2026 STATE BLOCKCHAIN LEGISLATION

COMPREHENSIVE LANDSCAPE REPORT

Policy Analysis & Strategic Intelligence

Prepared for: State Policy, Federal Policy, and Blockchain Communities

Report Prepared By: ***Mortar Strategies***

Data current as of: February 15, 2026

For questions or additional analysis, contact:
derek@mortarstrategies.com

MORTAR STRATEGIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2026 state legislative session marks a critical inflection point in U.S. digital asset policy. With 224 blockchain-related bills tracked across 43 states, the landscape has evolved from experimental "blockchain innovation" to sophisticated regulatory frameworks addressing consumer protection, commercial law modernization, and resource allocation disputes.

Key Finding: Consumer protection and fraud prevention dominate state priorities, with 36% of all bills addressing kiosk regulation, disclosure requirements, and anti-scam measures. This represents a fundamental shift from the 2020-2023 era of "blockchain for government efficiency" to 2025-2026's focus on harm reduction and market integrity.

Table of Contents

1. The Great Divergence: 2026 Legislative Landscape
2. Statistical Landscape: Volume, Velocity & Success Rates
3. Topic-by-Topic Analysis: What's Passing vs. What's Stalling
4. State Power Rankings & Posture Analysis
5. Regional Distribution & Political Geography
6. Federal-State Dynamics: Macro Policy Drivers
7. Success Factors & Failure Points
8. Strategic Recommendations

1. The Great Divergence: 2026 Legislative Landscape

The 2026 legislative session represents a fundamental transformation in state blockchain policy. The era of unified "blockchain innovation" support has ended, replaced by a clear divergence between regulatory protection and digital sovereignty approaches.

The Sovereignty States

A cohort of states is pursuing digital asset sovereignty through Bitcoin reserves, anti-CBDC legislation, mining rights, and self-custody protections. These states view blockchain technology as a tool for monetary independence and economic development. While visible and politically charged, these bills face structural headwinds including executive vetoes, appropriations committee resistance, and concerns about fiduciary responsibility.

The Regulatory States

The dominant approach in 2026 focuses on consumer protection, money transmitter licensing, taxation frameworks, and kiosk regulation. These states prioritize harm reduction over innovation facilitation, driven by documented fraud patterns including "pig butchering" scams, elder exploitation, and romance fraud vectors. This regulatory approach is achieving higher passage rates because it addresses concrete, documented harms with enforceable solutions.

2. Statistical Landscape: Volume, Velocity & Success Rates

2.1 Headline Statistics

Metric	Value
Total Bills Tracked	**224**
States with Active Legislation	**43**
2026 Session Bills	**78 (34.8%)**
2025 Carryover Bills	**146 (65.2%)**

2.2 Activity Concentration

Legislative activity is heavily concentrated in a small number of states. The top 5 states account for 76 bills (34% of total volume), while the top 10 represent 118 bills (53%).

Top 10 Most Active States:

- New York: 26 bills
- Florida: 15 bills
- New Jersey: 12 bills
- Massachusetts: 12 bills
- Maryland: 11 bills
- Alabama: 9 bills
- Rhode Island: 9 bills
- Missouri: 9 bills
- Illinois: 8 bills
- West Virginia: 7 bills (tied with Wyoming)

Notable Insight: The Northeast dominates with 70 bills (31% of total), driven primarily by New York and Massachusetts. This concentration reflects both population density and heightened regulatory concern about consumer protection in major financial centers.

3. Topic-by-Topic Analysis: What's Passing vs. What's Stalling

The 2026 legislative landscape reveals stark differences in topic popularity and success rates. Based on analysis of historical enactment data and current bill trajectories, we can identify clear winners and losers in the policy arena.

3.1 High-Momentum Topics (Strong Enactment History)

Consumer Protection & Kiosk Regulation

Current Volume: 81 bills (36.2%)

Historical Success Rate: ~53% (highest of all categories)

This is the dominant legislative theme of 2026. Consumer protection bills, particularly those targeting cryptocurrency kiosks and ATMs, are passing at unprecedented rates. These bills typically include transaction caps, cooling-off periods, mandatory fraud warnings, operator registration requirements, and enhanced KYC thresholds.

