
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Senator Blakespear, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: SB 1097
Author: Wiener
Version: 3/25/2026
Urgency: No
Consultant: Brynn Cook

Hearing Date: 4/15/2026
Fiscal: Yes

SUBJECT: California Environmental Quality Act: electrical distribution: clean energy: exemptions: standard of review

DIGEST: This bill creates a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption for advanced reconductoring and replacing transmission lines, and makes numerous changes to the CEQA process regarding how lead agencies and courts will determine what level of environmental review is appropriate for clean energy projects, overturning the ‘fair argument standard’ in existing law.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires, pursuant to CEQA, lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project to prepare a negative declaration (ND), mitigated negative declaration (MND), or environmental impact report (EIR) for the project, unless the project is exempt from CEQA. (Public Resources Code (PRC) §21000 et seq.). If a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare a draft EIR. (CEQA Guidelines §15064(a)(1), (f)(1))
- 2) Establishes legal standing for the lead agency selecting CEQA documents, specifically:
 - a) NDs and MNDs are held to the “fair argument” standard, which means that if a “fair argument” can be made that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an EIR shall be prepared even though there may be other substantial evidence that the project will not have a significant effect. (CEQA Guidelines § 15064(f)(1))
 - b) Defines “substantial evidence” to mean that there is enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. (CEQA Guidelines § 15384)
 - c) Defines “significant effect on the environment” to mean “a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions

within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. (CEQA Guidelines § 15382)

- 3) Specifies that the existence of a public controversy over the environmental effects of a project shall not require the preparation of an EIR if there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the lead agency that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (f)(4))

- 4) Establishes, pursuant to AB 205 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 61, Statutes of 2022) an “Opt-in” permitting process, by which authorized persons proposing eligible facilities, including electrical transmission lines carrying electricity from certain other facilities that are located in the state to a point of junction with any interconnected electrical transmission system, to file applications for certification, on or before June 30, 2029, with the California Energy Commission (CEC) to certify sites and related facilities. Provided that the CEC’s certification of sites and related facilities is in lieu of any permit, certificate, or similar document required by any state, local, or regional agency, except as specified, including the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) permit requirements. (Public Resources Code §25545 et seq.)
 - a) Deems the sites and related facilities certified by the CEC as Environmental Leadership Development Projects (ELDPs) and makes them eligible for the judicial streamlining of such projects. (Public Resources Code §25545.13)

- 5) Establishes the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2021 which authorizes the Governor, until January 1, 2032, to certify ELDPs that meet specified requirements for certain streamlining benefits related to the CEQA. Repeals the Act on January 1, 2032. (Public Resources Code §21178 et seq.)

- 6) Requires the CEQA Guidelines to include a list of classes of projects that have been determined by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency to not have a significant effect on the environment and that shall be exempt from CEQA. (PRC 21084). The list of “categorical exemptions” includes:
 - a) Repair and maintenance of existing public or private facilities, involving negligible or no expansion of use, including existing facilities of both

investor and publicly owned utilities used to provide electric power, natural gas, sewerage, or other public utility services (Guidelines § 15301)

- b) New construction or conversion of small structures, including electrical, gas, and other utility extensions of reasonable length to serve such construction. (Guidelines § 15303)
- 7) Requires the CPUC to certify the “public convenience and necessity” of a transmission line over 200 kilovolts (kV) before an investor-owned utility (IOU) may begin construction (Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, or CPCN). The CPCN process includes CEQA review of the proposed project. A CPCN confers eminent domain authority for construction of the project. A CPCN is not required for the extension, expansion, upgrade, or other modification of an existing electrical transmission facility, including transmission lines and substations. (Public Utilities Code (PUC) § 1001)
- 8) Requires an IOU to obtain a discretionary permit to construct (PTC) from the CPUC for electrical power line projects between 50-200 kV. A PTC may be exempt from CEQA pursuant to CPUC orders and existing provisions of CEQA. IOU electrical distribution line projects under 50 kV do not require a CPCN or PTC from the CPUC, nor discretionary approval from local governments, and therefore are not subject to CEQA. (PUC General Order (GO) 131-E)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes a CEQA exemption for maintaining, reconductoring or replacing and removing transmission lines that are:
 - a) Undertaken within an existing right of way (ROW), with permission from the property owner if it is a private ROW, on the condition that the applicant restore the ROW to its original condition.
- 2) Requires that the lead agency file a notice of exemption with the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) and with the county clerk in each county in which the project is located.
- 3) Makes a series of changes to the legal standards by which lead agencies determine which level of environmental review is required for a certain clean energy projects, as defined. In summation, these changes result in overturning the ‘fair argument’ standard in current law, which finds that if there is a fair argument to be made that a project has a significant effect on the environment, the project should be evaluated in an EIR. Instead, a lead agency would determine that a project should do an ND/MND if there is any substantial

evidence, as defined, that the project does not have a significant effect on the environment. Specifically, these changes to existing definitions include:

