

**Vice-Chair**  
Ellis, Stan

# California State Assembly

**Chief Consultant**  
Lawrence Lingbloom

**Members**

Alanis, Juan  
Connolly, Damon  
Garcia, Robert  
Haney, Matt  
Hoover, Josh  
Kalra, Ash  
Macedo, Alexandra  
Muratsuchi, Al  
Pellerin, Gail  
Schultz, Nick  
Wicks, Buffy  
Zbur, Rick Chavez

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Principal Consultant**  
Elizabeth MacMillan



**Senior Consultant**  
Paige Brokaw

**Committee Secretary**  
Martha Gutierrez

**ISAAC G BRYAN**  
CHAIR

### AGENDA

Monday, June 29, 2026  
2:30 p.m. -- State Capitol, Room 437

## BILLS HEARD IN SIGN-IN ORDER

**\*\* = Bills Proposed for Consent**

- |     |                    |                     |  |
|-----|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| 1.  | SB 501             | Allen               | Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022: covered batteries.  |
| 2.  | <b>**SB 925</b>    | <b>McNerney</b>     | Fusion energy: State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission: strategic plan: certification and environmental review.             |
| 3.  | SB 958             | Weber Pierson       | California Environmental Quality Act: environmental impacts: building height.  |
| 4.  | SB 1075            | Reyes               | Air resources: toxic air contaminants: criteria air pollutants: community emissions reduction programs: local community emissions reduction plans. |
| 5.  | <del>SB 1087</del> | <del>Cabaldon</del> | <del>Transportation planning: sustainable communities strategies: transportation funding programs. <b>(Pulled)</b></del>                           |
| 6.  | SB 1213            | Reyes               | Zero- and near-zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles: incentives: transparency.  |
| 7.  | SB 1230            | Valladares          | Solid waste: illegal dumping: penalties: resources.  |
| 8.  | SB 1268            | Gonzalez            | Outdoor public recreation spaces: equitable access.  |
| 9.  | SB 1300            | Stern               | Natural Resources Agency: Secretariat for International Climate Coordination and Cooperation.  |
| 10. | SB 1341            | Cabaldon            | Beverage containers: wine and distilled spirits: processing fees.  |
| 11. | SB 1370            | Stern               | Covered wildfire mitigation projects: consolidated and expedited review.   |



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 501 (Allen) – As Amended June 1, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 30-10

**SUBJECT:** Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022: covered batteries

**SUMMARY:** Adds medium format batteries to the Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022 (Act).

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Establishes the Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL) and requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to oversee the management of hazardous waste. (Health & Safety Code (HSC) 25100 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the Integrated Waste Management Act and requires the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) to oversee the management of solid waste. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 40050 *et seq.*)
- 3) Establishes the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Act, which requires every retailer to have a system in place, on or before July 1, 2006, for the acceptance and collection of used rechargeable batteries for reuse, recycling, or proper disposal. (PRC 42451-42456)
- 4) Establishes the Electronic Waste Recycling Act (EWRA) to create a program for consumers to return, recycle, and ensure the safe and environmentally-sound disposal of “covered devices” that are hazardous wastes when discarded. Specifies that the EWRA includes embedded battery products, as defined. (PRC 42460 *et seq.*)
- 5) Establishes the Act, which requires producers of small household batteries to establish a stewardship program for the collection and recycling of covered batteries. (PRC 4240 *et seq.*)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Revises the definition of “covered battery” to include small format and medium format batteries.
  - a) Defines “small format battery” as a rechargeable battery weighing no more than 11 pounds that has a rating of no more than 300 watt-hours and a nonrechargeable battery weighing no more than 4.4 pounds, as specified.
  - b) Defines “medium format battery” as a rechargeable battery that weighs more than 11 pounds or that has a rating of more than 300 watt-hours, or both, but that does not exceed 25 pounds, or a nonrechargeable battery weighing 4.4 to 25 pounds, as specified.

- 2) Specifies that a device provided to a consumer by a producer of a product or battery to serve solely to prevent theft or tampering of the battery and not to inhibit the consumer's ability to remove, replace, or recycle the battery does not prevent a battery from being considered designed to be easily removed from a product with no more than common household tools.
- 3) Repeals exemptions from the Act for primary batteries weighing over two kilograms and rechargeable batteries weighing over five kilograms and having a rating or more than 300 watt-hours.
- 4) Revises the collection requirements to specify that 10 collection sites per county or one collection site per 15,000 people, whichever is greater, applies to small format batteries.
- 5) Establishes collection requirements for medium format batteries:
  - a) For counties with a population of 50,000 or more, a minimum of 5 collection sites per county or one collection site per 30,000 people, whichever is greater;
  - b) For counties with a population of 18,001 to 50,000, a minimum of 2 collection sites; and,
  - c) For counties with a population of 18,000 or fewer, a minimum of 1 collection site.
- 6) Specifies that if a stewardship plan for covered batteries does not include a brand of small format batteries that is sold in the state, it is not required to have collection sites for small format batteries.
- 7) Specifies that if a stewardship plan for covered batteries does not include a brand of medium format batteries that is sold in the state, it is not required to have collection sites for medium format batteries.
- 8) Clarifies that the Act's retailer take-back requirement only applies to small format batteries.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- 1) CalRecycle estimates implementation costs of \$285,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2027-2028 for 2 positions, with increased ongoing annual costs beginning in FY 2028-2029 of \$512,000 for 3 positions (Covered Battery Recycling Fund) in order to conduct research on medium format batteries; support the inclusion of medium format batteries into the current producer responsibility program; coordinate with DTSC and other relevant state agencies on compliance related issues; prosecute additional enforcement actions resulting from larger regulated community; and support the overall enforcement, planning, and strategy of the updated EPR program. CalRecycle expects that the January 14, 2026 amendments to this bill could increase these costs.
- 2) Unknown but potentially significant cost pressure (Hazardous Waste Control Account) to DTSC. According to DTSC, this bill would significantly expand the number of regulated entities, resulting in increases to DTSC's enforcement activity. DTSC states that the Responsible Battery Recycling Act's current enforcement and reimbursement provision would not fund or reimburse the department for the oversight costs of this bill beyond plan review.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Universal waste.** Universal wastes are hazardous wastes that are widely generated by households and businesses. Universal wastes include televisions, computers, batteries, fluorescent lamps, and mercury thermostats, among others.

Hazardous waste regulations (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11 Section 66261.9) identify seven categories of hazardous wastes that can be managed as universal waste. California's Universal Waste Rule allows individuals and businesses to transport, handle, and recycle universal wastes in a manner that differs from the requirements for most hazardous wastes. The more relaxed requirements for managing universal wastes were adopted to ensure that they are managed safely and are not disposed of with solid waste. The universal waste requirements are also less complex and easier to comply with, thereby increasing compliance.

- 2) **Batteries and battery-embedded products.** State law prohibits the disposal of batteries in the trash or household recycling collection bins that are intended for non-hazardous solid waste and/or recyclable materials. Many types of batteries, regardless of size, exhibit hazardous characteristics and are considered hazardous waste when they are discarded. These include single use alkaline and lithium-ion batteries and rechargeable lithium metal, nickel cadmium, and nickel metal hydride batteries of various sizes.

Many products are sold with embedded batteries, often lithium-ion batteries, including portable electronics like laptops, smart phones, digital cameras, game consoles, children's toys, and cordless power tools.

When batteries end up in the trash or a recycling bin, operators of solid waste facilities, including transfer stations, municipal landfills, materials recovery facilities, and recycling facilities, who discover batteries in the waste or recyclable materials are required to remove and manage the batteries separately. The facility that removes the batteries from the municipal solid waste stream or recyclable materials becomes the generator of the hazardous waste batteries and must comply with hazardous waste management regulations. Facilities that do not properly manage hazardous waste may be subject to regulatory enforcement and may be liable for monetary penalties. However, it is impossible for operators to locate every battery that enters the waste stream. Sorting through solid waste and recyclables to remove batteries poses a risk to the facility and the safety of facility workers.

Depending on the type of battery and applicable management requirements, batteries are required to be sent to a facility permitted to accept hazardous waste batteries, universal waste, or spent lead acid batteries. Only facilities that are appropriately regulated can accept hazardous waste batteries. Even though it is illegal to dispose of batteries in the solid waste stream, they frequently end up in solid waste facilities.

- 3) **Battery management.** There are two key state laws that dictate how batteries should be managed at the end of their lives:

- AB 2440 (Irwin), Chapter 351, Statutes of 2022, established the Responsible Battery Recycling Act, a producer responsibility program for producers of small format batteries. This program operates by requiring a producer responsibility organization to develop a stewardship plan for the collection, transportation, recycling, and safe and proper management of covered products in the state. The stewardship plan must be approved by CalRecycle and DTSC. The program is funded through reimbursement provided by producers and stewardship organization or organizations. That fund is used to cover the costs that CalRecycle and DTSC take on to implement and enforce the program.
- SB 1215 (Newman), Chapter 370, Statutes of 2022, added covered battery-embedded products (batteries sold within a product) to the state's EWRA, which requires CalRecycle to establish a fee, paid by consumers on new or refurbished covered battery-embedded products, that covers the reasonable regulatory costs to properly manage and recycle the covered battery-embedded products and to administer the EWRA.

While AB 2440 and SB 1215 established end-of-life management frameworks for most types of small and embedded batteries, medium-format batteries, such as those that power lawn equipment, ebikes, scooters, marine motors, and portable generators.

- 4) **Battery fires.** Some batteries, particularly lithium-ion, are extremely flammable and can combust or explode if they are damaged. When these batteries enter the waste stream, they are likely to be damaged during normal solid waste handling activities. When that happens, the batteries can ignite, causing fires in solid waste vehicles and facilities and posing a risk to the health and safety of solid waste workers and the public. While determining the exact cause of solid waste facility fires is extremely difficult, it appears that fires have become more frequent as embedded lithium-ion batteries have become more common. In May of this year, a fire erupted in a garbage truck in the City of Roseville when a battery was crushed during waste collection. One materials recovery facility located in Richmond experienced six fires over just two years in 2020 and 2021. Another facility in San Carlos experienced 10 or more fires almost every year since 2017; a stark contrast to 2013, when the facility experienced two fires. The suspected causes of these fires included a drone containing a lithium-ion battery, a lawnmower battery, a Prius battery, a lithium-ion battery pack, and a cell phone. When a battery ignites in a solid waste facility, it is surrounded by flammable materials, allowing the fire to grow quickly. Even with advanced fire suppression equipment, fires shut down operations, impact workers, and affect the air quality of nearby residents. The increasing frequency of fires has also impacted solid waste operators' ability to find insurance. Insurance premiums and deductibles rise dramatically after a fire, if the facility can find insurance at all. At the San Carlos facility, insurance premiums increased from \$180,000 per year to \$1.5 million, and the facility's deductible rose exponentially, from \$5,000 to \$1.5 million. The costs associated with the fires caused by batteries are passed on to ratepayers.

5) **Author's statement:**

SB 501 expands California's extended producer responsibility program for batteries to include medium-format batteries, such as those found in ebikes, outdoor lawn equipment, and portable power systems. Batteries continue to be one of the most problematic sources of household hazardous waste due to their

ability to cause fires or explosions when improperly managed, and the high costs of proper disposal to local governments. However, the amount of batteries entering end-of-life each year is rapidly increasing. EPR programs can help address problems with safe collection and shift the cost burden of managing these products from local cities and counties, and ultimately ratepayers, to the producers designing the products. SB 501 builds on California's extensive experience with EPR programs while taking advantage of the efficiencies of expanding existing programs.

