike without license and registration requirements, noting that all other higher-powered e-bikes should require registration, insurance, and licensing.
 - Anything above 10 mph of throttle should require pedaling so that the user is actively engaged.
 - Pedal assistance should stop at 20 mph
 - 750 watts should be the maximum wattage
 - It was noted that updating the classification system may be out of scope for this particular project, as this would function on the statewide level (rather than the municipal level).
 - One issue is the inability to differentiate between different types of vehicles. Utilizing Title 39 to maintain consistency statewide is crucial, and issues such as power and throttle are statewide concerns rather than municipal ones.
 - There is a need for more research to understand the physics of devices at different speeds.
 - Participants emphasized the need for public education through the school system to parents, a program to educate vendors about the registration requirements, and funding local studies to gather comparative data (citing that the danger of motor vehicle crashes far exceeds crashes involving micromobility devices).
 - E-bike crash reporting lacks e-bike classification because police struggle to differentiate between classes, especially when the device has been modified. Therefore, the data collected is not accurate or reliable.
 - Participants suggested reclassifying e-bikes by including a throttle, as modifications to these are easier to identify compared to other types of modifications. Further, age-minimums should be adjusted, requiring that any e-bike with a throttle should have a user age limit of 17.
 - One issue of importance is the regulation of **all** e-bike use on certain types of roads. Blanket regulations that focus on the speed of a device or operating locations can be punitive to people who rely on e-bikes as their primary mode of transport.
 - Participants drew comparisons to how society responds when new vehicle types are introduced on our roadways (such as cars). Standards for cars were implemented on the national level, and because of the growing market and range of devices being produced, elements such as battery, power, and form may require a top-down approach.
 - There needs to be some sort of national-level manufacturing regulation, as well as clear distinctions regarding what the state and municipalities regulate. Participants noted that municipalities currently create regulations that they cannot, or do not, enforce.
 - Noting that New Jersey is a small state, with people often commuting across the border for work, there is a challenge of knowing the regulations in all municipalities that an

individual's commute passes through. Regional bike networks and trails could become un-navigable, especially when municipalities enact blanket bans.

- On December 4th, the NJ Senate president will introduce a bill that merges all e-bike classifications, essentially designating them all as class 3. The license requirements will make e-bikes and shared mobility out of reach for many, removing any incentives to choose a low-speed e-bike.
 - Some participants believe that there should be more rider education around moped licensure.
 - Participants agreed with the need for state and national-level policy, especially given that local officials are receiving requests to act. Providing a model policy would be a beneficial step toward implementing real and timely action. They also note that municipalities are passing ordinances anyway, so a statewide model policy would help strengthen these municipal policies.
 - E-bike sales are comparable to EV sales in the US. Examining the number of EVs may provide a rough estimate of the number of e-bikes owned by the public, and adding e-scooters may double this figure.
 - If a device is over 750 watts, it is not considered an e-bike in NJ. Rather than banning micromobility devices in specific locations, municipalities should be encouraged to adopt rules such as speed limits on trails or regional shared-use paths.
 - Some highlighted the need to focus on riding behavior as a primary issue. They question whether focus needs to be on law-abiding riders that may not be licensed or registered as opposed to law-breaking riders that meet the license and registration requirements.
 - In many recent outreach efforts, concerns about etiquette and speed have been identified as the top concerns for trail users.
 - Some suggested requiring the installation of a speed limiter on e-bikes for users who are caught speeding or operating dangerously. This controls their speed without banning them from using devices.
 - There is a lack of training for law enforcement around Title 39. There is also no real enforcement of the Safe Passing Law; however, they could use reckless driving as a subjective infraction to enforce this when they cannot verify the 4-foot safe passing distance.
- **Rutgers-VTC** closed out this discussion, sharing that the BPRC has a collection of current municipal micromobility ordinances in written form, and a report on these will be published online once it is reviewed internally.

Main Goals for the Policy Subcommittee (2026)

1. **Address e-bike and micromobility regulations**
 - Develop or refine policy guidance on e-bikes and other micromobility devices at both state and local levels.
2. **Advance RSIS-related policy improvements**

- Continue prioritizing Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) issues, especially those related to parking, lighting, safety, and pedestrian/bicycle safety as referenced in the Target Zero Action Plan.
3. **Discuss which Target Zero Action Plan Actions to Prioritize**
 - Identify which Target Zero legislative items the subcommittee should focus on first.
 - Clarify how subcommittee members can support agencies responsible for implementing specific actions.
 4. **Support speed management reforms**
 - Promote understanding of speed-related design and policy issues (e.g., lane width, MUTCD flexibility, 85th percentile rule).
 - Follow updates to speed hump and raised intersection policies.
 5. **Contribute to broader Target Zero safety initiatives**
 - Support non-legislative actions that make biking and walking safer, even if they are not policy related.