- a) Changing the definition of “mitigated negative declaration” by requiring that lead agencies should do a mitigated negative declaration if the project requires mitigation and substantial evidence shows that it does not have a significant effect on the environment: this overturns the more protective existing standard that “mitigated negative declarations” should be used only if there is *no* substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that the project will have a significant effect on the environment;
 - b) Changing the standard of “substantial evidence” from “substantial evidence shall include enough relevant information (facts, reasonable assumptions on the facts, and expert opinion supported by facts) that a fair argument, considering the whole record, can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached,” to “substantial evidence includes fact, a reasonable assumption predicated upon fact, or expert opinion supported by fact.” ;
 - c) Changing the definition of “Significant effect on the environment” to mean that the public agency has determined, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the proposed project is more likely than not to have a significant effect on the environment, replacing the existing definition of "Significant effect on the environment" as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.
- 4) Specifies that the existence of public controversy over the environmental effects of a project shall not require preparation of an EIR if an EIR would not otherwise be required by CEQA.
 - 5) Specifies that solar, wind, electric, electrical generating thermal powerplants (other than those relying on fossil or nuclear fuels) and energy storage systems that will be reviewed under the new standards in CEQA described above, shall not be located on:
 - a) A state park, a wilderness area, a marine protected area;
 - b) A national park, recreation area, monument, or national wild and scenic rivers system;

- c) Any ecological reserve or wildlife management area acquired and managed by the Department of Fish and Wildlife;
 - d) A hazardous waste site unless the site is an underground storage tank site that received a uniform closure letter or The State Department of Public Health, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, or a local agency has otherwise determined that the site is suitable for the use proposed by the project;
 - e) Within a regulatory floodway;
 - f) Lands under conservation easement;
 - g) On, or within a 300-foot radius of, a wetland;
 - h) An environmentally sensitive area within the coastal zone;
 - i) Lands identified for protection from development in an adopted natural community conservation plan, habitat conservation, or other natural resource protection plan;
 - j) Within a very high fire hazard severity zone, unless the sites have adopted fire hazard mitigation measures pursuant to existing building standards or state fire mitigation measures applicable to the development; or
 - k) Either prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance.
- 6) Specifies that transmission lines that will be reviewed under the new standards in CEQA described above, shall not be located on:
- a) High fire threat district designated a tier 2 or tier 3 fire threat area;
 - b) A hazardous waste site unless the site is an underground storage tank site that received a uniform closure letter or The State Department of Public Health, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, or a local agency has otherwise determined that the site is suitable for the use proposed by the project;
 - c) Within a regulatory floodway;
 - d) On, or within a 300-foot radius of, a wetland; or
 - e) Lands under conservation easement for preservation as wildlife habitat or for open-space purposes.
- 7) Requires that a lawsuit brought against the adoption of a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration as described above, including appeals, shall be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 days of the filing of the certified record of proceedings with the court.

Background

- 1) *The A, B, C's of CEQA*. CEQA is designed to (a) make government agencies and the public aware of the environmental impacts of a proposed project, (b)

ensure the public can take part in the review process, and (c) identify and implement measures to mitigate or eliminate any negative impact the project may have on the environment. CEQA is enforced by civil lawsuits that can challenge any project's environmental review. Nonprofits, private individuals, public agencies, advocacy groups, and other organizations can all file lawsuits under CEQA.

- 2) *ND/MND vs. EIR environmental review.* Under CEQA, projects (unless they have a specific exemption) must undergo environmental analysis. This process starts with an initial study which determines what level of further environmental review is needed for a given project. If a project has no significant effects on the environment, or if those effects can be fully mitigated, the project can move forward with a negative declaration (ND) or mitigated negative declaration (MND). If the initial study finds that the project has potential significant effects on the environment, then a full EIR is required. An EIR provides a more thorough environmental review of a proposed project, analyzing the significant direct and indirect environmental impacts of a proposed project on water quality, transportation, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, terrestrial and aquatic biological resources, surface and subsurface hydrology, land use and agricultural resources, aesthetics, geology and soils, recreation, public services and utilities such as water supply and wastewater disposal, and cultural resources, among other factors. The EIR also includes proposed mitigation measures for any significant effects that it identifies. It also requires a consideration of alternatives to the proposed project, and a consideration of cumulative and growth-inducing impacts.
- 3) *Legal standing for EIR vs. ND/MND.* When a lead agency is determining whether an ND/MND or EIR are appropriate for a project, they follow the evidentiary standards laid out in CEQA.