- 6) **Double referral.** This bill passed the Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee 5-1 on June 16<sup>th</sup>.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

Alameda County  
California Product Stewardship Council  
Californians Against Waste  
City of Cupertino  
City of Glendale  
City of Long Beach  
Los Angeles County  
Recyclesmart  
Rethink Waste  
Stopwaste

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Elizabeth MacMillan / NAT. RES. /



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 925 (McNerney) – As Amended June 15, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 37-0

**SUBJECT:** Fusion energy: State Energy Resources Conservation and Development  
Commission: strategic plan: certification and environmental review

**SUMMARY:** Requires the California Energy Commission (CEC) to develop a strategic plan for fusion energy and makes fusion energy manufacturing projects eligible for expedited California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review by the CEC.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires the CEC to evaluate various fusion technologies and to analyze the feasibility of using nuclear fusion in the state as part of its 2027 integrated energy policy report (IEPR). (Public Resources Code (PRC) 25302.4)
- 2) Establishes the Fusion Research and Development Innovation Initiative at the CEC to accelerate the development and growth of fusion energy by advancing fusion science and technology. (PRC 25997 *et seq.*)
- 3) Authorizes specified energy projects not subject to the CEC's thermal powerplant licensing process to opt-in to a CEC process for expedited CEQA review, in lieu of review by the appropriate local lead agency. Eligible projects include manufacture, production, or assembly of an energy storage, wind, or photovoltaic system or component, or specialized products, components, or systems that are integral to renewable energy or energy storage technologies, for which the applicant has certified that a capital investment of at least \$250 million will be made over a period of five years. (PRC 25545 *et seq.*)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Requires the CEC, in coordination with specified agencies, to develop a strategic plan for the development of fusion energy in California and submit the plan to the Legislature on or before December 31, 2028.
- 2) Requires the CEC, in coordination with relevant agencies and the fusion energy industry, to develop and include the following in the strategic plan report:
  - a) A strategy for the expansion and development of fusion research and development in California.
  - b) A strategy for supporting the commercialization of fusion energy in California.
  - c) A regulatory framework for fusion energy and roadmap for licensing and permitting for new fusion energy research and fusion energy facilities.

- d) An assessment of the level at which fusion energy at scale would best support California's long-term renewable energy and greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.
- 3) Adds fusion energy manufacturing as an eligible project for the CEC's opt-in permitting process.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The CEC estimates one-time costs of \$3.3 million spread over two years and ongoing costs of \$2.2 million annually (Energy Facility Licensing and Compliance Fund [EFLCF] and either Energy Resources Programs Account [ERPA] or General Fund) to implement the provisions of this bill. Of this amount, up to \$1.8 million may be offset by fee revenue from Opt-In program applicant deposits.
- The Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) estimates one-time costs of about \$101,000 spread over two years (General Fund) to support updates to guidelines, facilitate development of communications materials, and support coordination and engagement.
- Unknown but likely very significant ongoing cost pressure, perhaps over \$10 million annually (various funds), to fund elements of the strategic plan once it is developed pursuant to this bill.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Background.** There are two fundamental ways to release energy from nuclear reactions: fission and fusion of atomic nuclei. Nuclear fission is a nuclear reaction or a radioactive decay process in which the atomic nucleus splits into lighter nuclei, releasing some combination of particles and energy. Nuclear fusion is a reaction in which multiple atomic nuclei combine to form a combination of new atomic nuclei and subatomic particles with the resulting mass difference manifesting as either an absorption or release of energy. Electricity generating technologies based on fission are commercially available, whereas fusion is still in the stages of research and development.

A fusion reaction occurs when atomic nuclei, such as hydrogen and its isotopes (deuterium and tritium), are forced together (using some combination of extremely high temperature, pressure, or velocity to overcome the electrostatic force) until they fuse into a nuclei of a heavier element. The fusion process releases a combination of particles and kinetic energy proportional to the difference in mass. There are multiple fusion methods that are currently being pursued for use in a commercial reactor system.

To generate commercial energy from fusion, the released energy would be converted to heat, which in turn is converted to electricity via a conventional generator cycle. Although the fusion reaction does not produce significant or long-lived radioactive byproducts, the high-energy particles irradiate the surrounding reactor vessel and associated components. The irradiated material could pose potential disposal problems similar to those for the irradiated fission reactor vessel. The reasons fusion continues to be actively pursued is that unlike nuclear fission, there are less waste products, no risk of a nuclear melt down, and fusion

power provides more energy for a given weight of fuel than any fuel-consuming energy source currently in use.

The aim of the controlled fusion research program is to achieve "ignition," which occurs when enough fusion reactions take place for the process to become self-sustaining, with fresh fuel then being added to continue it. Once ignition is achieved, there is net energy yield – about four times as much as with nuclear fission. According to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the amount of power produced increases with the square of the pressure, so doubling the pressure leads to a fourfold increase in energy production.

The world's most powerful laser fusion facility, the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, was completed in March 2009. Using its 192 laser beams, NIF is able to deliver more than 60 times the energy of any previous laser system to its target. In December 2022, a team at NIF conducted the first controlled fusion experiment in history to reach the ignition milestone, meaning it produced more energy from fusion than the laser energy used to drive it.

2) **Author's statement:**

For decades, fusion energy was viewed as a distant promise of unlimited clean energy that might never be realized. But not anymore. Successful fusion ignition has already been achieved multiple times at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in my Senate district — the only place in the world to do so. California now needs to build out its regulatory framework to keep fusion jobs and investment here in the state. SB 925 will require the CEC to create a strategic roadmap to advance fusion energy. This includes assisting research and development, locating sites for future power plants, and creating a licensing and permitting framework.

3) **Double referral.** This bill was heard and passed by the Utilities and Energy Committee on June 10 by a vote of 18-0.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

B3K Prosperity Board  
Blue Laser Fusion  
City of Bakersfield  
City of Livermore  
Clean Air Task Force  
East County Economic Development Council  
Ex-Fusion America  
Focused Energy  
Fuse  
General Atomics  
Helicity Space  
High Temperature Superconductors  
Inertia Enterprises  
Innovation for Green Advanced Transportation Excellence Development Corporation (I-GATE)  
Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group

Kyoto Fusioneering America  
Longview Fusion Energy Systems  
Marathon Fusion  
MIFTI Fusion  
Openstar Technologies  
Pacific Fusion  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce  
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation  
San Diego State University  
TAE Technologies

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Lawrence Lingbloom / NAT. RES. /

Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 958 (Weber Pierson) – As Amended June 15, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 37-0

**SUBJECT:** California Environmental Quality Act: environmental impacts: building height

**SUMMARY:** For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), provides that building height is not a significant impact on the environment for specified non-industrial infill projects.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed project to prepare a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report (EIR) for this action, unless the project is exempt from CEQA. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 21000 *et seq.*)
- 2) Defines “environment” as the physical conditions that exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise, or objects of historic or aesthetic significance. (PRC 21060.5)
- 3) Defines “significant effect on the environment” as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment. (PRC 21068)

**THIS BILL** prohibits the environmental impacts of a project that are associated with increased building height alone, including air circulation, noise and light refraction or reflection, or the potential to attract wildlife, from being considered significant impacts on the environment if the project meets the following conditions:

- 1) The use and density of the project is otherwise analyzed in a certified EIR.
- 2) The project is on a previously graded infill site.
- 3) There are no sensitive biological resources physically present on the site.
- 4) The project is not an industrial use project.
- 5) Requires a project that is proposed to be constructed on a site that is greater than 40 acres that has an estimated construction valuation that exceeds \$100 million and that is subject to a project-specific EIR to create high-wage, highly-skilled jobs that pay prevailing wages and living wages, employ a skilled and trained workforce, and provide construction jobs and permanent jobs for Californians.

- 6) Defines “jobs that pay prevailing wages” as construction workers employed in the execution of the project will receive at least the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for the type of work and geographic area, as determined by the Director of Industrial Relations.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8, negligible state costs.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Background.** This bill is intended to advance the Midway Rising project in the City of San Diego, notwithstanding adverse court decisions, most recently by the Fourth District Court of Appeal in 2025, regarding the City’s environmental review.

Midway Rising is a proposed development in the City of San Diego that covers 49 acres of City-owned land at the San Diego Sports Arena site in the Midway-Pacific Highway community (west of I-5 and south of I-8). The project is envisioned to include a 16,000-seat sports arena, 14 acres of parks and public space, a mixed-use entertainment, arts, and cultural district, and 4,250 housing units (2,000 of which will be affordable at 80% below area median income). The project is intended to replace an older stadium and associated parking lots.

The project is located within an area of San Diego that is subject to San Diego’s Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, which was established by the voters in 1972 and generally limits building heights to 30 feet west of I-5 to protect coastal views. In 2018, the City completed a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the land use plans governing the area to enable development of the project. Because both the arena and several residential buildings exceeded the 30-foot height limit, the City submitted a ballot measure to voters in 2020 to raise the height limit for the project area. The City relied on the PEIR as the environmental analysis for the project. However, the Fourth District Court of Appeals invalidated that ballot measure because the PEIR did not consider potential environmental impacts of removing the height limit. While that appeal was pending, in 2022 the City prepared a supplemental environmental impact report (SEIR) and approved a second ballot measure to remove the height limit from the same area. The Fourth District also invalidated the second ballot measure for similar reasons. The Court noted:

The 2022 draft SEIR recognized removal of the Coastal Zone height limit was a changed circumstance from the 2018 PEIR. Yet, for almost every category of potential environmental impacts the initial study addressed, it said the PEIR adequately examined potential impacts because the project “would be limited to the [Midway Rising] area footprint and land use, density, and zoning analyzed in the 2018 PEIR.”

The Court went on to identify a litany of impacts that could be related to building height that were not examined in the PEIR.

While the most immediate effect of this bill is to clear a path for the City to approve the Midway Rising project, the Fourth District’s findings regarding the City’s failure to analyze the environmental impacts of building height have broader implications. Likewise, this bill has a broader effect.

This bill's exemption from consideration of environmental impacts is strictly limited to building height, and only for projects that meet the bill's other conditions. For example, building design or features that may cause significant impacts independent of increased building height, including light or glare, are not excluded from CEQA review by the bill. Also, the bill suggests that building height alone may be considered a significant impact for any project that does not meet the bill's several conditions.

2) **Author's statement:**

SB 958 is about providing clarity and certainty within the CEQA process while maintaining strong environmental protections. Recent court decisions have created confusion regarding how environmental impacts associated solely with increased building height should be analyzed, creating uncertainty for housing, mixed-use, and infill projects throughout California. This bill establishes a narrow and thoughtful clarification in state law to ensure that projects are evaluated based on meaningful environmental impacts rather than speculative claims tied only to height itself. As California continues to confront interconnected housing, climate, and affordability challenges, we must support well-planned infill development near jobs, transit, and existing infrastructure while preserving the integrity of CEQA's environmental review process. SB 958 strikes that balance and helps ensure that projects approved through robust public planning processes can move forward with greater predictability and transparency.

3) **Opposition concerns.** Opposition to this bill comes from Midway Rising project neighbors, bird advocates, and airports.

The Peninsula Community Planning Board, which provides community planning oversight for the Point Loma area west of Midway Rising, opposes the bill outright, stating that "(f)uture applicants near airports, military installations, coastal zones, and sensitive viewsheds will invoke SB 958 to avoid meaningful height impact review."

Audubon California states that "urban and migratory birds face high rates of collision with heightened buildings due to disorientation caused by artificial lighting and daytime window strikes" and asks for amendments to require consideration of impacts on birds and wildlife.

