

Date of Hearing: June 16, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND TOXIC MATERIALS

Damon Connolly, Chair

SB 1259 (Blakespear) – As Amended May 18, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 21-10

SUBJECT: Refineries: decommissioning and remediation: cost estimates

SUMMARY: Requires oil refiners, no later than December 31, 2028, to submit to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) a draft report setting forth information concerning decommissioning and site remediation for every refinery it owns, operates, or controls. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Defines "refiner" as any person who owns, operates, or controls the operations of one or more refineries and includes persons who formerly owned, operated, or controlled the operations of one or more refineries that processed crude oil feedstocks, but now process renewable feedstocks and otherwise meet that definition.
- 2) Defines "refinery" as any industrial plant, regardless of capacity, processing crude oil feedstock and manufacturing oil products and includes facilities that formerly processed crude oil feedstocks, but now process renewable feedstocks.
- 3) Defines "trade secret" as all forms and types of financial, business, scientific, technical, economic, or engineering information, including patterns, plans, compilations, program devices, formulas, designs, prototypes, methods, techniques, processes, procedures, programs, or codes, whether tangible or intangible, and whether or how stored, compiled, or memorialized physically, electronically, graphically, photographically, or in writing if the owner thereof has taken reasonable measures to keep that information secret; and the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information. Exempts specified types of information from being trade secret.
- 4) Requires, refiners, no later than December 31, 2028, to submit to the State Water Board a draft report setting forth information concerning decommissioning and site remediation for every refinery it owns, operates, or controls. Requires the report to be detailed and technically rigorous, and to include all of the following components:
 - a) A plan for decommissioning the refinery, including, but not limited to, cleaning, removal, and disposal of physical refinery infrastructure, such as refining equipment, tanks, and pipelines. Requires the plan to include all of the following:
 - i) A technical description of the anticipated decommissioning processes;
 - ii) The estimated cost and duration of the decommissioning;
 - iii) Documentation of a source of funds available to cover the cost estimate for decommissioning; and,

- iv) A specific description of the applicable local, state, or federal laws, regulations, or orders that impose financial assurances for completion of decommissioning or remediation on the owner or operator.
 - b) A description of anticipated site remediation measures, including, but not limited to, remediation of soil and groundwater and any needed measures to address associated offsite contamination. The description shall include all of the following:
 - i) A technical description of anticipated decommissioning processes;
 - ii) The estimated cost and duration of remediation activities;
 - iii) Documentation of a source of funds available to cover the cost described above; and,
 - iv) A specific description of the applicable local, state, or federal laws, regulations, or orders that impose financial assurances for completion of decommissioning or remediation on the owner or operator.
- 5) Requires the development and presentation of the draft report required of the refiners for the decommissioning and remediation of its refinery to be governed by all of the following principles, methods, and assumptions:
- a) The draft report shall separately specify each component of decommissioning and site remediation, presenting a separate description and cost estimate associated with each component;
 - b) The refiner shall consult with all state and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over the decommissioning and remediation, including, but not limited to, the relevant Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards), the State Water Board, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the relevant air quality management district or air pollution control district, and the relevant certified unified program agency. A record of the consultation shall be included in the report;
 - c) The draft report shall fully document the basis for every cost calculation, based upon, as appropriate, both site-specific estimates and the cost of reasonably comparable decommissioning and remediation at other refineries, both in state and out of state;
 - d) If the information needed to accurately estimate costs is unknown, the refiner shall undertake a diligent investigation to obtain that information;
 - e) For purposes of cost estimation, if the refinery's retirement date is unknown, the estimate shall present results that assume alternative refinery closure dates in the years 2030, 2035, 2040, and 2045 for the purpose of establishing present value;
 - f) The estimated methods, costs, and timelines of soil and groundwater remediation in the report shall be reasonably consistent where applicable with the overview prepared by the State Water Board pursuant to this bill; and,
 - g) The report may include analysis of multiple potential decommissioning and remediation alternatives, with a reasoned explanation of the likelihood of each.