Why It's Working: FinCEN issued explicit warnings about kiosk-based scams, particularly "pig butchering" schemes targeting elderly victims. States have documented fraud patterns and can point to real victims. The bills are enforceable with existing regulatory infrastructure.

Money Transmission & Licensing

Current Volume: 59 bills (26.3%)

Historical Success Rate: ~22% (highest among regulatory frameworks)

States are rapidly updating money transmitter definitions to explicitly include digital asset businesses. This addresses the regulatory gap that allowed unlicensed operators to claim they weren't money transmitters.

Why It's Working: Federal alignment. States are rushing to harmonize with expected federal frameworks. These bills are technical, non-controversial, and address clear regulatory gaps.

UCC Article 12 (Commercial Law Modernization)

Current Volume: 3 bills (1.3%) - artificially low due to measurement

Historical Success Rate: ~33% (strong for technical legislation)

External Benchmark: 33 states have already enacted 2022 UCC amendments (Wolters Kluwer data)

UCC Article 12 amendments are the "quiet revolution" in blockchain legislation. These technical bills establish property rights frameworks for "controllable electronic records" (the legal term for tokenized assets). While low in absolute count, they're foundational for institutional adoption.

Why It's Working: Uniform Law Commission backing. These are lawyer-to-lawyer bills with minimal political friction. They're framed as "technical corrections" rather than crypto policy.

3.2 Struggling Topics (Low Historical Success)

Bitcoin/Crypto Reserves

Current Volume: 57 bills (25.4%)

Historical Success Rate: ~6.4% (very low)

The "Strategic Bitcoin Reserve" concept has exploded in popularity following federal discussions, but state-level implementation faces severe headwinds. Bills proposing state treasury Bitcoin holdings have been vetoed in Arizona and killed in committee in Virginia, Montana, and other states.

Why It's Failing: Governors and state treasurers cite fiduciary concerns, volatility risk, and "unclaimed property" legal complexities. Appropriations committees block funding. These bills die in committee or face executive veto even when they pass both chambers.

Mining & Energy

Current Volume: 50 bills (22.3%)

Historical Success Rate: ~9-12% (very low)

Mining legislation is bifurcated. Red states pursue "Right to Mine" protections, while blue states introduce carbon caps and noise restrictions. Neither approach passes frequently.

Why It's Failing: Local opposition. Even in pro-mining states, rural communities object to noise and grid impact. Utilities resist demand response programs. Environmental coalitions block energy-intensive operations. These bills face grassroots opposition regardless of state political orientation.

Self-Custody & Private Key Rights

Current Volume: 40 bills (17.9%)

Historical Success Rate: 0% (complete failure)

Bills establishing "right to self-custody" or protecting private key sovereignty have not passed in any tracked state. These bills attempt to protect individuals from forced disclosure of private keys or mandatory custodial arrangements.

Why It's Failing: Law enforcement opposition. State AGs and prosecutors argue these bills obstruct asset seizure, warrant execution, and fraud investigations. Definitional problems: legislators struggle to draft workable language around "custody" and "control."

DAO Recognition & Entity Frameworks

Current Volume: 13 bills (5.8%)

Historical Success Rate: 0% (complete failure)

Despite industry enthusiasm, DAO recognition bills have a perfect failure record. Virginia's HB 1796 and Arizona's DAO framework proposals died in committee or were vetoed.

Why It's Failing: Secretaries of State object that DAOs circumvent existing LLC accountability structures. Concerns about anonymity, jurisdiction, and legal standing. These bills are perceived as creating a regulatory loophole rather than filling a gap.

Anti-CBDC Legislation

Current Volume: 6 bills (2.7%)

Historical Success Rate: 0% (complete failure)

Bills attempting to ban or restrict central bank digital currencies at the state level have failed to gain traction despite political appeal in certain states.

Why It's Failing: Federal preemption concerns. State legislators question whether states have authority to ban federal currency instruments. Viewed as symbolic rather than operational. Often packaged poorly with other partisan measures.

4. State Power Rankings & Posture Analysis

State approaches to blockchain legislation fall into distinct categories. While volume indicates activity level, posture reveals strategic intent. Our analysis categorizes states based on their legislative focus areas and regulatory philosophy.