The California Airports Council states that "SB 958 may inadvertently limit the consideration of airport land use compatibility and aviation safety concerns associated with increased building height near airports" and asks for amendments to require consistency with local Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

San Diego Mayor Todd Gloria (sponsor)  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

**Opposition**

Audubon California (unless amended)  
California Airports Council (unless amended)  
Embarcadero Coalition of San Diego  
Peninsula Community Planning Board

**Analysis Prepared by:** Lawrence Lingbloom / NAT. RES. /

Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1075 (Reyes) – As Amended June 25, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 29-9

**SUBJECT:** Air resources: toxic air contaminants: criteria air pollutants: community emissions reduction programs: local community emissions reduction plans

**SUMMARY:** Updates AB 617 (Cristina Garcia), Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017, to add requirements for implementation and enforcement of undefined “local community emissions reduction plans” (L-CERPs), permit an additional year (two years total) for air districts to adopt community emissions reduction programs (CERPs), establish new requirements for AB 617 community steering committees, expand eligible uses of AB 617 grant funds, and require the Air Resources Board (ARB) to report annually to the budget subcommittees regarding AB 617 implementation.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and its implementing regulations set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six criteria pollutants, designate air basins that do not achieve NAAQS as nonattainment, and require states with nonattainment areas to submit a State Implementation Plan (SIP) detailing how they will achieve compliance with NAAQS. (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes ARB as the air pollution control agency in California and requires the ARB, among other things, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources and coordinate with local air districts to control emissions from stationary sources in order to implement the CAA. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) 39000 *et seq.*)
- 3) Requires, subject to the powers and duties of the ARB, air districts to adopt and enforce rules and regulations to achieve and maintain the state and federal air quality standards in all areas affected by emission sources under their jurisdiction, and to enforce all applicable provisions of state and federal law. (HSC 40001)
- 4) Requires air districts to develop attainment plans detailing how they will attain and maintain state air quality standards, and submit those plans to ARB. (HSC 40910 *et seq.*)
- 5) Establishes the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987 to, among other things, require a health risk assessment to be submitted to the air districts that evaluates and predicts the dispersion of hazardous substances in the environment and the potential for exposure of human populations, and to assess and quantify both the individual and population wide health risks associated with those levels of exposure. (HSC 44300 *et seq.*)
- 6) Pursuant to AB 617, requires a statewide emissions reduction strategy targeting pollution-burdened communities, as follows:

- a) Requires ARB to prepare a statewide strategy to reduce emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and criteria pollutants in communities affected by a high cumulative exposure burden, and update the strategy at least once every five years.
- b) Requires the strategy to include criteria for development of CERPs, including:
  - i) An assessment and identification of communities with high cumulative exposure burdens for TACs and criteria air pollutants, prioritizing disadvantaged communities (DACs) and sensitive receptor locations based on one or more of the following: best available modeling information, existing air quality monitoring information, existing public health data based on consultation with Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), and the results of community air monitoring systems (CAMS).
  - ii) A methodology for assessing and identifying the contributing sources or categories of sources, including, but not limited to, stationary and mobile sources, and an estimate of their relative contribution to elevated exposure to air pollution in impacted communities.
  - iii) An assessment of whether a district should update and implement the risk reduction audit and emissions reduction plan for any facility to achieve emission reductions commensurate with its relative contribution, if the facility's emissions either cause or significantly contribute to a material impact on a sensitive receptor location or DAC.
  - iv) An assessment of the existing and available measures for reducing emissions from the contributing sources or categories of sources.
- 7) AB 617 further requires the adoption of CERPs in communities designated by ARB, as follows:
  - a) Requires ARB to select locations around the state for preparation of CERPs, concurrent with the statewide strategy, with additional locations selected annually thereafter, as appropriate.
  - b) Requires a district, within one year of ARB selection, to adopt a CERP to achieve emissions reductions using cost-effective measures identified by ARB.
  - c) Requires the CERP to be consistent with ARB's statewide strategy and include emissions reduction targets, specific reduction measures, an implementation schedule, and an enforcement plan.
  - d) Requires the CERP to be submitted to ARB for review and approval within 60 days. Requires CERPs rejected by ARB to be resubmitted within 30 days. If a CERP is not approvable by ARB, requires ARB to initiate a public process to discuss options for achievement of an approvable CERP. Requires ARB to concurrently develop and implement the applicable mobile source elements to commence achievement of emission reductions.

- e) Requires CERPs to result in emissions reductions in the community, based on monitoring and other data.
- f) Requires ARB and the district each to be responsible for measures consistent with their respective authorities.
- g) Requires districts to prepare an annual report summarizing the results and actions taken to further reduce emissions pursuant to a CERP.
- h) Requires compliance with the CERP to be enforceable by the district and ARB, as applicable.
- i) Requires ARB to provide grants to community-based organizations for technical assistance and to support participation in implementation of CERPs and CAMS.  
(HSC 44391.2)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Adds disadvantaged unincorporated communities (a fringe, island, or legacy community in which the median household income is 80 percent or less than the statewide median household income) to the definition of disadvantaged communities eligible for selection by ARB pursuant to AB 617.
- 2) Gives air districts two years to adopt a CERP.
- 3) Requires L-CERPS to be consistent with ARB's statewide strategy, submitted to ARB for review, and enforceable by ARB and the air district.
- 4) Requires an AB 617 steering committee to remain active until either:
  - a) The emissions objectives identified in the CERP are achieved.
  - b) More than five years have passed since the adoption of the CERP and two-thirds of the members of the steering committee vote to disband the committee.
- 5) Establishes the following requirements for steering committees:
  - a) All members live, work, or own businesses within the program area and a majority of the members are residents.
  - b) An open and transparent nomination process is used to select members and the membership of the committee reflects the diverse makeup of the community in the program area.
- 6) Requires the following to be eligible uses of grant funding:
  - a) Community-led deployment of technologies, practices, or projects that result in measurable or meaningful reductions in emissions or exposure to air pollution.
  - b) Local mitigation strategies that address emission sources identified in CERPs or L-CERPs.

- c) Projects that improve air quality outcomes through neighborhood- or household-level interventions, as identified in collaboration with community residents and stakeholders.
  - d) Other initiatives that align with the goals of this section and support the implementation of CERPs or L-CERPs.
  - e) Community monitoring efforts.
- 7) Requires the Secretary for Environmental Protection to periodically convene representatives of agencies and departments within the California Environmental Protection Agency to ensure coordination among those agencies and departments with jurisdiction over pollution sources included in a CERP to address concerns raised about those sources.
- 8) Requires ARB, on or before June 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, to report to the appropriate budget subcommittees about its progress in implementing the CERP provisions of AB 617.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, ongoing costs likely in the low millions of dollars annually (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund [GGRF]) for ARB to report on progress toward meeting the statewide strategy, accept submissions of L-CERPs, provide oversight, coordinate with local governments and stakeholders, conduct community outreach and consultation, and implement new requirements to award Community Air Grants, as specified.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Background.** AB 617 established the Community Air Protection Program, which includes a variety of requirements and programs to reduce air emissions in pollution-burdened communities. AB 617 increased data collection and reporting, expedited pollution control retrofits, increased civil and criminal penalties for specified air pollution violations, enhanced community air pollution monitoring, established a statewide emissions reduction strategy targeting pollution-burdened communities, and established CERPs.

AB 617 requires ARB to select pollution-burdened communities around the state each year for preparation of CERPs and requires the relevant air district to adopt a CERP to achieve emissions reductions. In recognition of the division of authority between ARB for mobile sources and air districts for stationary sources, AB 617 requires ARB and the district to each be responsible for measures consistent with their respective authorities. Once adopted, compliance with a CERP is enforceable by ARB or the district, as applicable.

In the implementation of AB 617, and the development of CERPs through community steering committees, issues related to air pollution sources and exposure have arisen that may be outside the jurisdiction of the air districts or ARB. This may include local land use practices that increase exposure to air pollution, practices under the authority of another state agency, such as pesticide application or highway construction, and sources of air pollution regulated primarily by the federal government, such as rail and aviation.

AB 617 has been funded primarily by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), with as much as \$250 million appropriated each year since 2017. Last year's cap and invest extension envisioned a continuous appropriation of \$250 million per year to ARB for AB 617

programs, incentives, and support for air district implementation. Under the GGRF structure enacted by SB 840 (Limon), Chapter 121, Statutes of 2025, securing \$250 million for AB 617 relies on total annual GGRF revenues of approximately \$4.2 billion. However, the SB 840 GGRF structure was tenuous. The only firm continuous appropriation amount in SB 840 is \$1 billion for high-speed rail. Other “continuous” appropriation amounts are subordinate to \$1 billion reserved for legislative appropriation and are subject to proportional reductions if revenues are insufficient. GGRF revenues fluctuate from auction to auction. In recent years, cap-and-trade auctions have raised between \$2 billion and \$5 billion per year.

To make GGRF matters much worse going forward, under the recent amendments to the cap and invest regulation adopted by ARB, allowances that otherwise would be auctioned by the state are redirected to industries through the Manufacturing Decarbonization Initiative (MDI), taking billions of future GGRF revenues and giving that value instead to the state’s largest industrial emitters of greenhouse gases.

## 2) **Author’s statement:**

SB 1075 fulfills the promise of the AB 617 program by strengthening community representation, enforcement, and oversight of the program.

As of 2026, there have been 19 communities granted CERP designation, with each CERP serving as a documented plan that requires specific reduction measures and an enforcement plan for impacted communities.

Despite the importance of this program there has consistently been a fundamental disconnect between program goals and efforts to maximize emissions reductions in impacted communities. For example, even when emissions reductions plans are identified for implementation there are no requirements that local governments comply with the emissions reductions measures identified by state agencies, local air districts, and community members.

In order for AB 617 to reach its goal of significantly reducing air pollution in overburdened communities, statutory changes are needed to ensure the full implementation of CERPs. SB 1075 will bridge this gap and ensure more effective enforcement and implementation of the Statewide Strategy to reduce emissions.

## 3) **What are L-CERPs and should they be enforceable by ARB and the districts?** L-CERP is not defined in this bill or elsewhere in statute, and it’s not clear what “compliance” with a L-CERP might entail. The L-CERP was introduced by ARB as a less formal alternative to a CERP. ARB’s most recent AB 617 statewide strategy (Blueprint 2.0) describes L-CERP as follows:

A Local Community Emissions Reduction Plan is a set of priority actions to improve local air quality developed and implemented by a Community Air Grantee and represents key deliverables under the grant. An L-CERP is distinguished from a Community Emissions Reduction Program in that the L-CERP is developed and implemented, ideally with air district participation, by a community-based nonprofit organization or California Native American Tribe funded through a Community Air Grant (CAG). CAG applicants interested in developing and implementing L-CERP projects are strongly encouraged to

partner or coordinate with the local air district to support implementation and to evaluate the feasibility of proposed actions in their L-CERP projects. L-CERP eligible activities include developing a charter to support governance and decision-making, community boundary setting, recruiting and engaging impacted residents and potential partners in the community, reviewing air quality data, prioritizing air quality concerns, and developing and prioritizing actions to address those concerns. *An L-CERP is not required to be adopted and approved by either an air district board or the CARB Board* (emphasis added). In 2022, CARB included the L-CERP as a new project category in its request for applications for Community Air Grants.

Under current procedures, the air district may have nothing to do with development of a L-CERP. Absent a clear definition, and review and approval by the air district, it does not seem appropriate to require the air district to enforce compliance with what may be an informal, non-governmental plan.

## **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

### **Support**

350 Bay Area Action  
Active San Gabriel Valley  
APEN Action  
Breathe Southern California  
California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) Action  
California Environmental Voters  
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)  
Center for Environmental Health  
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment  
Central California Asthma Collaborative (CCAC)  
Central California Environmental Justice Network (CCEJN)  
Central Valley Air Quality Coalition (CVAQ)  
Clean Water Action  
CleanEarth4Kids.org  
Coalition for Clean Air  
Communities for a Better Environment  
Community Action to Fight Asthma  
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability  
Little Manila Rising  
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Nextgen California  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles  
Planning and Conservation League  
Regional Asthma Management and Prevention (RAMP)  
Resource Renewal Institute  
Sacramento Environmental Justice Coalition  
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Sierra Club California  
Strategic Concepts in Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE)

**Opposition**

Agricultural Council of California  
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (unless amended)  
BNSF Railway  
California Air Pollution Control Officers Association  
California Cement Manufacturers Environmental Coalition  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Manufacturers & Technology Association  
California Retailers Association  
California Short Line Railroad Association  
California Trucking Association  
County of Kern  
NAIOP of California  
NAIOP SoCal  
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association  
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (unless amended)  
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District  
South Coast Air Quality Management District (unless amended)  
Supply Chain Federation  
Union Pacific Railroad  
Western Growers Association

**Analysis Prepared by:** Lawrence Lingbloom / NAT. RES. /



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1213 (Reyes) – As Amended May 14, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 33-0

**SUBJECT:** Zero- and near-zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles: incentives: transparency

**SUMMARY:** Makes the inclusion of any medium- and heavy-duty vehicle in specified incentive programs that the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) administer conditioned on the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) complying with certain transparency requirements around vehicle pricing.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires ARB, pursuant to California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 [AB 32 (Núñez), Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006], to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions limit equivalent to 1990 levels by 2020 and to reduce GHGs to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 and to 85% below 1990 levels by 2045. (Health & Safety (HSC) Code 38500 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the California Clean Truck, Bus, and Off-Road Vehicle and Equipment Technology Program, administered by ARB in conjunction with the CEC, to fund development, demonstration, precommercial pilot, and early commercial deployment of zero- and near-zero-emission truck, bus, and off-road vehicle and equipment technologies. Requires priority to be given to projects benefiting disadvantaged communities. (HSC 39719.2)
- 3) Establishes the Clean Transportation Program to be administered by the CEC to provide, upon appropriation by the Legislature, competitive grants, revolving loans, loan guarantees, loans, or other appropriate funding measures to various eligible entities to develop and deploy innovative technologies that transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change policies. (HSC 44272)
- 4) Establishes the Medium- and Heavy-Duty Zero-Emission Vehicle Fleet Purchasing Assistance Program within ARB's Air Quality Improvement Program to make financing tools and nonfinancial supports available to the operators of medium- and heavy-duty vehicle fleets to enable those operators to transition their fleets to zero-emission vehicles. (HSC 44274.11)
- 5) Requires ARB to create, in coordination with other state agencies that administer programs similar to the program established in HSC 44274.11, a "one-stop shop" that provides information on ARB's internet website to operators of medium- and heavy-duty fleets about all of the potential financing and grant options and other technical assistance available to help obtain financing for zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. (HSC 44274.15)