- 6) Requires, no later than six months following submission of the draft report, the State Water Board, , in consultation with the applicable Regional Water Board, to review the draft report for completeness and reasonableness and make one of the following determinations:
 - a) The draft report complies with all requirements;
 - b) The draft report requires minor, non-substantive corrections to comply with all requirements; or,
 - c) The draft report does not comply with all requirements. Requires the State Water Board, if it makes this determination, to disclose the specific, material deficiencies demonstrating why the draft report does not comply with all requirements.
- 7) Requires the refinery, if the State Water Board determines the draft report does not comply with all requirements, to revise its draft report to address the deficiencies within 60 days, unless the State Water Board determines that an extension of time, not to exceed six months, is required.
- 8) Requires the State Water Board, once a draft report is determined to comply with all requirements, to make the draft report available on the State Water Board's internet website for public comment for not less than 45 days. Requires the State Water Board to include in the draft report an addendum, as necessary, describing the basis of any trade secrets redacted pursuant to this bill. Authorizes the State Water Board, after the public comment period, to require further revisions to the draft report before the report is deemed final.
- 9) Requires the State Water Board to promptly make the final report available to the public on the State Water Board's internet website. Requires the final report to include an addendum, as necessary, describing the basis of any trade secrets redacted.
- 10) Requires a refiner, if the refiner submitting a draft or final report believes that the report contains a trade secret, to assert the claim upon submission of the report.
- 11) Requires the State Water Board to provide the refiner with a decision concerning the claim of trade secret protection within 30 days following receipt of the claim. The State Water Boards decision shall specify whether the State Water Board is denying the claim, granting it in part, or granting it in its entirety, shall provide all factual and legal bases for the decision.
- 12) Authorizes a person to seek judicial review of the State Water Board's decision to grant a claim of trade secret from a refiner.
- 13) Requires refiners to present to the State Water Board annual updates to the report submitted covering decommissioning and remediation of their refinery, including any new information that has become available.
- 14) Requires, on or before December 31, 2027, the State Water Board to develop an overview of the methods, costs, and timelines of soil and groundwater remediation that have been employed at refineries that have undergone decommissioning and remediation.
- 15) Requires the State Water Board, in consultation with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, no later than one year after receiving the

reports required by this bill, to publish a report assessing the total decommissioning and remediation liabilities for refineries in the state. This report shall do all of the following:

- a) Protect confidential business information or other information that may be subject to protection under the Petroleum Industry Information Reporting Act of 1980 or other applicable laws;
- b) Include consideration of the existing financial assurances that operating refineries are subject to under local, state, and federal laws and regulations;
- c) Assess the risk of existing financial assurance mechanisms as being inadequate to cover decommissioning and remediation costs; the report may contemplate alternative modes and mechanisms of ensuring adequate resources are available to fund and execute necessary decommissioning and remediation activities; and,
- d) Include coordination with state and local agencies as the State Water Board deems necessary and appropriate.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) to regulate discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States and to set quality standards for surface waters. (33 United States Code § 1251, et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne), which prohibits the discharge of pollutants to surface waters unless the discharger obtains a permit from the State Water Board; declares that the health, safety, and welfare of people require there to be a statewide program for water quality control and that the statewide program for water quality control can be most effectively administered regionally, within a framework of statewide coordination and policy. (Water Code (WC) § 13000, et seq.)
- 3) Prohibits the discharge of waste or pollutants to surface and ground waters unless the discharger obtains a permit from the State Water Board or a Regional Water Board. (WC § 13260, et seq.)
- 4) Requires specified persons to file a report of waste discharges with the appropriate Regional Water Board. Provides that specified persons include a person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, outside the boundaries of the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the waters of the state within any region. (WC § 13260(a)(2))
- 5) Requires, by December 31, 2025, the owner or operator of an underground storage tank (UST) to permanently close that UST if the UST does not meet certain requirements in state law and regulation. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 25292.05)
- 6) Establishes the Barry Keene Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund Act of 1989, which created the UST Cleanup Fund Program to help owners and operators of petroleum USTs satisfy federal and state financial responsibility requirements, until January 1, 2036. (HSC § 25299.10)