4.1 The Regulatory-Focused States

These states prioritize consumer protection, taxation, licensing requirements, and fraud prevention. Their legislation emphasizes market integrity over industry growth.

New York (26 bills): The most active state legislature. Primary focus on consumer protection, blockchain voting systems, and taxation frameworks. Notable for proposed 0.2% transaction tax and strict advertising disclosure requirements. Very few pro-industry bills survive committee.

Massachusetts (12 bills): Second highest volume. Leading the national charge on DeFi registration requirements and exchange risk disclosures. Treats crypto primarily as a consumer risk vector rather than an innovation opportunity.

New Jersey (12 bills): Heavy emphasis on money transmission licensing and consumer protection. Focused on closing regulatory gaps in existing financial services law.

Maryland (11 bills): Concentrated on taxation and mining regulation. Balancing revenue generation with energy policy concerns.

4.2 Historical Innovation Leaders (Per Prior Reports)

Based on historical enactment data from 2020-2025, several states have distinguished themselves through high success rates and innovative frameworks:

Wyoming: The "Gold Standard" for digital asset legal frameworks. Created the first DAO LLC statute, special purpose depository institution framework, and comprehensive digital asset property rights law. Currently operationalizing the Stable Token (FRNT) on Solana. Known for protecting developer anonymity and providing legal clarity.

Utah: Highest historical success rate at 50% (7 of 14 bills enacted in prior session). Known for technical efficiency and practical implementation. Successfully codified medical cannabis blockchain pilots and various technical corrections. Focuses on operational deployment rather than aspirational frameworks.

Rhode Island: The surprise leader of 2026. Focused on on-chain registries and corporate tax incentives. Enacted 4 major bills in recent session. Small state with disproportionate impact.

4.3 The Balanced Approach States

Some states pursue both innovation enablement and consumer protection simultaneously:

Florida (15 bills): High volume with mixed approach. Pursuing both Bitcoin reserve strategies and regulatory frameworks. Balancing pro-business positioning with consumer protection concerns.

Texas (6 bills): Leading the "mining as grid utility" concept, treating cryptocurrency mining as a demand response tool for grid stability. Pursuing both mining protections and consumer safeguards.

5. Regional Distribution & Political Geography

5.1 Regional Bill Distribution

Region	Bills	% of Total
Northeast	**70**	31.3%
South	**81**	36.2%
Midwest	**47**	21.0%
West	**26**	11.6%

5.2 Regional Characteristics

Northeast (31% of bills): Dominated by New York and Massachusetts. Highest concentration of consumer protection and taxation bills. Reflects population density, financial services concentration, and documented fraud victimization rates. These states view crypto primarily through a consumer protection lens.

South (36% of bills): Largest regional share. Diverse mix including Florida's pro-business approach, Texas's grid-utility mining framework, and Alabama's self-custody focus. Regional variation reflects different state priorities from economic development to energy policy to sovereignty concerns.

Midwest (21% of bills): Moderate activity with emphasis on mining and data center regulation. States like Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin focus on money transmission licensing and grid impact. Rural states see mining as economic development; urban states see it as an energy policy challenge.

West (12% of bills): Lowest activity despite Wyoming's historical leadership. This reflects that frontier states like Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado have already established comprehensive frameworks in prior sessions. Current activity focuses on technical refinements rather than foundational legislation.

6. Federal-State Dynamics: Macro Policy Drivers

State blockchain legislation in 2026 cannot be understood in isolation. Federal policy developments are fundamentally shaping state behavior, creating both opportunities and constraints for state-level action.

6.1 The GENIUS Act Effect

The GENIUS Act (payment stablecoin framework) was signed into law on July 18, 2025. This federal legislation established comprehensive requirements for stablecoin issuers, creating a regulatory perimeter that states are now responding to.

State Response Pattern: States are introducing complementary legislation focusing on state agency acceptance of stablecoins for fees and payments, operational pilots within state systems, and clarification of state-level regulatory authority over stablecoin activities not covered by federal law.

Notable state stablecoin initiatives in Florida, Maryland, and California explicitly reference GENIUS Act compliance frameworks, demonstrating that states are no longer "going rogue" but rather attempting to create compliant state-level mirrors of federal requirements.

