CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
AB 2418 (Mark González)
As Amended August 10, 2026
Majority vote

SUMMARY

Requires, until January 1, 2032, local agencies to contract with or employ, or allow an applicant to retain, a private provider to check plans and specifications for specified nonresidential buildings if there is an excessive delay in the local agency's estimate or performance of this function; specifies requirements for fees that local agencies may prescribe for nonresidential building permits; and, requires inspections of specified nonresidential buildings or structures to be conducted within 10 business days of a notice of completion of permitted work for those projects.

Senate Amendments

1) Change the sunset date on the provisions of this bill pertaining to private plan-checking from January 1, 2037, to January 1, 2032.

2) Require a city or county to conduct a random audit of at least 20% of the nonresidential building permits issued annually under this bill, as specified. If an audit reveals material noncompliance, the city or county shall, within 10 business days following the audit, provide a notice to the applicant specifying the requirements for the plans and specifications to comply.

3) Allow a city or county to adopt requirements that do either of the following, provided that the requirements do not prohibit or effectively prohibit the use of a private professional provider pursuant to this bill: limit the size of an eligible nonresidential building to no less than 10,000 square feet; or, specify the eligible types of businesses or occupancy.

4) Limit the private plan-checking provisions of this bill to a nonresidential tenant improvement to a nonresidential building that is:

   a) One to three stories with no floors used for human occupancy more than 40 feet above ground level.

   b) A Group B (Business) Occupancy as defined in the California Building Code with an occupant load that does not exceed 49 persons.

   c) Not a health facility or public building.

5) Specify that nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the displacement of public employees. The use of a private professional provider pursuant to this bill shall be strictly temporary in nature and shall not exceed the time required to complete the review of the tenant improvement application. A local agency shall not reduce, eliminate, or fail to fill budgeted civil service positions within the building department as a result of the use of private professional providers pursuant to this bill.

6) Make a number of technical, clarifying and conforming changes.

COMMENTS

Existing law requires a local agency to contract with or employ a private entity or persons on a temporary basis to perform plan-checking functions upon the request of an applicant when there is an "excessive delay" in checking the applicant's plans and specifications. Plan-checking includes items such as compliance with building, health, and safety codes.

For a nonresidential permit for the remodeling or tenant improvements of a building, "excessive delay" generally means the building department of the local agency has taken more than 50 days after receiving a complete application to check the applicant's plans and specifications. "Excessive delay" can also be claimed if the agency takes more than 60 days to check the initial application and check resubmitted corrected plans and specifications after the agency returned the plans to the applicant for correction.

To streamline housing construction, the Legislature enacted AB 253 (Ward), Chapter 487, Statutes of 2025, and AB 1308 (Hoover) Chapter 509, Statutes of 2025, which provided specific timelines for inspecting residential buildings and plans, a failure of which constituted a violation of the Housing Accountability Act.

Specifically, under AB 253, until January 1, 2036, an applicant for specified residential building projects may hire a private professional provider to check plans and specifications if the county or city estimates a timeframe that exceeds 30 days or does not complete this plan-checking function within 30 days. AB 1308 required local building departments to inspect permitted work within 10 business days of receiving notice of the completion of permitted work authorized by a building permit issued for specified housing projects.

This bill expands the framework of AB 253 and AB 1308 by adopting equivalent timelines and procedures for checking plans and approving building permits for specified nonresidential buildings and inspecting those buildings.

According to the Author
"It is essential that we reduce cost burdens on our small, local businesses, especially at a time when costs continue to rise for consumers and businesses alike. AB 2418 aims to mimic existing streamlined housing permitting processes and cut through red tape by establishing common-sense deadlines for plan checks and inspections. Small businesses, especially in historic, ethnic enclaves, in my district like Chinatown, Koreatown, Historic Filipinotown, Boyle Heights, and Pico-Union are hit hardest by delays to improve or set up their businesses the most and by making the permitting process more efficient and cheaper, they will be able to stay open and thrive."

Arguments in Support
The California Business Properties Association, NAIOP So-Cal, and the Building Owners and Managers Association of Greater Los Angeles, sponsors of this bill, write, "AB 2418 builds on reforms enacted last year under AB 253 (Ward, 2025) and AB 1308 (Hoover, 2025) and extends similar efficiencies to nonresidential projects."

"Local jurisdictions continue to face plan-checking delays due to staffing shortages and inconsistent workloads. These delays impact tenant improvements, new construction, and expansions. Even routine interior buildouts can take months, delaying openings and increasing costs. While residential timelines have improved, nonresidential projects still face unpredictable review processes."

"AB 2418 sets clear timelines for plan review and requires agencies to provide estimated review periods. If those timelines are exceeded, applicants may request a qualified third-party plan checker at their own expense. Third-party reviewers must meet jurisdiction standards, and local agencies retain full oversight and final authority."

"This is a targeted fix that improves predictability while maintaining local control."

Arguments in Opposition
The California Building Officials (CALBO) write, "At this time, CALBO is not aware of a single local building department that is not offering next-day inspections for completed and routine work. Further; It is common practice to employ third-party plan reviewers by local government who are knowledgeable of applicable local and state codes. We work with these third-party partners to complete specialized projects and inspections, assist with backlogs, and supplement our public sector staff. Our concerns rest in the process that is presented by AB 2418, which removes considerable control from local government officials and imposes timelines for completion in a *one-size fits all* format.

"Local governments work as expeditiously as possible to aid in the local commercial and political demands of their communities. While AB 2418 attempts to rectify an alleged problem in the local permitting process, what the bill does not address that, oftentimes, these permitting delays rest in the planning and zoning process – not building. If the sponsors of the bill truly seek to expedite the permitting process, AB 2418 is not accurately looking at the true delays and setbacks that occur in the permitting, inspection, and development processes.

"Further; bills that impose penalties upon local government where "permits are deemed approved" when a capricious deadline is imposed do nothing more than jeopardize public safety. Local government works with the resources it has available; and as previously noted, we oftentimes rely upon third-party private sector resources to make our proverbial ends meet. AB 2418 simply creates new barriers to completion for local government, while imposing penalties that will ultimately impact consumers and patrons."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8, negligible state costs.

VOTES:

ASM LOCAL GOVERNMENT: 10-0-0
YES: Carrillo, Ta, Johnson, Pacheco, Ramos, Ransom, Blanca Rubio, Stefani, Ward, Wilson

ASM JUDICIARY: 12-0-0
YES: Kalra, Macedo, Bauer-Kahan, Bryan, Connolly, Dixon, Harabedian, Pacheco, Papan, Sanchez, Stefani, Zbur

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0
YES: Wicks, Hoover, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Caloza, Ellis, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0-2
YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, 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, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
ABS, ABST OR NV: Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez

UPDATED

VERSION: August 10, 2026

CONSULTANT: Angela Mapp / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958 FN: 0003777