- 7) Requires every owner and operator of a UST to establish and maintain evidence of financial responsibility for taking corrective action and compensating third parties for bodily injury and property damage arising from operating an underground storage tank. (HSC § 25299.31)
- 8) Requires DTSC to enforce the standards within the HWCL and the regulations adopted by DTSC pursuant to the HWCL. (HSC § 25180)
- 9) Authorizes DTSC to issue permits for the use and operation of one or more hazardous waste management units at a facility that meets the standards adopted pursuant to the HWCL. (HSC § 25200 (a))
- 10) Requires DTSC to impose conditions on each permit specifying the types of hazardous wastes that may be accepted for transfer, storage, treatment, or disposal. (HSC § 25200 (a))
- 11) Establishes a process, under the Green Chemistry statutes, for a person to identify a portion of information it submits to DTSC as a trade secret (HSC § 25257)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill: According to the author, "Refineries are unique among major energy infrastructure because they are not required to meaningfully disclose or plan for cleanup costs until closure is imminent. Other energy sectors, such as nuclear, wind, and solar, are required to plan, set aside funds and submit advanced disclosures to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission for eventual closing of infrastructure. Due to forces at play globally and in California, we must plan for a future with fewer refineries in our state. We need to know the potential timelines and costs for refinery cleanups long before refineries close, so communities affected and the State can be ready and prepared to transition. SB 1259 is a commonsense transparency measure that requires refineries to proactively and collaboratively share information with the State to help us plan for the future of the land refineries sit upon today."

Federal Clean Water Act (CWA): The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was the first major U.S. law to address water pollution. The law was amended in 1972 and became commonly known as the CWA. The CWA establishes the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into the waters of the United States and regulating quality standards for surface waters. Under the CWA, the United States Environmental Protection Agency has implemented pollution control programs, including setting wastewater standards for industrial facilities, as well as setting water quality standards for all contaminants in surface waters. The CWA made it unlawful to discharge any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters without a permit.

State regulation of water pollution: The State Water Board is responsible for administering the federal CWA and California's Water Quality Act, enacted in 1969, which set up the statewide structure for water quality control. The Water Quality Act designates the State Water Board as the water pollution control agency for all purposes stated in the CWA, and authorizes the State Water Board to exercise any powers that the federal CWA delegates to the State. The State

Water Board and the Regional Water Boards are charged with preventing and reducing water pollution in rivers, streams, lakes, beaches, bays, and groundwater.

Remedial actions for waste releases: There are currently thousands of contaminated sites across the state and the unauthorized releases of pollutants pose a risk to public health and the environment. These sites are complex and vary widely. They can include pesticide manufacturing facilities, rail yards, ports, dry cleaners, and refineries where pollutants were released to the soil, groundwater, surface water, and/or sediment. The types of pollutants encountered at these sites are plentiful and diverse and can include solvents, heavy metals, and petroleum. Some of these pollutants can persist in the environment, meaning that today's contaminated sites may be due to historical or recent unauthorized releases of pollutants.

The State Water Board and DTSC both have authority to over hazardous waste cleanup, but each maintains different jurisdictions. The State Water Board oversees remediation where hazardous waste impacts surface or ground waters of the state, as well as UST contamination. There are nine Regional Water Boards that exercise rulemaking and regulatory activities in regions defined by watersheds. DTSC oversees all other hazardous waste release cleanup.

The Regional Water Boards and DTSC are charged with identifying parties that are responsible for contamination, setting cleanup standards and requirements, and overseeing the cleanup of contaminated sites to ensure that they are properly remediated and do not continue to pose a threat to public health and the environment. State law specifies requirements for cleaning up contaminated sites, and the Regional Water Boards and DTSC have developed extensive policies and procedures for determining the extent and type of contamination, and processes and standards for the proper remediation of contaminated sites.

State Water Board's Cleanup Program: The Site Cleanup Program (SCP) regulates and oversees the investigation and cleanup of "non-federally owned" sites where recent or historical unauthorized releases of pollutants to the environment, including soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment, have occurred. Sites in the program are varied and include, but are not limited to, pesticide and fertilizer facilities, rail yards, ports, equipment supply facilities, metals facilities, industrial manufacturing and maintenance sites, dry cleaners, bulk transfer facilities, refineries, and some brownfields. These releases are generally not from strictly petroleum USTs. The types of pollutants encountered at the sites are plentiful and diverse and include solvents, pesticides, heavy metals, and fuel constituents to name a few.

Oil refineries in California: California refineries produce most of the refined petroleum transportation fuels that the state consumes. Refineries take crude oil and refine it into various petroleum products, primarily transportation fuels such as gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel. Other refinery products or byproducts include asphalt, plastic feedstocks, petrochemicals, lubricants, and sulfur. . California has more refining capacity than any state except Texas and Louisiana. As of April 2026, there were eight gasoline-producing refineries operating in the state. Three are in Northern California, four are in Southern California, and one small refinery is in Central California. One in Northern California (Valero Benicia) is expecting to fully idle refining operations by the end of April 2026, but continue importing fuel.