A lead agency's determination to use an ND/MNDs or EIR is held to the "fair argument" standard, which means that if a "fair argument" can be made that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an EIR shall be prepared even though there may be other substantial evidence that the project will not have a significant effect. Only if there are clearly no significant effects and no fair argument to be made that there are significant effects would an ND/MND be used (CEQA Guidelines § 15064(f)(1)). Another way of saying this is that the lead agency can pursue an ND/MND if there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment" (§21064.5).

- 4) *Transmission projects and permitting.* Electric transmission lines are generally high voltage lines that move electricity from power plants to substations, which in turn connect to distribution lines in neighborhoods. Companies, usually electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs), proposing the construction of new transmission, are required to obtain a permit from the CPUC for construction of transmission projects. The CPUC reviews permit applications under two concurrent processes: (1) an environmental review pursuant to CEQA, and (2) the review of project need and costs pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1001 and General Order (GO) 131-D (CPCN).

As the CPUC conducts the CEQA review, it also reviews the electric IOU's application for either a CPCN or a Permit to Construct (PTC). Which application the CPUC pursues depends on the size of the project, specifically:

- a) Projects below 50 kV are considered distribution projects, rather than transmission projects, and in general do not require CPUC approval.
- b) Projects between 50 kV and 200 kV require a PTC from the CPUC, which consists primarily of an environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The CPUC process generally does not require a detailed analysis of the need for or economics of these projects.
- c) Projects over 200 kV require a CPCN from the CPUC. The CPCN process analyzes the need for the project and the economics of the project, as well as the environmental impacts of the project.

The CPUC's decision on the CPCN or PTC cannot be issued until the environmental review is complete

Most projects are reviewed through the CPUC's advice letter approval process, which tends to be more simplified and expedient than a full application for a CPCN. According to CPUC data, from 2012 to 2023, 608 projects have been exempted from CEQA, 29 projects have been approved via negative declaration, and 27 have required an EIR.

- 5) *CEQA and permit streamlining for clean energy and transmission projects.* In recent years, the Legislature and Governor's Office have advanced a suite of policies to streamline clean energy projects and associated transmission lines.

Clean energy projects, including solar and wind projects, energy storage systems, power plants 50 MW or greater using any source of thermal energy, excluding fossil or nuclear fuels, and transmission lines associated with these generating and storage facilities, and facilities that manufacture or assemble clean energy or storage technologies or related components, and hydrogen

production facilities that are not derived from fossil fuel are eligible for the following CEQA streamlining processes:

- a) *270 day environmental review through the AB 205 opt-in process.* In 2022, the Legislature passed AB 205 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 21, Statutes of 2022), which created an optional process for clean energy projects to get environmental review and permit streamlining through a one-stop-shop at the CEC, with the CEC as the lead CEQA agency. The Opt-In program requires the CEC to complete an EIR in 270 days, certify compliance with requirements for community benefits agreement, project labor agreements, and economic benefits, and ensure consistency with all laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) under the Warren-Alquist Act.
- b) *270-day judicial review through AB 205 and the SB 149 ELDP process.* The same clean energy projects that are eligible for shortened 270-day environmental review are also eligible for CEQA judicial streamlining, meaning that actions or proceedings related to the certification of an environmental impact report need to be resolved within 270 days to the extent feasible. This judicial streamlining is available to clean energy projects that meet high labor and environmental criteria to become certified leadership projects under the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2021, and projects that go through the AB 205 opt-in process.
- c) *GO 131-E streamlining for electric transmission lines and existing CEQA exemptions.* SB 529 (Hertzberg), Chapter 357, Statutes of 2022, directed the CPUC to revise General Order (GO) 131-D to authorize a utility to use the PTC process or claim an exemption to seek approval to construct an extension, expansion, upgrade, or other modification to its existing transmission facilities regardless of the voltage level.

