
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1894
Author: Blanca Rubio (D)
Amended: 5/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Becker, Seyarto, Allen, Cabaldon, Grove, Laird, Reyes

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/4/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Fish and wildlife: invasive mussels: imported water

SOURCE: San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

DIGEST: This bill prevents a public agency from prohibiting imported water deliveries for groundwater replenishment due to invasive mussels unless there is substantial, documented evidence of a proven health and safety risk as a result of the invasive mussels.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits, until January 1, 2030, a person from possessing, importing, shipping, or transporting in the state, or placing, planting, or causing to be placed or planted in any water within the state, invasive mussels (Fish and Game Code (FGC) §2301(a)).
- 2) Requires a public or private agency that operates a water supply system to cooperate with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to implement measures to avoid infestation by invasive mussels and to control or eradicate any infestation that may occur in a water supply system. Requires the

operator of the water supply system, if invasive mussels are detected, and in cooperation with CDFW to prepare and implement a plan to control or eradicate invasive mussels within the system, and eliminate or minimize any potential downstream transport of an invasive mussel (FGC §2301(d)).

- a) Requires all plans that do not specifically address invasive mussel species that are known to be present in bodies of water in the state as of January 1, 2026, to be updated or revised on or before September 30, 2027.
- 3) Requires any entity that discovers invasive mussels within the state to immediately report the discovery to CDFW (FGC §2301(e)).
- 4) Makes any person who violates the above provisions, violates any verbal or written order or regulation adopted pursuant to these provisions, or who resists, delays, obstructs, or interferes with the implementation of these provisions subject to an administrative penalty (FGC §2301(f)).
- 5) Defines “invasive mussel” as any nonnative detrimental mussel species that is capable of spreading in freshwater and is listed in specific regulations adopted by the Fish and Game Commission (FGC §2303).

This bill:

- 1) Prevents a public agency from prohibiting imported water deliveries for groundwater replenishment due to invasive mussels unless there is substantial, documented evidence of a proven health and safety risk as a result of the invasive mussels.
- 2) Defines “imported water deliveries for groundwater replenishment” as deliveries of water imported from outside a region’s local watershed or natural boundary, primarily originating from the State Water Project, the Colorado River, or the Eastern Sierra, where the water is to be used for managed aquifer recharge, groundwater rejection, spreading, percolation, or other activities intended to replenish groundwater supplies.
- 3) Specifies, for purposes of this bill, that water includes, but is not limited to, surface water conveyed by an aqueduct, canal, pipeline, or other conveyance.
- 4) Finds and declares that this bill addresses a matter of statewide concern and applies to all cities and counties, including charter cities and charter counties.

Comments

Recent author amendments. Recent author amendments limit the bill’s application to imported water deliveries for groundwater replenishment *that are made in*

compliance with an approved invasive mussel control plan. Specifically, unless there is a proven health and safety risk, a public agency would not be able to prohibit the importation of water for groundwater replenishment that is made in compliance with an CDFW-approved invasive mussel control plan.

But, what if? Despite adherence to a CDFW-approved invasive mussel control plan, it is still possible that invasive mussels can make their way to groundwater recharge facilities. Such instances are typically governed by the contractual agreement between the delivering and receiving entities. For example, in LACFCD's agreement, "[the entity conducting the spreading] shall be responsible for and shall fully compensate and reimburse [LACFCD] immediately upon request in connection with any damage to [LACFCD's] property or facilities caused directly or indirectly by the replenishment connection or any water flowing therefrom." Thus, if water imported from the SWP were to contain invasive mussels that damaged the facility, the San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District would be responsible for mitigating the situation.

It is unknown whether all water agencies and receiving agencies that would be impacted by this bill have similar provisions within their agreements.

See Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee policy analysis of this bill for complete background information.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/22/2026)

San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (Co-source)
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (Co-source)
Burbank Water and Power
California Municipal Utilities Association
City of Azusa
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
San Gabriel Valley Water Association
Three Valleys Municipal Water District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/22/2026)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “[s]everal water agencies in Los Angeles County are being blocked from delivering imported water needed to replenish groundwater despite complying with state law and developing approved plans to address invasive mussels. These disruptions undermine the court-ordered management of the Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin and threaten the primary drinking water source for more than 1.5 million residents, many in disadvantaged communities.

“AB 1894 ensures that critical water decisions affecting the entire state are made consistently at the state level and not through a patchwork of conflicting local rules. By aligning policy with science and existing law, this bill protects our water supply, supports emergency response needs, and upholds California’s commitment to the human right to water while prioritizing strategies to mitigate the threats of the invasive Golden Mussel.”

According to a coalition letter representing various water agencies, including the co-sponsors of the bill, AB 1894 would “establish clarification of the adherence of state law and regulatory guidelines when it comes to preventing, controlling, and eradicating of the newly immersed invasive golden mussel, along with other invasive species.” Additionally, “the interruption of the imported water delivers also threatens the 1973 Main San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Adjudication, which expressly relies on the continued delivery of imported water to offset overdraft and maintain sustainability. Imported water deliveries are not discretionary for the Basin; it is a fundamental element of the groundwater adjudication’s physical solution.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to the Valley Ag Water Coalition, writing in an opposed unless amended position, there are 4 main issues. First, “the bill usurps the authority of a groundwater recharge facility owner to protect its investment in design, permitting, and construction of the facility, and removes control of the facility from the owner by requiring it to accept the importation of water supplies from known infested bodies of water.”

Second, the bill’s “broad preemption of local authority could ultimately increase risks to water supply reliability by importing invasive mussels into an area that is not infested. ... AB 1894 would expose ... areas to infestation of golden mussels through the forced importation of State Water Project supplies from the north.”

Third, “if invasive mussels are detected, the operator of the water supply system – not the entity importing the water – would be required to prepare and implement a plan to control or eradicate invasive mussels within the system AB 1894, in

effect, shifts the burden from the entity creating the problem to the operator of the water supply system that [accepts the water].”

Finally, the coalition argues that “[golden mussels] are not directly known to pose a direct threat to human health, but they do create significant safety and infrastructure risks that can be indirectly affect public well-being. Therefore, the health and safety risk exception provided ...would be unlikely to ever apply.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/4/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bennett, Bonta, Caloza, Chen, Muratsuchi

Prepared by: Genevieve Wong / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/24/26 16:32:20

**** END ****