- 6) Establishes the California Clean Fuel Reward, to be administered by ARB through the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) regulations. (Title 17 California Code of Regulations 95480)
- 7) Establishes the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) as the repository for all moneys collected by ARB from the auction or sale of allowances to be available for appropriation by the Legislature. (Government Code 16428.8)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Finds and declares both of the following:
  - a) Robust competition and fair pricing are essential to the successful deployment of zero-emission heavy-duty vehicles that are necessary to achieve California's climate and public health goals; and,
  - b) To ensure the integrity of the state's climate programs, the receipt of state funding should be conditioned upon full pricing transparency.
- 2) Requires, beginning January 1, 2027, ARB and CEC to condition the inclusion of any medium- or heavy-duty vehicle model in any incentive program that receives funding from the GGRF including, but not limited to, the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP), and in any program that receives funding through the California Clean Fuel Reward administered by ARB through the LCFS or through the Clean Transportation Program on receipt of specified pricing data.
- 3) Requires ARB, in order to support the deployment of zero-emission heavy-duty vehicles through the HVIP, to annually reevaluate the cap on the purchase of unredeemed state vouchers issued through the HVIP with the goal of increasing the cap to the extent feasible to maximize the benefits of zero-emission vehicles deployed.
- 4) Requires an increase to the voucher cap to be provided on the purchase of electric medium- and heavy-duty vehicles that provide a direct and meaningful benefit to disadvantaged communities.
- 5) Requires ARB to establish criteria for determining the eligibility of an applicant and the required nexus between vehicle operation and community benefit.
- 6) Requires, beginning January 1, 2027, any state agency administering a medium- or heavy-duty vehicle incentive program that receives funding from the GGRF, including, but not limited to, the HVIP, and any program that receives funding through the California Clean Fuel Reward administered by ARB through the LCFS or through the Clean Transportation Program to condition the inclusion of any medium- or heavy-duty vehicle model in that program upon the following transparency requirements:
  - a) The OEM provides on a quarterly basis the manufacturer's suggested retail price for all zero-emission vehicle models offered for sale in California that may be funded by any incentive program to the administering agency;

- b) Receipt by the administering agency of a final purchase order for each vehicle for which an incentive is sought that clearly lists the final base unit price of the vehicle, not including incentives, and itemizes any charges for warranty, taxes, fees, service agreements, or additional components not original to the vehicle; and,
  - c) Receipt by the administering agency of any additional data needed to effectively track vehicle pricing behavior in the covered incentive programs, including, but not limited to, vehicle make and model, model year, gross vehicle weight rating, body type, vehicle identification number, and nominal battery capacity of any vehicle for which an incentive is sought.
- 7) Requires ARB, in coordination with the CEC, every six months, to compile and make the data provided publicly available on its internet website in an aggregated format that anonymizes buyers and includes pricing data shown by vehicle model for each model year in order to provide market certainty and facilitate oversight.
- 8) Provides that failure to comply with the reporting requirements result in the immediate suspension of a vehicle model's eligibility for state incentive programs.
- 9) Authorizes ARB to recover previously dispersed incentive funds that are found to be dispersed based on false data that was knowingly provided or through anticompetitive pricing or sales behavior.
- 10) Authorizes ARB to coordinate with the Attorney General to investigate any violations of this section.
- 11) Requires, on or before January 1, 2028, ARB, in coordination with the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) and the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IBank), to explore alternative financing opportunities to encourage the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles and report its findings regarding these alternative financing opportunities to the Legislature. Requires the report to include, but not be limited to, all of the following:
- a) Incentives with a specific focus on encouraging new entries into the market, spurring market competition, and prioritizing manufacturing within the state;
  - b) An evaluation of ways to de-risk and scale up the participation of private investors in the market for affordable zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, including used vehicles;
  - c) An evaluation of providing low-cost loans for zero-emission trucks;
  - d) An exploration of the development of residual value guarantees for zero-emission trucks;
  - e) Recommendations on improving market function to increase deployment and decrease costs; and,
  - f) Other data sources, reporting mechanisms, and disclosures that could be used, including, but not limited to, of data that may be held or generated by the Department of Motor

Vehicles, that would further achieve these goals and promote well-functioning markets and capital access for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

12) Provides that the provisions of this bill are severable.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- ARB estimates ongoing costs of about \$4.1 million in the first year and \$2.8 million annually thereafter (GGRF and Cost of Implementation Account) to include transparency requirements for programs that receive GGRF funding, annually reevaluate fleet cap for vouchers in California's Clean Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project, coordinate with GO-Biz and the IBank, and report to the Legislature, among other things.
- GO-Biz estimates ongoing costs of approximately \$78,000 annually (General Fund or special fund) to coordinate across agencies, perform research, collaborate with private sector stakeholders to ensure opportunities address market needs would be accessible, and to support other ad hoc report needs.
- The IBank anticipates that consulting with ARB and GO-Biz on possible alternative funding opportunities for a report would result in minor and absorbable costs. However, if the IBank is expected to perform more extensive work and research on the report, the IBank would anticipate costs of approximately \$68,000 (General Fund or special fund).
- The CEC anticipates any costs would be minor and absorbable.

**COMMENTS:**

1) **Air quality and climate goals.** Traffic-heavy Los Angeles and parts of the San Joaquin Valley have among the worst air quality in the nation. They are identified as severe nonattainment areas that don't meet federal Clean Air Act standards. Transportation-related pollutants in these regions also disproportionately impact disadvantaged neighborhoods and communities of color, contributing to respiratory diseases and premature deaths. Transitioning to zero-emission vehicles (ZEV) improves air quality by reducing pollution from internal combustion engines that continues to plague regions of the state with poor air quality and harm to public health. The transportation sector represents about 40% of California's total GHG emissions portfolio, and replacing traditional gas-powered vehicles with ZEVs is a significant part of California's effort to reduce air pollution and climate emissions.

While trucks represent only 6% of the vehicles on California's roads, they account for more than 35% of the state's transportation-generated nitrogen oxide emissions and a quarter of the state's on-road GHGs. Under the rubric of California's ambitious GHG reduction goals, the state is seeking to phase-out passenger combustion-engine cars by 2035. Governor Newsom's ZEV Executive Order N-79-20 set the target to achieve 100% zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles in the state by 2045, and 100% zero-emission off-road vehicles and equipment operations by 2035.

2) **ZEV market penetration.** Incentives are a powerful tool to make ZEVs of all model types more affordable and attractive to consumers and businesses. Trucking groups have long

advocated for California to double down on incentive programs that help small businesses buy electric models and build more chargers.

According to the report *Advanced Clean Trucks Credit Summary Through the 2023 Model Year*, in 2023, manufacturers sold 116,483 vehicles in California of which 18,473 (15% of total sales) were ZEVs. Governor Newsom proclaimed that ZEV trucks now represent one out of every six new vehicles sold for services that include last-mile delivery, freight transportation, and school buses. ARB released data in September 2025 that show manufacturers sold 30,026 zero-emission trucks in 2024, a 7% increase over 2023. The medium-duty sector, which includes vehicles such as large pickup trucks and the electric Amazon delivery vans that have become common around the state, accounted for most of those sales.

- 3) **GGRF investments.** California's Climate Investments finance billions of cap-and-trade dollars into various environmental and clean energy programs, including several ZEV incentive programs. The California Clean Fuel Reward offers a per-vehicle reward designed to help reduce the upfront cost of buying or leasing new medium- and heavy-duty battery-electric vehicles for commercial use. The reward is applied at the time of sale, reducing the upfront cost boosting sales opportunities. Another is the Clean Transportation Program, which accelerates advancement and adoption of alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicles, including low-and zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles through annual investments of up to \$100 million.
- 4) **Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project.** HVIP offers vouchers to eligible ZEVs on a first-come, first-served basis and are applied at the time of purchase. More than \$1 billion in vouchers has been made available to zero-emission trucks and buses.

Pursuant to the most current HVIP Implementation Manual<sup>i</sup>, effective September 30, 2025, each fleet/purchaser is limited to having 20 unredeemed truck voucher requests at any given time. Exceptions apply for public school buses, which are limited to 30 total voucher requests per calendar year and public transit, which is limited to 50 total voucher requests per calendar year. Small businesses have a cap of 5 vouchers. Voucher values vary by vehicle type and fleet characteristics. Current incentive levels range from roughly \$7,500 for smaller vehicles to as much as \$420,000 for certain fuel-cell Class 8 trucks, with enhanced incentives for qualifying small fleets and certain priority populations. ARB reports that, as of September 2025, only about \$900 million has been implemented through delivered vehicles because many vouchers remain outstanding while fleets wait for vehicle delivery.

SB 1213 requires ARB to annually reevaluate the cap on the purchase of unredeemed state vouchers issued with the goal of increasing the cap to the extent feasible to maximize the benefits of ZEVs deployed.

- 5) **Pricing competition.** There are growing concerns around both vehicle pricing and competitive dynamics in California's medium- and heavy-duty ZEV truck market.

While HVIP requires manufacturers and dealers to report manufacturer suggested retail price (MSRP), transaction prices, and related program data as a condition of participation, the Clean Air Coalition and other environmental organizations note that the state's ZEV truck policy efforts are undermined by opaque and inconsistent truck pricing practices. Unlike the

passenger vehicle market, the medium- and heavy-duty truck sector lacks publicly available pricing information. Manufacturers generally do not publish their suggested retail prices, transactions are heavily negotiated, and pricing data is often shielded by nondisclosure agreements. This lack of visibility gives manufacturers significant control over price and limits accountability, especially when public dollars are involved. As a result, neither policymakers nor most buyers can clearly determine what trucks actually cost.

According to research from the International Council on Clean Transportation, the median price of Class 8 battery-electric tractor trucks in the United States has increased 27% since 2020, even as battery costs have dropped and demand for electric trucks has risen. In contrast, in the European Union, where markets have greater transparency and competitive pressure, tractor trucks fell in price by 32% over the same period.

California conservatively projects an annual funding need of \$950 million per year over the next five years for its medium- and heavy-duty truck incentives. The Natural Resources Defense Council reports that without addressing pricing transparency, the state risks spending big without getting the impact they're aiming for.

This bill requires ARB to further compile and make those data provided by OEMs under this bill publicly available on its internet website in an aggregated format that anonymizes buyers and includes pricing data shown by vehicle model for each model year in order to provide market certainty and facilitate oversight.

- 6) **This bill.** To ensure competition and fair pricing, SB 1213 requires ARB and CEC to condition inclusion of any medium- or heavy-duty vehicle model in any incentive program that receives funding from GGFR, including HVIP, Clean Fuel Reward, and the Clean Transportation Program, on receipt of pricing data from the OEM.

7) **Author's statement:**

SB 1213 maintains California's leadership in the deployment of clean medium and heavy-duty vehicles by placing price transparency requirements on incentive programs. In addition, it increases the cap on the number of vehicles that can be covered through vouchers and directs the state to explore alternative financing models by 2028. These alternative funding models are intended to help bring in more private capital to the space, as well as decreasing the ultimate need for state funding, and moving the market to a time when financing for a zero-emission truck will be as affordable and easy to get as any other loan.

- 8) **Committee amendments.** The *committee may wish to considering amending* the bill as follows:

- a) The California Clean Fuel Reward was established by ARB but is administered by Southern California Edison. Therefore, "administered by the state board" should be struck from HSC 39719.2 (h)(3)(i) and HSC 43216 (a).
- b) Amend 43215 to direct ARB to periodically reevaluate whether or not taxes should be included when determining the maximum share of vehicle cost under HVIP.