6.2 Market Structure Negotiations

The U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs announced markup on comprehensive digital asset market-structure legislation on January 15, 2026, led by Chairman Tim Scott. However, Reuters has reported ongoing deadlock on key provisions, particularly regarding stablecoin interest/rewards treatment and banking sector concerns.

State Implication: Until federal perimeter rules are fully settled, states continue legislating at the edges. This explains the concentration of state activity in areas federal law has not yet addressed: kiosk regulation, local mining restrictions, state-specific custody requirements, and tax treatment.

6.3 The Kiosk Fraud Catalyst

FinCEN issued an explicit warning about cryptocurrency kiosks being used for scam payments, particularly "pig butchering" schemes. This federal enforcement signal provided political cover and technical justification for aggressive state-level kiosk regulation.

The convergence of FinCEN warnings, multi-state fraud crackdown narratives covered by national media, and documented elder fraud cases created the perfect storm for kiosk regulation to become the dominant state legislative theme of 2026.

6.4 The Strategic Reserve Overton Window

Federal-level proposals for a strategic Bitcoin reserve, combined with President Trump's pro-crypto rhetoric, shifted the Overton Window on state Bitcoin reserves. What was previously viewed as fringe policy is now a standard debate in state treasuries and appropriations committees.

However, acceptance of the debate does not equal acceptance of the policy. While 15+ states have introduced Bitcoin reserve bills in 2026, most have been killed in committee. Virginia's SB 557, Arizona's HB 2324 (vetoed by governor), and Montana's proposals all failed. The debate is now normalized, but passage remains elusive.

7. Success Factors & Failure Points

Analysis of historical enactment patterns reveals consistent success factors and failure points across different bill types.

7.1 What Makes Bills Pass

Concrete Harm Addressed: Bills responding to documented fraud patterns, elder exploitation, or specific consumer losses pass at significantly higher rates. Legislators need to point to real victims and quantifiable damages.

Enforceable with Existing Infrastructure: Bills that leverage existing regulatory authorities (state banking departments, consumer protection agencies, attorney general offices) pass more frequently than those requiring new agencies or novel enforcement mechanisms.

Federal Alignment or Gap-Filling: Bills that harmonize with federal frameworks (GENIUS Act stablecoin compliance) or fill acknowledged gaps in federal coverage pass more easily than those creating state-federal conflicts.

Technical Not Political: UCC Article 12 amendments and money transmitter definition updates pass because they're framed as technical corrections rather than political statements about blockchain technology.

Bipartisan Support: Consumer protection bills attract both progressive consumer advocates and conservative law-and-order legislators. This coalition-building is key to passage.

7.2 The "Veto Magnets" - Why Bills Fail

Sovereign Reserves (6.4% success rate):

- Governors cite fiduciary duty concerns and volatility risk
- State treasurers object to unclaimed property complexities
- Appropriations committees block funding mechanisms
- Example: Arizona HB 2324 passed both chambers but was vetoed

DAO Frameworks (0% success rate):

- Secretaries of State feel they circumvent LLC accountability
- Concerns about anonymity and jurisdiction
- Perceived as creating loopholes not filling gaps
- Example: Virginia HB 1796 killed in committee despite industry support

Regulatory Sandboxes (formerly popular, now failing):

- Attorney General offices demand direct enforcement power
- Resistance to "safe harbor" concepts after fraud scandals
- Viewed as protecting industry not consumers

- Example: Arizona HB 2906 vetoed despite bipartisan support

Self-Custody Rights (0% success rate):

- Law enforcement opposition to warrant execution constraints
- Definitional problems: impossible to draft workable "custody" language
- Perceived conflict with AML and fraud enforcement
- No state has successfully enacted any version of these bills

8. Strategic Recommendations

Based on comprehensive analysis of 224 bills across 43 states, combined with historical enactment data and federal policy dynamics, we provide the following strategic guidance for policymakers, industry participants, and advocacy organizations.

8.1 For State Policymakers

Focus on Foundation Bills Over Headlines: UCC Article 12 amendments and money transmitter licensing updates are unglamorous but foundational. These technical bills enable institutional adoption and provide legal certainty. They pass at higher rates and create long-term economic value.