The state's petroleum system has gone through changes in recent years. Marathon converted its Martinez (Contra Costa County) refinery to renewable fuels production in 2023. Phillips 66 converted its Rodeo (Contra Costa County) refinery to renewable fuels production in 2024.

California Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL): The HWCL is the state's program that implements and enforces federal hazardous waste law in California and directs DTSC to oversee and implement the state's hazardous waste laws and regulations. Any person who stores, treats, or disposes of hazardous waste must obtain a permit from DTSC. The HWCL covers the entire management of hazardous waste, including hazardous waste generation, management, transportation, and ultimately disposal into a state or federally authorized facility.

DTSC's hazardous waste management permitting program: DTSC is responsible for administering the hazardous waste facility permitting program established under the HWCL and the federal RCRA. The core activities of the permitting program include: review of RCRA and non-RCRA hazardous waste permit applications to ensure safe design and operation; issuance and denial of operating permits; issuance of post-closure permits; approval and denial of permit modifications; issuance and denial of emergency permits; review and approval of closure plans; oversight of approved closure plans; and, ensuring a public process on the permitting of hazardous waste facilities.

Closure requirements under DTSC's hazardous waste facility permit: As a condition of a hazardous waste facility permit, before the facility operates under that permit or as a condition of a permit renewal, the permit includes a requirement that the facility provide a cost estimate for closure of the facility, provide evidence of financial assurance for that cost estimate and provide a cost estimate for any remediation, both onsite and offsite, at the facility (also known as corrective action). Under the law governing the permitting of hazardous waste facilities, there is not a provision dealing with trade secrets. Additionally, these hazardous waste facility permits are publicly available on DTSC's website, including the closure cost estimates.

Examples of existing closure costs estimates of hazardous waste facilities: Below are two examples of a publicly available closure cost estimate for a hazardous waste facility:

- 1) The Chevron El Segundo refinery in the City of El Segundo has a hazardous waste facility permit that covers two active hazardous waste units and one closed hazardous waste unit. The two active units include a polychlorinated biphenyl storage building and a hazardous waste storage and treatment facility. The closed unit covers a former land treatment facility. The closure cost estimated for the active hazardous waste units (in 2022 dollars) as approved by DTSC is \$2,772,312. The post-closure care cost estimate for the closed unit (2019 dollars) as approved by DTSC is \$2,525,317. The corrective action (remediation) cost estimate (in 2022 dollars) as approved by the Los Angeles Water Quality Control Board (as the lead agency) is \$39,883,696.
- 2) Phibro-Tech, Inc. (PTI), in the city of Santa Fe Springs, is an inorganic chemical manufacturing facility, with a hazardous waste facility permits that includes the treatment/recycling and transfer of inorganic hazardous wastes. PTI receives inorganic hazardous wastes from off-site generators and treats the waste by reclaiming metals and inorganic chemicals, which PTI then sells to customers. The closure cost estimate (2024 dollars) as approved by DTSC is \$10,522,632. The cost estimate for corrective action (2024 dollars) as approved by DTSC is \$2,163,277.

A cautionary tale -- Exide Technologies: In 2000, Exide Technologies, headquartered in Georgia, purchased a facility—first opened in 1922—in the City of Vernon, a few miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles. The facility occupied 15 acres in a heavily industrial

region with surrounding residential areas. Facility operations included recycling lead-bearing scrap materials obtained from spent lead-acid batteries. The facility processed about 25,000 batteries a day, providing a source of lead for new batteries. The Department of Health Services (DHS) Toxic Substances Control Division issued an interim status authorization in 1981 to Gould, Inc., operator of the facility at the time. While seeking a hazardous waste facility permit, the facility operated under that interim authorization until it closed in 2015.

As a result of extensive investigations, contamination from the facility was found both on-site and off-site. Activities conducted at the former Exide facility that may have contributed to contamination of offsite properties include battery breaking, smelting, refining lead, and storage, handling, and transportation of batteries, finished lead product, and other materials associated with lead recycling operations. Many of these activities occurred for decades before environmental statutes or regulations existed and without proper environmental control measures, and may have contributed to releases of lead in the residential area near the facility. In March 2015 Exide permanently closed the facility.