- c) When ARB makes data publicly available on its internet website in an aggregated format that anonymizes buyers, ensure those shared data protect the confidentiality of manufacturer and dealer transaction information.
- d) Require the ARB, when coordinating with GO-Biz and IBank, to additionally report on the exploration of increasing deployment and decreasing costs by retrofitting internal combustion trucks to ZEV.

9) **Double referral.** This bill was heard in the Assembly Transportation Committee on June 22 and approved 16-0.

## REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

### Support

American Lung Association	Greenlining Institute
Apen Action	Humble Robotics
California Environmental Voters	Little Manila Rising
California Interfaith Power & Light	Los Angeles Business Council
California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice	Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator
Center for Biological Diversity	Medical Advocates for Healthy Air
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice	Natural Resources Defense Council
Central California Asthma Collaborative	Neighbors for Clean Air
Ceres	Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay
Climate Action California	Port of Long Beach
Coalition for Clean Air	Regional Asthma Management and Prevention
Communities for a Better Environment	Sierra Club California
E2	Smart Freight Centre
Earthjustice	The Climate Center
Federation of American Scientists	Union of Concerned Scientists
Green Latinos	

### Opposition

California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance  
 Daimler Truck North America  
 Hexagon Purus  
 Hyundai Translead  
 TEC Equipment  
 Volvo

**Analysis Prepared by:** Paige Brokaw / NAT. RES. /

<sup>i</sup> [FY24-25 HVIP IM Revised with Addendums 1-2.pdf](#)



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1230 (Valladares) – As Amended June 25, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 36-2

**SUBJECT:** Solid waste: illegal dumping: penalties: resources

**SUMMARY:** Increases penalties for illegal dumping and declares the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) as the lead state agency to act as a resource for cities and counties to address illegal dumping.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Establishes the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, administered by CalRecycle, to regulate solid waste disposal, management, and recycling. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 40050 *et seq.*)
- 2) Authorizes local governmental agencies to determine aspects of solid waste handling that are of local concern, including fees and the extent of providing solid waste handling services. (PRC 40058-4006)
- 3) Prohibits dumping waste on public or private highways or roads, including any portion of the right-of-way thereof, or on private property without consent, or in a public park or other public property (Penal Code (PC) 374.3)
- 4) Specifies that every day that waste placed, deposited, or dumped in violation of PC 374.3 remains a separate violation.
- 5) Establishes penalties for the illegal dumping of commercial and non-commercial quantities of waste:
  - a) A person convicted of dumping non-commercial quantities of waste may be required to pay the cost of cleanup or cleanup themselves for 12 hours, in addition to a mandatory fine of the following amounts:
    - i) First offense: \$250-\$1,000;
    - ii) Second offense: \$500-\$1,500; and
    - iii) Third offense: \$750-\$3,000.
    - iv) Doubles the fines for used tires (PC 374.3)
  - b) A person convicted of illegally dumping commercial quantities is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for not more than six months and by a fine. Provides that the fine is mandatory at the following amounts:
    - i) First offense: \$1,000-\$3,000;
    - ii) Second offense: \$3,000-\$6,000; and
    - iii) Third offense: \$6,000-\$10,000. (PC 374.3)

- c) Provides that if a person convicted for a violation of illegal dumping in commercial quantities is the owner or operator of the business involved in the illegal dumping, and that business employs more than 10 full-time employees, the mandatory fine is as follows:
- i) First offense: \$1,000-\$5,000;
  - ii) Second offense: \$3,000-\$10,000; and
  - iii) Third offense: \$6,000-\$20,000. (PC 374.3)
- 6) States that the court shall require, in addition to the fine imposed upon a conviction, that a person convicted of illegal dumping in commercial quantities to remove, or pay the cost of removing, any waste matter that the convicted person dumped or caused to be dumped upon the public or private property. (PC 374.3)
- 7) Requires the court, if a person convicted of illegal dumping in commercial quantities holds a license or permit to conduct business that is substantially related to the illegal dumping for which the person was convicted, to notify the applicable licensing or permitting entity subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer Affairs of the conviction, as specified. (PC 374.3)
- 8) Requires the licensing or permitting entity to record and post the offense on the public profile of the license or permit holder on the internet website of the entity. (PC 374.3)
- 9) Defines “commercial quantities” as an amount of waste matter generated in the course of a trade, business, profession, or occupation, or an amount equal to or in excess of one cubic yard. Specifies that it does not apply to the dumping of household waste at a person’s own residence. (PC 374.3)
- 10) Requires the court, when setting fines pursuant to the above violations, to consider the defendant’s ability to pay, including consideration of several specified factors. (PC 374.3)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Repeals the provision that specifies that every day that waste is placed, deposited, or dumped is a separate violation.
- 2) Increases the fine for the dumping of commercial quantities of waste to not less than \$4,500 nor more than \$8,000 for the second conviction and to not less than \$8,000 nor more than \$10,000 for the third and any subsequent convictions.
- 3) Increases the fine for the dumping of commercial quantities of waste by a business that employs more than 10 employees to not less than \$6,000 nor more than \$10,000 for the second conviction and to not less than \$15,000 nor more than \$25,000 for the third and any subsequent convictions.
- 4) Declares CalRecycle as the lead state agency to act as a resource for cities and counties to address illegal dumping. Requires CalRecycle to create a website with resources to help cities and counties combat, prevent, and clean up illegal dumping.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, annual costs of \$155,000 beginning 2027-28 to implement the provisions of this bill (Solid Waste Disposal Site Cleanup Trust Fund).

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Illegal dumping.** Illegal dumping is the act of disposing of solid waste at a location that is not a permitted solid waste facility. In California, illegal dumping is often done for economic gain, either by individuals who opt to dump their own waste illegally to avoid paying disposal fees or by illegitimate “junk hauling” entities that collect waste for disposal for a fee, but don’t haul the material to a permitted facility. Illegal dumping poses significant social, environmental, and economic impacts statewide. According to CalRecycle, local governments spend tens of millions of dollars annually to remove illegally dumped materials, and private property owners incur significant costs to clean up illegal dumping on private lands. Once a site has illegally dumped material, the site tends to grow in size and becomes more difficult to abate.

Most local governments treat illegal dumping as a nuisance/litter issue rather than a violation of solid waste laws. The methods used by local governments to manage illegal dumping vary widely. Local and state law enforcement entities will cite people caught illegally dumping, but those agencies are not responsible for cleanup programs. No single state or local agency is given responsibility for a comprehensive program to combat littering and illegal dumping. CalRecycle is responsible for investigation, cleanup, and enforcement of sites that qualify as illegal solid waste disposal sites and shares this responsibility with local enforcement agencies.

In recent years, many urban areas have experienced an increase in illegal dumping activity. For example, in Oakland, the amount of illegally dumped trash collected by the city has increased sixfold since 2015. Los Angeles County’s illegal dumping cleanup costs grew from \$2.3 million in fiscal year (FY) 2019-2020 to \$6.8 million in FY 2023-2024, a nearly threefold increase. Los Angeles County also projected a 15% increase in reported illegal dumping cases from 2023 to 2024, to over 15,800 cases. According to data compiled by Crosstown LA, there were 22,046 reports of trash, furniture, and other debris illegally disposed in the months of January and February of 2025, compared to 16,212 the previous year over the same two-month period.

Rural areas also grapple with illegal dumping. There are reports of pervasive dumping in the Antelope Valley. Residents say that more than 100 dump sites are scattered throughout the valley—from Lake Los Angeles to the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve and north to the Mojave. One site is alleged to contain more than 182,000 tons of debris left over from the processing of construction and demolition material.

Illegal dump sites undermine the quality of life of nearby residents and are environmental and public health hazards. From 2020 to 2024, self-combustible wood chips and organic materials used to camouflage garbage as mulch sparked 42 fires, costing taxpayers more than \$1.6 million to extinguish and exposing downwind Antelope Valley residents to toxic smoke, contaminated dust, and airborne particulates. The Bravo fire ignited at an illegal 80-acre dump site in 2024, and cost the LA County Fire Department more than \$288,000, took four days to extinguish, and exposed residents to toxic smoke.

- 2) **Illegal dumping technical advisory committee (IDTAC).** CalRecycle established a state and local technical advisory committee in 2006 to assess the extent of illegal dumping and to develop recommendations to improve the effectiveness of local and regional responses to the problem. Originally established as a task force, the group developed recommendations that were presented to the former California Integrated Waste Management Board in 2007. IDTAC is comprised of local government entities, state government entities, nonprofit organizations, and others. The Illegal Dumping Toolbox was created by the IDTAC to provide resources to local governments to help combat illegal dumping.

In 2020, IDTAC completed a Work Plan to develop new and expanded resources and objectives to address illegal dumping. The Work Plan includes priorities and objectives in three areas: enforcement, outreach, and standards. In addition to the Work Plan, the IDTAC has focused on, and provides information to local governments and the public about, the topics of homeless encampments and abandoned vehicles.

- 3) **Solid Waste Disposal and Codisposal Site Cleanup Program.** The cleanup program allocates \$1 million annually for public entities to fund illegally disposed waste removal and disposal, security measures (i.e., fences, signs, etc.), and health and safety measures associated with the cleanup. Grant awards are limited to \$50,000 per applicant per year.
- 4) **Farm and Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement Program.** CalRecycle administers a grant program to eligible cities, counties, resource conservation districts, and Native American tribes for the cleanup and abatement of illegal dumping on farm and ranch properties. Funding for this program is limited to \$1 million each fiscal year. Grants are limited to \$50,000 per site and \$200,000 per applicant per year.

5) **Author's statement:**

Illegal dumping is a persistent and costly problem affecting communities throughout California, particularly in rural, desert, and lower-income areas where enforcement resources are most limited. In Senate District 23, residents of the Victor Valley and surrounding high-desert communities have documented hundreds of unauthorized dump sites containing construction debris, household waste, plastics, and other discarded materials. These sites degrade natural habitats, create fire risks, and impose significant financial burdens on local governments that are often already stretched thin.

SB 1230 takes two targeted, practical steps to address this ongoing problem. First, it increases fines for repeat illegal dumping offenders under California Penal Code Section 374.3. The non-commercial repeat offender fine ranges and commercial minimum thresholds have not been substantively updated since AB 1802 in 2004. Although AB 2374 in 2022 raised maximum fines for larger businesses, it did not address the fine minimums or non-commercial infraction ranges, leaving those penalty floors unchanged for over two decades and well below the true cost of cleanup and environmental remediation. By raising the penalty thresholds, this bill creates a stronger deterrent for chronic violators, including those dumping in commercial quantities.

Second, SB 1230 designates the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) as the lead state agency for supporting cities and counties in combating illegal dumping. It requires CalRecycle to create a publicly accessible website offering enforcement tools, best practices, educational outreach materials, and information on available grant funding. Cities and counties, particularly smaller and rural jurisdictions, currently lack a centralized state resource for this guidance.