Address Documented Harms First: Kiosk regulation and consumer disclosure requirements respond to real, documented fraud patterns. These bills protect vulnerable constituents and build political capital for more innovative policies later.

Avoid Symbolic Legislation: Anti-CBDC bills and aspirational Bitcoin reserves generate headlines but waste legislative resources. Focus on enforceable, operational frameworks that don't require federal preemption battles or executive veto overrides.

Coordinate Regionally: Interstate coordination prevents regulatory arbitrage and creates larger markets for compliant businesses. Consider adopting model legislation from successful states like Wyoming and Utah rather than reinventing frameworks.

8.2 For Industry & Advocacy Groups

Pivot Away from Sovereignty Rhetoric: Bitcoin reserve proposals and anti-CBDC bills have a 0-6% success rate. Industry resources would be better spent supporting UCC modernization, custody clarity, and operational regulatory frameworks.

Support Consumer Protection: Industry should proactively support reasonable kiosk regulation and disclosure requirements. Opposition to fraud prevention measures damages industry credibility and invites more restrictive legislation later.

Build Technical Expertise in Legislatures: UCC Article 12 and money transmitter bills pass because lawyers can explain them to other lawyers. Invest in technical education for legislative counsel offices rather than lobbying partisan champions.

Federal Alignment Is Essential: Work with GENIUS Act frameworks rather than against them. State bills that harmonize with federal law pass; those creating conflicts fail.

8.3 For Federal Policymakers

Clarify Federal-State Boundaries: State legislative uncertainty stems from unclear federal perimeter. Explicit guidance on what remains under state jurisdiction would reduce redundant or conflicting state legislation.

Provide Model Frameworks: Rather than complete federal preemption, provide model state legislation for areas like kiosk regulation, custody standards, and consumer protection. This maintains federalism while ensuring minimum standards.

Address State Treasury Concerns: The Bitcoin reserve debate will continue until there's clarity on federal treatment of state-held digital assets. Guidance on unclaimed property, fiduciary duty, and accounting treatment would help states evaluate these proposals rationally.

8.4 Key Takeaway: The "Wild West" Era Is Over

The landscape has matured from experimental blockchain innovation to sophisticated legal and regulatory frameworks. Success now depends on:

- Integration with existing commercial and financial law (UCC, money transmission)
- Response to documented consumer harms rather than theoretical innovation
- Federal-state coordination rather than state experimentation
- Technical competence over political symbolism

Investors, firms, and policymakers should focus on foundational infrastructure bills rather than headline-generating sovereignty measures. The states that will win the digital economy are those building legal clarity and consumer trust, not those making political statements about monetary independence.

CONCLUSION

The 2026 state blockchain legislative landscape represents a critical maturation point in U.S. digital asset policy. With 224 bills across 43 states, activity has never been higher, but the nature of that activity has fundamentally shifted.

Consumer protection dominates (36% of all bills), money transmission licensing is being rapidly updated (26% of bills), and technical commercial law modernization through UCC Article 12 is quietly establishing the legal foundation for institutional tokenization. Meanwhile, politically visible but structurally flawed initiatives—Bitcoin reserves, DAO recognition, anti-CBDC laws—are failing at near-total rates despite media attention.

The Great Divergence between "Sovereignty States" and "Regulatory States" is real, but the regulatory approach is winning in terms of actual legislative success. States focusing on harm reduction, federal alignment, and technical infrastructure are passing bills at 15-50% rates. States pursuing monetary sovereignty and political symbolism are seeing sub-10% success rates.

For the blockchain industry, the message is clear: pivot from rhetoric to reality. Support consumer protection. Invest in commercial law integration. Build technical competence in state capitals. The future of digital assets will be built on UCC Article 12 foundations and money transmitter compliance frameworks, not on Bitcoin reserve headlines and anti-CBDC manifestos.

The "Wild West" era of state blockchain legislation is over. Welcome to the era of institutional maturation.

Report Prepared By: Mortar Strategies

Data Current As Of: February 15, 2026

For questions or additional analysis, contact: derek@mortarstrategies.com