Residential cleanup near Exide: The Exide residential cleanup project constitutes the largest cleanup effort undertaken by California. DTSC is the lead agency overseeing the investigation and cleanup of residential properties, schools, parks, daycare, and childcare centers within the approximately 1.7-mile radius of the former Exide facility. Exide filed for bankruptcy in 2015, and while the pending permit had financial assurance for closure of approximately \$15 million, the extent of the contamination is significantly more costly. To date, the state has spent over \$600 million of taxpayer funds (from the state's General Fund) to remediate the contamination from Exide. The residential cleanup is ongoing and onsite remediation of soil has yet to begin.

Current legislation requiring closure cost estimates of operating facilities: SB 811 (Caballero), which is pending action in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee, establishes a permitting requirement for the state's ten metal shredding facilities overseen by DTSC. Among the requirements for this metal shredder permit is a requirement that each facility provide DTSC a closure cost estimate, as well as an assessment of potential contamination on-site. Additionally, SB 811, does not contain any specific provisions on trade secrets. It's important to note that SB 811 is sponsored by metal shredding facilities.

Policy question: Should oil refineries provide the State Water Board with closure cost estimates and remediation costs estimates, so that the state is prepared to deal with the closure of a refinery, especially if that refinery files bankruptcy and the state is left to close the facility and remediate the site?

This bill: SB 1259 requires oil refiners, no later than December 31, 2028, to submit to the State Water Board a draft report setting forth information concerning decommissioning and site remediation for every refinery it owns, operates, or controls. This type of closure cost and remediation estimate is currently required of hazardous waste facilities in the state. The closure cost estimate will be very important for the State Water Board to have, in the event an oil refinery closes and files for bankruptcy protection, leaving the state to close and remediate the site (likely while at the same time seeking cost recovery from the oil refiner).

Potential amendments: The committee and author may wish to amend the bill as follows:

- 1) Given that the requirements for other closure cost estimates of hazardous waste facilities and the proposed requirements of metal shredding facilities within SB 811 do not contain language regarding trade secrets, the bill could be amended to delete the trade secret language in the bill. If stakeholders are interesting in adding in trade secret protections, the trade secret language under DTSC's green chemistry statutes could be an option.
- 2) A technical change to restructure the language in the bill to make it more clear that the requirements in the bill are focused on the retirement of oil refineries.
- 3) Other technical and conforming changes.

Double-referral: Should this bill pass the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee, it will be re-referred to the Assembly Utilities and Energy Committee.

Arguments in support: According to a coalition of environmental justice organizations:

"SB 1259 will equip the state of California with critical information for California's communities to proactively plan for refinery decommissioning and land revitalization.

Workers, residents, and taxpayers all benefit from greater clarity about the future of their communities, beginning with transparent planning and disclosure of legacy pollution and cleanup obligations. California's refineries are closing due to global market dynamics (rather than due to California regulations). California's refining sector is in terminal decline due to a multitude of factors including a declining demand for gas and diesel, corporate consolidation, and aging infrastructure and maintenance costs. Refineries are closing and these closures need to be managed. The lack of defined refinery transition plans has and will continue to negatively impact communities, workers, and local jurisdictions. We must ground this reality in the potential impacts to communities.

SB 1259 would create transparency in a deeply opaque industry that utilizes loopholes to shield information from the public. By requiring refiners to file decommissioning and remediation plans, with associated cost estimates, this bill would allow communities, workers, and taxpayers to understand the timeline and cost of land revitalization for community uses. As we prepare for refinery transitions, it is critical that we equip the state of California and communities with relevant data and information so they can prepare and actively plan for revitalization and reuse, giving communities burdened by legacy pollution an opportunity to actively dream of a different future.

The transparency created by SB 1259 is generally standard across the energy sector. In fact, oil refineries are unique amongst all energy infrastructure in that they have insufficient requirements for decommissioning or remediation plans, or financial assurances.

Refineries handle some of the most toxic substances in the state, yet they are under-regulated compared to other energy systems. SB 1259 is a small but important step to bring refineries up to date with basic information-sharing requirements in their industry. By requiring real cost estimates and clean up plans, transparency will help decision makers ensure that taxpayers are not stuck with the cost of cleaning up after polluters who have profited off California communities for decades."