- 6) **This bill.** This bill is intended to combat illegal dumping by increasing the penalties for repeated violations. However, the amended version of this bill weakens existing law by removing the provisions that declares that each day that illegally dumped waste remains in place is a separate violation. Further, this bill is intended to provide assistance and guidance to local governments by requiring CalRecycle to provide information and maintain a website to support local efforts to stop illegal dumping.
- 7) **Double referral.** This bill was heard by the Assembly Public Safety Committee on June 23, and passed 9-0.
- 8) **Related legislation.** AB 2310 (Carillo) increases penalties for a fourth or subsequent illegal dumping offense from an infraction to a misdemeanor, with a fine of up to \$5,000, and increases penalties for commercial quantities of illegal dumping with fines of up to \$50,000. This bill has been referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

## REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

### Support

Alameda County  
California Association of Highway Patrolmen  
California Chapters of the Solid Waste Association of North America's Legislative Task Force  
City of Hesperia  
Rural County Representatives of California

### Opposition

ACLU California Action

**Analysis Prepared by:** Elizabeth MacMillan / NAT. RES. /



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1268 (Gonzalez) – As Amended April 23, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 73-0

**SUBJECT:** Outdoor public recreation spaces: equitable access

**SUMMARY:** Codifies the Outdoors for All initiative within the Natural Resources Agency (NRA).

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Establishes the Equitable Outdoor Access Act, which sets forth the state's commitment to ensuring all Californians can benefit from, and have meaningful access to, the state's rich cultural and natural resources. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 1000)
- 2) Requires all relevant state agencies, including NRA, and each department, board, office, conservancy, and commission within the agency, and state departments, including the Department of Transportation, to consider and incorporate, as appropriate, the state policy under the Equitable Outdoor Access Act when revising, adopting, or establishing policies, regulations, or grant criteria, or making expenditures, to the extent the policies, regulations, grant criteria, or expenditures are not in conflict with an appropriation. (PRC 1002 (b))
- 3) Directs NRA to combat the biodiversity and climate crisis by, among other things, establishing the California Biodiversity Collaborative and establishing the 30x30 goal. (Executive Order No. N-82-20)
- 4) Codifies the 30x30 goal. Requires NRA, in implementing actions to achieve the 30x30 goal, to prioritize specified actions. (PRC 71451-71452)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Establishes the Outdoors for All initiative to be administered by NRA, in consultation with the Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) and other relevant state entities, to advance the objectives of the initiative.
- 2) Requires NRA to implement all of the following priorities provided in the Outdoors for All Strategy published by NRA on November 15, 2023:
  - a) Establish outdoor public recreation spaces for people and nature to thrive;
  - b) Foster belonging;
  - c) Connect people and the outdoors;
  - d) Cocreate with communities;
  - e) Build equitable career pathways and a representative workforce; and,

- f) Align funding from federal, state, regional, and private sources to achieve the initiative's goals.
- 3) Requires NRA to maintain the position of Deputy Secretary for Access to coordinate the initiative's implementation.
- 4) Requires, on or before December 31, 2028, and every five years thereafter, NRA to update the Outdoors for All Strategy to advance the specified objectives to align with relevant goals of the state, including the state's outdoor equity goals and the 30x30 goal, and to ensure conservation strategies enhance public access and benefits for disadvantaged and low-income communities.
- 5) Requires NRA to consult with diverse stakeholders, including community-based organizations, local governments, and environmental justice advocates, to ensure inclusive decisionmaking and prevent loopholes.
- 6) Requires NRA to host at least three public meetings during the update process. These meetings may be in-person, virtual, or hybrid.
- 7) Requires NRA to provide at least one 30-day public comment period on the update.
- 8) Requires NRA to post the final update on its internet website in a publicly accessible location.
- 9) Requires, on or before January 1, 2028, and annually thereafter, NRA to submit a report to the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature detailing the progress made to achieve the initiative's goals, including implementing and updating the Outdoors for All Strategy.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, NRA estimates ongoing costs of \$250,000 annually (General Fund) for staff support and potential consulting costs to develop and produce strategy updates and progress reports as required by this bill.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **30x30.** In October 2020, Governor Newsom issued EO N-82-20 to establish a state goal of conserving 30% of California's lands and coastal waters by 2030 – known as 30x30. The 30x30 goal is intended to help conserve our lands and coastal waters through voluntary, collaborative action with partners across the state to meet three objectives: conserve and restore biodiversity, expand access to nature, and mitigate and build resilience to climate change. The 30x30 goal was codified by SB 337 (Min), Chapter 392, Statutes of 2023.

As of July 2025, the state has conserved 26.1% of lands and 21.9% of coastal waters for 30x30, adding approximately 1.044 million acres to lands conserved over the previous year and identifying concrete strategies to strengthen conservation in coastal waters. California has a strategy to conserve an additional four million acres of land and 283,000 acres of coastal waters.

- 2) **Outdoors for All.** The Outdoors for All initiative is intended to expand parks and nature access in communities with little outdoor space, supporting programs to connect people who lack access.

Spending time outdoors directly benefits mental and physical health. It improves mood and happiness, lowers stress, and strengthens people's sense of meaning. Research shows that people who visit outdoor spaces for 30 minutes or more during a week have lower rates of depression and high blood pressure. Access to outdoor spaces also facilitates exercise, which improves long-term physical health. Many healthcare professionals recognize these benefits, and in some places have started to issue medical prescriptions to spend time in nature to improve health outcomes.



Photo: <https://sfchildrennature.org/discover/explore/>

Outdoor access is not equitably distributed to all communities. A history of discriminatory policies and exclusionary zoning have led to long-term disinvestment, fewer parks and outdoor spaces, and less coastal access for many communities. The practice of redlining led to neighborhoods with far fewer trees and parks that provide shade and clean the air for lower-income residents and communities of color. Instead, these neighborhoods have more paved surfaces that absorb and radiate heat. During extreme heat events some cities experience differences of up to 12 degrees between formally red- and green-lined areas.

Establishing welcoming places where all people feel safe and have a sense of belonging is essential to building an Outdoors for All. AB 30 (Kalra), Chapter 939, Statutes of 2022, codified the state's commitment to ensuring all Californians can benefit from, and have meaningful access to, the state's rich cultural and natural resources as the Equitable Outdoor Access Act.

Outdoors for All also furthers two other NRA priorities, Nature Based Solutions and 30x30, by investing in California's public lands and natural resources. Tying it all together, the Pathways to 30x30 Annual Progress Report (May 2023) notes,

By increasing both the variety and accessibility of outdoor recreation, California's 30x30 initiative is working to enable everyone in California to enjoy and connect with nature. Seizing opportunities to expand conservation that also increase access has been a priority over the past year and will remain so going forward. The Outdoors for All strategy will guide this facet of its 30x30 work.

- 3) **Equitable Outdoor Access Act.** The Equitable Outdoor Access Act sets the requirement for California to prioritize outdoor equity, expand access to public lands, and promote opportunities for underserved communities, and the Outdoors for All Initiative is the policy vehicle to make those established goals a reality.

This bill codifies the Outdoors for All initiative and the Deputy Secretary for Access within NRA. By doing so, this preserves the goals of the initiative, the stakeholder engagement, and

the periodic updates to the initiative, which all help the state achieve the priorities laid out in the Equitable Outdoor Access Act.

4) **Author's statement:**

Despite California's nation-leading outdoor recreation industry, many Californians lack access to the benefits of outdoor spaces. A history of exclusionary zoning, discriminatory policies, and underinvestment has resulted in fewer parks and less outdoor access for urban communities, communities of color, and lower-income communities. Barriers including limited facilities for people with disabilities, the cost of equipment, transportation, and fees, and racial and ethnic discrimination exacerbate these historical inequalities.

As the federal government repeatedly attacks public lands, deploys federal immigration agents to stage raids in public parks, and rolls back equity programs, it is more important than ever to strengthen the state's commitment to outdoor equity and conservation. The Outdoors for All initiative provides enormous benefits to Californians and the state's environment but is not currently codified in state law – meaning it could be easily altered or undone by a different state administration. SB 1268 will codify this important, successful initiative and ensure that the state will maintain momentum on our outdoor equity goals regardless of actions at the federal level or changes in state leadership.

5) **Double referral.** This bill was heard in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee on June 16 and approved 11-0.

6) **Related legislation:**

AB 946 (Bryan) requires the Governor's office, state agencies, and the Legislature, when distributing resources, to aspire to recognize the coequal goals and benefits of the 30x30 goal and the Outdoors for All initiative, and, to the extent practical, maximize investment in historically underserved urban communities consistent with those initiatives. This bill is referred to the Senate Natural Resources & Water Committee.

AB 2285 (Rendon, 2024) Encourages the Governor's office, state agencies, and the Legislature, when distributing resources towards conservation and restoration goals during future budgetary deliberations, to ensure parity in allocations toward urban nature-based investments and requires state funding agencies to amend guidelines as necessary to meet the 30x30 goal to allow for urban nature-based projects on degraded lands to be eligible and competitive for state funds. This bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

Active San Gabriel Valley  
All About Owls  
Allensworth Progressive Association  
Alta Peak Chapter, California Native Plant Society

Amigos De Los Rios  
Asian Pacific Islander Forward Movement  
Audubon California  
Azul  
Bay Area Ridge Trail Council

Cactustocloud Institute	Latino Outdoors
California Academy of Sciences	League of California Cities
California Association of Local Conservation Corps	Los Angeles County
California Association of Recreation & Park Districts	Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
California Environmental Voters	Los Angeles United Methodist Urban Foundation
California Native Plant Society	Los Cerritos Wetlands Land Trust
California Outdoors Recreation Partnership (CORP)	Los Padres Forestwatch
California Park & Recreation Society	Midpeninsula Open Space Trust
California State Parks Foundation	Mono Lake Committee
Californians for Western Wilderness	Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center
Calwild	Nature for All
Center for Biological Diversity	Outdoor Outreach
Center for Progressive Reform	Outward Bound Adventures
Central Valley Partnership	Pogo Park
Children & Nature Network	Prevention Institute
City of Huron	Resource Renewal Institute
Clockshop	River Partners
Cofem	Salted Roots
Conservation Corps of Long Beach	Save Mount Diablo
Conservation Lands Foundation	Save the Redwoods League
Day One	Sea and Sage Audubon Society
East Bay Regional Park District	Sempervirens Fund
Endangered Habitats League	Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Environmental Protection Information Center	Sierra Business Council
Fish on	Sierra Club
Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Friends of the Dunes	Siskiyou Crest Coalition
Friends of the Lost Coast	Sonoma Ecology Center
Greenlatinos	South Yuba River Citizens League
Habitat 2020	Surfrider Foundation
Hispanic Access Foundation	The Leap Institute
Justice Outside	Trout Unlimited
Kaboom!	Trust for Public Land; the Wildlands Network
	Yes Nature to Neighborhoods

## Opposition

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Paige Brokaw / NAT. RES. /



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1300 (Stern) – As Amended May 27, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** 35-0 (not relevant)

**SUBJECT:** Natural Resources Agency: Secretariat for International Climate Coordination and Cooperation

**SUMMARY:** Authorizes the Natural Resources Secretary to appoint a Secretariat for International Climate Coordination and Cooperation.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Establishes the Natural Resources Agency, and requires the secretary of an agency to be generally responsible for the sound fiscal management of each department, office, or other unit within the agency; review and approve the proposed budget of each department, office, or other unit; hold the head of each department, office, or other unit responsible for management control over the administrative, fiscal, and program performance of his or her department, office, or other unit; review the operations and evaluate the performance at appropriate intervals of each department, office, or other unit, and; seek continually to improve the organization structure, the operating policies, and the management information systems of each department, office, or other unit. (Government Code (GC) 12800)
- 2) Provides that the Natural Resources Agency consists of the departments of Forestry and Fire Protection, Conservation, Fish and Wildlife, Parks and Recreation, and Water Resources; the State Lands Commission; the Colorado River Board; the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; the Central Valley Flood Protection Board; the Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission; the Wildlife Conservation Board; the Delta Protection Commission; Exposition Park; the California Science Center; the California African American Museum; the Native American Heritage Commission; the California Conservation Corps; the California Coastal Commission; the State Coastal Conservancy; the California Tahoe Conservancy; the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy; the Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy; the San Joaquin River Conservancy; the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; the Baldwin Hills Conservancy; the San Diego River Conservancy; and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy. (GC 12805)

**THIS BILL** authorizes the Secretary to appoint an individual or identify one or more University of California centers to oversee and administer a Secretariat for International Climate Coordination and Cooperation to assist the legislative and executive branches' engagement in international climate policy, including, but not limited to, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties processes and the state's existing and future international climate change memoranda of understanding, technical cooperation agreements, and other voluntary frameworks.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:****Author's statement:**

The State of California has a long and successful track record of entering into voluntary agreements on the topic of climate change, both sharing mitigation and adaptation strategies with other countries and subnational jurisdictions. These agreements have been growing in recent months, including announcements about clean technology investments.

For decades, California has demonstrated that subnational governments can play a meaningful role in addressing climate change. Through partnerships with governments and regions around the world, California has advanced innovation, strengthened clean energy investment, and shared successful climate solutions that benefit communities both at home and abroad.

Historically, these voluntary agreements, often called Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs), have been led through the Executive Branch. As international climate engagement continues to expand globally, California must strengthen and coordinate these efforts to ensure they are informed by the best available scientific and policy expertise.

SB 1300 builds on California's longstanding climate leadership by creating a framework to support international climate cooperation. At a time when climate challenges increasingly transcend national borders, California must continue to collaborate with partners around the world to accelerate solutions and promote innovation.

SB 1300 strengthens California's ability to engage strategically and effectively in international climate efforts that support our environmental, economic, and public-health goals.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:****Support**

None on file

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Lawrence Lingbloom / NAT. RES. /

Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1341 (Cabaldon) – As Amended June 15, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** Not relevant

**SUBJECT:** Beverage containers: wine and distilled spirits: processing fees

**SUMMARY:** Exempts the box portion of “bag in box” beverage containers from the California Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act (Bottle Bill).

**EXISTING LAW:**

1) Establishes the Bottle Bill, which:

- a) Requires beverage containers, as defined, sold in-state to have a California redemption value (CRV) of 5 to 25 cents. Requires beverage distributors to pay a redemption payment to Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) for every beverage container sold in the state. Continuously appropriates these funds to CalRecycle for, among other things, the payment of refund values and processing payments. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 14500 *et seq.*)
- b) Defines “beverage” as:
  - i) Beer and other malt beverages;
  - ii) Wine and distilled spirit coolers;
  - iii) Carbonated water;
  - iv) Noncarbonated water;
  - v) Carbonated soft drinks;
  - vi) Noncarbonated soft drinks and sports drinks;
  - vii) Noncarbonated fruit juice drinks that contain any percentage of fruit juice;
  - viii) Coffee and tea drinks;
  - ix) Carbonated fruit drinks;
  - x) Vegetable juice;
  - xi) Wine and sparkling wine; and,
  - xii) Distilled spirits. (PRC 14505)
- c) Defines “beverage container” as the individual, separate bottle, can, jar, carton, or other receptacle in which a beverage is sold, and which is constructed of metal, glass, plastic, or any other material, or any combination of these materials. Specifies that “beverage container” does not include cups or other similar open or loosely sealed receptacles. (PRC 14505)
- d) Requires CalRecycle to establish a processing payment for a beverage container that has a scrap value less than the cost of recycling, as specified, that is at least equal to the difference between the scrap value of the material and the sum of the cost of recycling and a reasonable financial return. (PRC 14575(b))

- e) Requires beverage manufacturers to pay a processing fee that is equal to the processing payment. Reduces, or “offsets,” the processing fee based on the recycling rate of the container type. The offsets range from 65% of the processing payment for a container type with a recycling rate of 30% or less to 10% of the processing payment for a container type with a recycling rate of greater than 75%. (PRC 14575(d))

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Defines “bag in box” as a container for wine, distilled spirits, or wine and distilled spirit coolers that have both:
  - a) An interior flexible bag with a valve to dispense the beverage; and,
  - b) A rigid box composed primarily of cardboard or corrugated paper that is designed to contain the bag and to allow the bag’s valve to extend through the box to dispense the beverage.
- 2) Specifies that the interior flexible bag in a bag in box container is a beverage container, and that the rigid box that is used to contain the bag is not a beverage container, for purposes of the Bottle Bill.
- 3) Specifies that beginning January 1, 2027, the processing fee for a beverage container that is a bag in box be calculated based on the weight of the interior flexible bag and its valve.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Bottle Bill.** The Bottle Bill was established in 1986 to be a self-funded program that encourages consumers to recycle beverage containers and to prevent littering. The program accomplishes this goal by requiring consumers to pay a deposit for each eligible container purchased. Then the program guarantees consumers repayment of that deposit, the CRV, for each eligible container returned to a certified recycler. Statute includes two main goals for the program: (1) reducing litter; and, (2) achieving a recycling rate of 80% for eligible containers. Containers recycled through the Bottle Bill’s certified recycling centers also provide a consistent, clean, uncontaminated stream of recycled materials with minimal processing.
- 2) **Ways to redeem containers.** Consumers have a handful of options to redeem their empty beverage containers:
  - a) Return the container to a “convenience zone” recycling center located within 1-mile radius of a supermarket. These are generally small centers that only accept beverage containers and receive handling fees.
  - b) Return to a dealer or a dealer cooperative recycling center. In convenience zones without a convenience zone recycler, beverage dealers, primarily supermarkets, are required to either accept containers for redemption or join a dealer cooperative that meets specified statutory requirements and accepts all beverage containers in the zone.

- c) Return the container to an “old line” recycling center, which refers to a recycler that does not receive handling fees and usually accepts large quantities of materials, frequently by truckload from municipal or commercial waste collection services.
- d) Consumers can also forfeit their CRV and “donate” their containers to residential curbside recycling collection. Curbside programs keep the CRV on these containers.

California currently has approximately 1,200 certified recycling centers throughout the state. However, many recycling zones are “unserved,” meaning they don’t have a certified recycling center. Additionally, many rural counties have only one or two recycling centers to service large geographic areas. Alpine and Sierra County have none. Between 2014 to 2024, approximately half of California’s recycling centers closed.

- 3) **Processing payments.** The processing payment is calculated to reflect the difference between the cost to recycle and the scrap value of a beverage container. Materials that are highly recyclable with higher scrap values have lower processing payments than more difficult to recycle materials. For example, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) had a processing payment of only \$0.00091 per container in 2025. In contrast, harder-to-recycle polyvinyl chloride (PVC) containers had a processing payment of \$0.05447. CalRecycle updates processing payments at least annually based on the actual costs of recycling.

CalRecycle collects between 10% and 65% of the processing payment from beverage manufacturers as the processing fee. The portion of the processing payment not covered by the processing fee is funded by unredeemed CRV deposits. By passing along the cost of recycling from recyclers to manufacturers, the processing fee serves as an incentive to producers to use more readily recyclable materials and incentivizes recyclers to accept hard-to-recycle materials.

- 4) **Wine and spirits.** SB 1013 (Atkins), Chapter 610, Statutes of 2022, added wine and spirits to the Bottle Bill beginning January 1, 2024. Due to the challenges associated with recycling boxes, bladders, and pouches, SB 1013 established a CRV of 25 cents for those container types.

While some boxes, particularly those used for bag in box containers, are made from coated cardboard (which is highly recyclable through curbside recycling), some are cartons. Cartons contain layers of fiber, plastic, and aluminum for waterproofing and shelf stability. Very few facilities accept cartons for recycling as it is labor intensive to separate the materials into recyclable raw materials.

While the box portion of a bag in box container is readily recyclable, the bag must be removed from the box prior to recycling, which requires additional processing. Once separated, the box can be recycled or may be discarded. The bag can be made from a variety of materials, such as a combination of plastic laminate with PET, low density polyethylene (LDPE) or ethylene vinyl acetate. None of these types are readily recycled.

Plastic labeled #7 (categorized as “other” or mixed/miscellaneous plastic) had a processing payment of \$0.14789, 162 times the cost of PET. LDPE had a processing payment of \$0.01907, 20 times higher than PET. A product made with several layers of different plastics

adds additional complexity to the recycling process.

Without data on the cost of recycling, SB 1013 gave boxes, bladders, and pouches a placeholder processing payment equivalent to the processing payment for high density polyethylene (HDPE), which is much more recyclable material with a relatively low processing payment (currently \$0.00867 per container), for two years to allow CalRecycle time to collect the relevant recycling data. In 2026, CalRecycle released actual processing payments for bag in box containers, multilayered pouches, and paperboard cartons, based on real recycling data. Bag in box containers now have a processing fee of \$0.32503 per container, multilayered pouches have a processing fee of \$0.02802 per container, and paperboard cartons have a processing fee of \$0.02851 per container. Bag in box currently has the highest processing fee in the Bottle Bill, followed by #7 (other) containers, which have a processing fee of \$0.21988 per container. Given the low recycling rates for these materials, producers are required to pay 65% of the processing fee. While manufacturers anticipated higher processing fees in 2026, they did not anticipate how high the processing fee for bag in box containers would be.

- 5) **This bill.** This bill is intended to lower the processing fees for bag in box containers by removing the box portion of the container from the Bottle Bill. While this change is likely to reduce the processing fee by reducing the weight of each container and the labor costs associated with recycling, it also significantly impacts convenience for consumers, which is a critical element of the Bottle Bill. Instead of recycling the bag in box container, consumers would be required to separate the bag from the box and recycle them separately. Additionally, removing the box from the Bottle Bill would move it to the state's producer responsibility program for single-use packaging established by SB 54 (Allen), Chapter 75, Statutes of 2022, increasing consumer confusion about how to properly manage these containers. Finally, CalRecycle submitted the final regulations implementing SB 1013 to the Office of Administrative Law on May 29<sup>th</sup>. The regulations require the bag in box container to be intact to be eligible for CRV. As drafted, this bill would require CalRecycle to revise the regulations and potentially delay SB 1013 implementation.

6) **Author's statement:**

SB 1341 creates a mechanism to recalibrate the processing fee for beverage containers for situations in which the amount of fees expected to be collected is significantly higher than the amount needed to make the associated processing payments. This situation is occurring presently with certain wine and spirits container types that first entered the Bottle Bill program in 2024. Specifically, on December 15, 2025, CalRecycle announced an increase in the processing fee for bag-in-box containers of nearly 5000% that took effect on January 1, 2026. Information provided by CalRecycle made it apparent that the amount of fees expected to be collected would be several orders of magnitude more than necessary to meet anticipated processing payments for those containers. Unfortunately, there is no mechanism to adjust processing fees in these instances. SB 1341 empowers CalRecycle to adjust the processing fee to account for these discrepancies.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

Container Recycling Institute  
Tetra Pak, Inc.

**Opposition**

Californians Against Waste

**Analysis Prepared by:** Elizabeth MacMillan / NAT. RES. /



Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Isaac G. Bryan, Chair

SB 1370 (Stern) – As Amended June 11, 2026

**SENATE VOTE:** not relevant

**SUBJECT:** Covered wildfire mitigation projects: consolidated and expedited review

**SUMMARY:** Codifies the Governor’s streamlined permitting at the Natural Resources Agency (NRA) and the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) for specified wildfire mitigation projects established under executive order.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires each electrical corporation to annually prepare and submit a wildfire mitigation plan (WMP) to the Wildfire Safety Division for review and approval. Defines 23 variables a WMP is required to contain, including a description of the preventive strategies and programs to be adopted by the electrical corporation to minimize the risk of its electrical lines and equipment causing catastrophic wildfires, including consideration of dynamic climate change risks. (Public Utilities Code (PUC) 8386)
- 2) Requires any person that owns, controls, operates, or maintains any electrical transmission or distribution line upon any mountainous land, or in forest-covered land, brush-covered land, or grass-covered land shall, during such times and in such areas as are determined to be necessary by the director or the agency which has primary responsibility for the fire protection of such areas, maintain a specified clearance of distances in all directions between all vegetation and all conductors which are carrying specified electric current. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 4293)
- 3) Defines “community wildfire preparedness plan” as a plan for an at-risk community that (a) is developed within the context of the collaborative agreements and the guidance established by the Wildland Fire Leadership Council and agreed to by the applicable local government, local fire department, and state agency responsible for forest management, in consultation with interested parties and the federal land management agencies managing land in the vicinity of the at-risk community; (b) identifies and prioritizes areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments and recommends the types and methods of treatment on federal and non-federal land that will protect one or more at-risk communities and essential infrastructure; and, (c) recommends measures to reduce structural ignitability throughout the at-risk community. (16 United States Code 6511(3))
- 4) Requires, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a lead agency to prepare and certify the completion of an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. Provides specified exemptions for wildfire risk reduction projects. (PRC 21080.49)
- 5) Requires, by April 1, 2026, the California Earthquake Authority (CEA) in its role as California Wildfire Fund Administrator, in consultation with the Public Utilities

Commission (PUC), the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety, the Department of Insurance, the Office of Emergency Services, and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), to prepare and submit to the Legislature, and to the Governor, a report that evaluates and sets forth recommendations on new models or approaches that mitigate damage, accelerate recovery, and responsibly and equitably allocate the burdens from natural catastrophes, including catastrophic wildfires, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, including recommendations on options for enactment of programs to reduce the risk of wildfires spreading and becoming high-severity catastrophes, including improved state and local catastrophic event response capability, home fire risk reduction standards, vegetation management practices, and communitywide wildfire hardening requirements. (PUC 719)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Defines the following terms:
  - a) “Consolidated review agencies” as NRA and CalEPA acting jointly to provide coordinated environmental and regulatory review of covered wildfire mitigation projects.
  - b) “Covered wildfire mitigation project” as any of the following activities undertaken for the purpose of reducing wildfire risk and for which the wildfire risk reduction achieved by the activity, and its cost per unit of risk reduced, has been quantified either in a utility’s WMP in a community wildfire preparedness plan, by the department, or by another government agency using tools approved for that quantification by the Office of the State Fire Marshall:
    - i) Removal of hazardous, dead, or dying trees or vegetation;
    - ii) Removal of vegetation for the creation of strategic fuel breaks as identified by approved fire prevention plans, including, but not limited to, department unit fire plans or community wildfire preparedness plans;
    - iii) Removal of vegetation for community defensible space;
    - iv) Removal of vegetation along roadways, highways, and freeways to create safer ingress and egress routes for the public and first responders and to reduce roadside ignitions;
    - v) Removal of vegetation using cultural or traditional ecological knowledge for cultural burning or prescribed fire treatments for fuels reduction;
    - vi) Maintenance of previously established fuel breaks as part of fuel modification projects; and,
    - vii) Removal of vegetation around electrical utility lines, poles, and rights-of-way to reduce the risk of wildfire and fire-related service outages.
  - c) “Expedited authorization” as a written decision by the Secretary for CalEPA or the Secretary of NRA authorizing a covered wildfire mitigation project and requiring the covered wildfire mitigation project to comply with the State Environmental Protection

Plan, the issuance of which waives the requirements that the covered wildfire mitigation project comply with state statutes, rules, regulations, and requirements within the jurisdiction of the boards, departments, and agencies within the consolidated review agencies.