Arguments in opposition: According to the Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA),

"WSPA and its member companies have worked extensively with the California Energy Commission and the Legislature, at the direction of Governor Gavin Newsom, to identify solutions to stabilize refinery operations and fuel supply in California. Yet the state still finds itself in a policy-driven crisis—losing in-state refining capacity at a pace that far exceeds the rate of declining fuel demand. At a time when the state should be focused on preserving remaining capacity and preventing further market disruption, SB 1259 moves California in the opposite direction. It sends a clear and deeply troubling signal to the few remaining refiners that continued investment in this state is increasingly untenable.

SB 1259 would compel refinery operators to estimate and disclose asset retirement obligations (AROs) and environmental liabilities based on speculative, hypothetical end-of-life scenarios—even when no closure decision has been made and a facility's useful life remains indeterminate. These requirements ignore well-established state and federal regulatory frameworks that already comprehensively govern remediation obligations, financial assurance, and cleanup responsibilities.

Moreover, refinery operators are already fully accountable under stringent legal and regulatory regimes that require investigation and remediation of environmental impacts. State and Regional Water Boards, along with federal Clean Water Act requirements, impose enforceable, site-specific obligations backed by permits, cleanup orders, and cost-recovery authority. These responsibilities do not disappear—they persist through operations, shutdown, and beyond. SB 1259 does nothing to strengthen these protections; instead, it imposes duplicative and unnecessary requirements that create confusion rather than clarity.

At a fundamental level, SB 1259 exacerbates an already fragile operating environment. California's refining sector is under extraordinary pressure from cumulative regulatory burdens, escalating compliance costs, and ongoing policy uncertainty. Imposing additional, unwarranted requirements at this moment will not improve business operations—it could likely accelerate the loss of critical in-state refining capacity."

Related legislation:

- 1) SB 811 (Caballero). Requires metal shredding facilities to obtain a permit under DTSC. Requires, among various things, metal shredder facilities to provide a closure plan and closure cost estimate before their permit can be approved by DTSC. This bill is pending action in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.
- 2) SB 404 (Caballero, 2025). Would have required metal shredding facilities to obtain a permit under DTSC. Requires, among various things, metal shredder facilities to provide a closure plan and closure cost estimate before their permit can be approved by DTSC. This bill was vetoed by Governor Gavin Newsom.
- 3) AB 753 (Grayson, 2021). Extends the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Trust Fund (USTCTF) to January 1, 2031. Requires the State Water Board to, on or before January 1, 2024, report to the Legislature, at the conclusion of a stakeholder study, recommendations for revising the eligibility criteria and funding priorities of the USTCTF in order to clean-up

contaminated properties that could be used for affordable housing. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

235 Individuals

350 Bay Area Action

Aapi Force

Acce Action (alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment)

Ahri Center, a Project of Tides Center

Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE) Action

Amazon Watch

Apen Action

Asian Pacific Environmental Network Action

Benicia Good Neighbor Steering Committee

Benicians for a Safe and Healthy Community

Biofuelwatch

California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) Action

California Environmental Voters

California Green New Deal Coalition

California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative

California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice

California Work & Family Coalition

CAUSE

Ceja Action

Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment

Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy

Cleaneearth4kids.org

Climate Action California

Climate Health Now Action Fund

Coalition for Clean Air

Communities for a Better Environment

Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)

Consumer Attorneys of California

Consumer Watchdog

Courage California

Earthjustice

Environmental Health Coalition

Equal Rights Advocates

Esperanza Community Housing

Fractracker Alliance

Fund Her

Good Neighbor Steering Committee of Benicia

Healthy Martinez

Individuals

Indivisible Alta-pasadena

Indivisible Ca: Statestrong

Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability
Long Beach Forward
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Phillipine Action Group for the Environment
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Poder
Poder Sf
San Diego 350
Sandiego350
Scope
Scope LA
Sierra Club California
Social 350 Climate Action
Stand-la Coalition (stand Together Against Neighborhood Drilling – Los Angeles)
Stand.earth
Sunflower Alliance
Supervisor John Gioia, Contra Costa County
The Climate Center
The Greenlining Institute
The Unidos Network
Torrance Refinery Action Alliance
Union of Concerned Scientists

Opposition

California Chamber of Commerce
California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance (CCEEB)
California State Council of Laborers
District Council of Iron Workers of the State of California and Vicinity
Los Angeles / Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California
Western States Petroleum Association

Analysis Prepared by: Josh Tooker / E.S. & T.M. / (916) 319-3965