- d) “State Environmental Protection Plan” as the Statewide Fuels Reduction Environmental Protection Plan (EPP), issued May 2025, as it may be updated periodically.
- 2) Requires, any state-level environmental and resource permits, approvals, consultations, and reviews required for a covered wildfire mitigation project to be consolidated into a single coordinated review administered jointly by the consolidated review agencies.
- 3) Requires an applicant seeking authorization to undertake a covered wildfire mitigation project to submit a single, consolidated application package to the consolidated review agencies.
- 4) Requires the consolidated review agencies to establish expedited timelines to complete their review and issue a determination on a complete application.
- 5) Requires the projects to be approved within 60 calendar days of receipt, provided an application is complete within the timelines established by the consolidated review agencies. Provides that the applicant and the consolidated review agencies may agree to extend these timelines if both parties agree more information is required.
- 6) Requires the determination to be in writing and to include all of the following:
  - a) A description of the project;
  - b) The basis for eligibility;
  - c) A list of permits, agreements, or authorizations covered by the authorization; and,
  - d) The required environmental protection measures, including documentation of compliance with the EPP.
- 7) Authorizes the consolidated review agencies to consult with the agencies, boards, and offices that would have otherwise held authority over the covered wildfire mitigation project.
- 8) Provides that an expedited authorization issued waives the requirement that the covered wildfire mitigation project comply with state statutes, rules, regulations, and requirements, within the jurisdiction of boards, departments, and agencies within the consolidated review agencies, and replaces any other permit, agreement, or authorization required by state statutes, rules, regulations, and requirements that fall within the jurisdiction of boards, departments, and offices within the consolidated review agencies.
- 9) Requires any covered wildfire mitigation project shall be conducted in accordance with the EPP.
- 10) Requires projects to be less than 3,000 acres in project size and completed within two years of approval by the consolidated review agencies.

- 11) Exempts a covered wildfire mitigation project authorized under this bill from CEQA.
- 12) Requires, on or before July 1, 2029, the consolidated review agencies to review the requirements and implementation of the EPP and recommend improvements to more effectively protect human health and the environment.
- 13) Requires the agencies to review projects and conduct inspections and monitoring of a subset of projects to develop recommendations.
- 14) Requires the review and recommendations shall be posted on the internet websites of the respective consolidated review agencies.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Governor's emergency proclamation.** In response to the January 2025 wildfires that burned multiple communities in Los Angeles, Governor Newsom issued Order (EO) N-4-25 on January 12, 2025, exempting reconstruction of properties substantially damaged or destroyed in the wildfires from CEQA and the Coastal Act to accelerate redevelopment. In February 2025, he issued EO N-20-25 to state all rebuilds of primary structures and facilities up to 110% of the existing footprint and accessory dwelling units are exempt from the Coastal Act *entirely*, and further redirected the Coastal Commission to stop issuing guidance or attempting to enforce permitting requirements that conflict with EO N-4-25 to streamline the building of accessory dwelling units to assist in creating more temporary housing. On March 1, the Governor issued a far more sweeping emergency proclamation ordering a suspension of all laws, regulations, rules, and requirements that fall within the jurisdiction of boards, departments, and offices within CalEPA and NRA for expediting critical fuels reduction projects initiated in 2025. On December 31, 2025, Governor Newsom extended the emergency proclamation to March 1, 2026, and through this extension, project streamlining applications were accepted through May 1, 2026.

Critical fuels reduction projects included:

- Removal of hazardous, dead, and/or dying trees;
- Removal of vegetation for the creation of strategic fuel breaks as identified by approved fire prevention plans, including without limitation CAL FIRE Unit Fire Plans or Community Wildfire Preparedness Plans;
- Removal of vegetation for community defensible space;
- Removal of vegetation along roadways, highways, and freeways for the creation of safer ingress and egress routes for the public and responders and to reduce roadside ignitions;
- Removal of vegetation using cultural traditional ecological knowledge for cultural burning and/or prescribed fire treatments for fuels reduction; or,
- Maintenance of previously-established fuel breaks or fuels modification projects.

Under the proclamation's exemptions, entities were required to ask NRA to make a determination that the activities are eligible under the proclamation, and any activity

conducted under the temporary exemptions was required to comply with the state EPP. The EPP provides Best Management Practices (BMPs) and measures to protect air quality, water quality, Tribal cultural resources, special-status species, their habitat, and other habitat resources.

According to the state's dashboard for tracking permits approved under the EPP, 211 projects have been approved; 169 projects are underway; and, 47 projects have been completed, totaling 427 projects that have successfully been approved through the EPP.

Last year, SB 254 (Becker), Chapter 119, Statutes of 2025, assigned the CEA the task of conducting a study and reporting on options to enhance natural catastrophe resiliency while meeting California's climate change and clean energy goals. The CEA's report, *Enhancing California's Resiliency to Natural Catastrophes: Senate Bill 254 (2025) Study Report*, released April 7, recommends establishing in statute the authority to facilitate ongoing fast-track environmental permitting for critical, short-term projects covered under the Governor's emergency proclamation.

- 2) **This bill.** SB 1370 seeks to permanently extend the streamlined permitting under the EPP for wildfire mitigation projects included in the Governor's emergency proclamation and codify the process established by NRA and CalEPA to implement permitting under the EPP.
- 3) **Hitting the pause button.** There is both merit in and consensus for extending this streamlined permitting. However, with a new gubernatorial administration coming into office in 2027, and new appointed secretaries of NRA and CalEPA to follow, the Legislature may wish to extend the EPP process *with a sunset date*. This allows critical projects to move forward while affording the Legislature time to review progress, compliance, and any gaps in needed oversight.
- 4) **Parameters on vegetation management.** California covers more than a million acres of land and has very diverse topographies, ecosystems, and climates, and a diverse range of species and habitat needs across those different regions. Vegetation management under the auspices of wildfire reduction can include myriad different treatment types, including prescribed burning, pruning, removal, mechanical treatment, grazing, and application of herbicides. The Legislature has enacted rules for vegetation management, broadly speaking, to provide environmental protections and ensure the treatments are done appropriately. Exemptions, statutory and categorical, are provided under many of those laws in recognition of likely minimal environmental impact under the scope of the exemption.

Under the Forest Practice Act, the Board of Forestry is authorized to exempt the cutting or removal of trees for the purpose of reducing flammable materials and maintaining a fuel break for a distance of not more than 300 feet on each side from an approved and legally permitted habitable structure. (PRC 4584 (l)(1))

Under CEQA, exemptions are provided for defensible space of up to 100 feet, as measured from the center line of the roadway, for a public roadway identified as an egress and evacuation routes; defensible space within 200 feet of a legal structure located in a high or

very high fire hazard severity zones; and, fuel breaks that extend up to 200 feet from structures. (PRC 21080.49)

Electrical corporations are required to maintain a firebreak which consists of at least 10 feet in each direction from the outer circumference of such pole or tower and specified clearances of vegetation and all conductors which are carrying electric current. (PRC 4292, 4293). Further, Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 stipulates rules for utility vegetation management around overhead electric and communication lines along their rights-of-way to maintain specified safety clearances and system reliability.

More broadly, as it relates to type conversion, current law states the intent of the Legislature that additional consideration be provided for chaparral and coastal sage scrub plant communities that are being increasingly threatened by fire frequency in excess of their natural fire return patterns. Current law provides that prescribed burning, mastication, herbicide application, mechanical thinning, or other vegetative treatments of chaparral or sage scrub can occur only if CAL FIRE finds that the activity will not cause “type conversion” away from the chaparral and coastal sage scrub currently on site. (PRC 4483)

The Legislature did not have an opportunity to opine on or propose revisions to the Governor’s Executive Orders. However, in extending the Governor’s streamlined permitting for such a broad swath of project categories, the bill could provide geographic parameters on the project types consistent with current law.

- 5) **Forest Practice Rules.** The California Forest Practice Act was enacted in 1973 to ensure that timber harvesting and related activities are done in a manner that will preserve and protect fish, wildlife, forests, and streams. The State Board of Forestry enacts and enforces additional rules to protect these resources, known as the Forest Practice Rules (FPRs). The FPRs provide detailed instructions for woody material management, among many other things, for fuel treatment standards that specify wood material management, treatment, and removal within specified distances of various structures and roads.

Under the Governor’s emergency proclamation, projects with a commercial timber component were subject to the EPP and the FPRs, and this bill should expressly state the same.

6) **Author’s statement:**

California's wildfire crisis requires us to implement proven wildfire mitigation projects as quickly and effectively as possible. SB 1370 builds on the success of Governor Newsom's emergency wildfire streamlining efforts by creating a permanent framework for the expedited review of qualifying wildfire mitigation projects. The bill establishes a coordinated state review process, requires projects to demonstrate measurable wildfire risk reduction and cost-effectiveness, and provides greater certainty for critical activities such as vegetation management, fuel reduction, prescribed fire, and community protection projects. By reducing unnecessary permitting delays while maintaining environmental safeguards, SB 1370 will help California better protect communities, infrastructure, and natural resources from catastrophic wildfire.

- 7) **Committee amendments.** The *Committee may wish to consider* amending the bill to:
- a) Require NRA and CalEPA to consult with the boards, agencies, departments, and offices within each of their agencies through the projects review teams established under the EPP;
  - b) Establish geographical limitations consistent with current law on the scope of the specified wildfire reduction projects;
  - c) Clarify the rules applicable to herbicide application;
  - d) Clarify FPR-regulated projects shall continue to comply with the FPRs;
  - e) Clarify the process for submission and authorization of the consolidated permit package;
  - f) Augment the reporting requirements with additional information to be provided; and,
  - g) Sunset the bill on December 31, 2030.
- 8) **Related legislation.** AB 2410 (Ellis) exempts from CEQA specified critical fuels reduction projects conducted in a community located in a high fire threat district as determined by the PUC or very high fire hazard severity zone as identified by the State Fire Marshal or as designated by a local government. This bill is in the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

## **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

### **Support**

American Property Casualty Insurance Association  
 California Chamber of Commerce  
 California State Association of Counties  
 Edison International and Affiliates, Including Southern California Edison  
 League of California Cities  
 Megafire Action  
 National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies  
 Pacific Association of Domestic Insurance Companies  
 Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
 Personal Insurance Federation of California  
 Rural County Representatives of California  
 San Diego Gas & Electric  
 The Nature Conservancy (if amended)

### **Opposition**

350 Bay Area Action  
 350 Humboldt  
 7th Generation Advisors

California Chaparral Institute  
California Civil Defense Institute (unless amended)  
California Native Plant Society  
Californians for Pesticide Reform  
Center for Biological Diversity  
Center for Environmental Health  
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment  
Endangered Habitats League (unless amended)  
Environment California  
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin  
Environmental Information Protection Center  
Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety  
Feather River Action!  
GMO Science  
Pacific Forest Trust (unless amended)  
Pesticide Action & Agroecology Network  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay  
Resource Renewal Institute  
Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance  
Sierra Club  
Sunflower Alliance

**Analysis Prepared by:** Paige Brokaw / NAT. RES. /