On January 30, 2025, the CPUC adopted GO 131-E, replacing the previous GO 131-D. The new order establishes updated rules for the permitting, approval, and construction of electric transmission lines, substations, and generation facilities. It also clarifies and streamlines the regulatory process. Some of these reforms include:

- i) Allow applicant-prepared draft CEQA documents: Applicants may submit draft CEQA documents alongside their applications, providing an alternative pathway that can accelerate environmental review. This approach reduces duplication and allows applicants to

- complete much of the required analysis in advance, streamlining the overall permitting process;
 - ii) Require pre-filing consultation: Applicants are now required to meet with CPUC staff at least six months before submitting their applications. This early engagement is intended to clarify requirements, address potential issues in advance, and support a more efficient and coordinated review process;
 - iii) Authorize a pilot program to explore faster CEQA review: A pilot program will be created to track CPUC CEQA review timelines and explore the potential for a faster CEQA review process for certain electric transmission projects;
 - iv) Implement presumption of need for projects: A “rebuttable presumption” will be implemented when the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) transmission planning process has already determined that a project is needed. This would streamline the CEQA review by removing CEQA’s alternative analyses for projects already determined to be needed by the CAISO; and
 - v) Limits the range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project in an initial draft EIR circulated for public comment to alternative routes or locations for construction of the relevant CAISO transmission plan approved electric project and the “no action” alternative.
- 6) *Reconductoring of powerlines.* Conductors are the wires that carry electricity. Most of the existing electric grid uses conductors with a steel core for strength surrounded by aluminum for the electrical current. More recently, conductor designs (referred to as advanced conductors) with composite or carbon cores, in place of steel, have come into use. Advanced conductors provide a variety of benefits including increased capacity. By increasing the capacity of powerlines it is possible to get more electricity into the grid without the need to build new powerlines. The new composite or carbon cores replacing steel are also lighter, leading to less sag in the line which may reduce the chances of the line connecting with vegetation (which is a fire risk).

Comments

Purpose of Bill. According to the author, “California must use every lever available to lower energy costs while tackling the climate crisis. The state needs to rapidly ramp up its deployment of clean energy and transmission infrastructure to meet our growing electricity needs, but far too many projects are getting caught up in permitting delays and lawsuits.

SB 1097 would expedite advanced reconductoring projects that increase capacity of our existing grid infrastructure and reduce wildfire risk. SB 1097 will also ensure that common sense, environmentally beneficial clean energy generation, storage, and transmission projects get constructed quickly.

SB 1097 is critical to ensuring that California can make the clean energy progress we need to stabilize energy prices and meet our climate goals”

- 2) *CEQA exemption for reconductoring.* Reconductoring existing transmission lines can provide important benefits, including environmental benefits. Reconductored transmission lines have increased capacity compared to existing conductors with a steel core, meaning that more electricity can be carried through the same line. Having more power go through one, existing line, can reduce the number of new transmission lines that need to be built.

The CEQA Guidelines already contain two categorical exemptions that would seem to cover reconductoring and replacement for transmission lines, including CEQA exemptions for:

- a) Repair and maintenance of existing public or private facilities including existing facilities of both investor and publicly owned utilities. (Guidelines 15301)
- b) New construction or conversion of small structures, including electrical, gas, and other utility extensions of reasonable length to serve such construction. (Guidelines 15303)

However, since these are categorical exemptions, they only apply to projects that are presumed to have no significant effects on the environment (e.g. the exemptions do not apply to a project if there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances). In this scenario, the CEQA exemption envisioned by SB 1097 would primarily benefit reconductoring for projects that could have a significant effect on the environment.

As written, the CEQA exemption for advanced reconductoring could include replacing the poles or towers that the wires are ‘directly attached to’ with new poles, or even replacing poles with metal towers that have a much larger footprint.

To ensure that reconductoring projects using this new statutory exemption in SB 1097 are not having significant adverse impacts on sensitive and protected lands, ***the author and committee may wish to amend this exemption to specify that the exemption will have more stringent criteria for projects that go through sensitive sites, as defined. Specifically, the exemption will only***

apply if the reconductoring does not expand the footprint of the transmission line or if the right of way where the CEQA exemption applies has been previously considered in environmental review under CEQA for projects on sensitive sites. Sensitive sites includes state parks; national parks, wilderness, and recreation areas; habitat for protected species; areas in habitat conservation and natural and community conservation plans, and conservation easements.

- 3) *Flipping the “Fair Argument” standard to favor less rigorous environmental review for clean energy projects.* Under CEQA today, if there is a “fair argument” based on substantial evidence that a project has significant impacts on the environment, that project would go through the rigorous EIR process, rather than the less rigorous ND/MNDs review. In other words, CEQA errs on the side of requiring EIRs where there is a fair case to be made that the project would have significant impacts. This is an intentional preference for more environmental review when it is likely that there are significant impacts. In these scenarios, further environmental review may be necessary to determine if impacts are significant. It also reflects a consideration that the risk of doing unnecessary environmental review is less important than the risk of leaving environmental impacts undisclosed and unmitigated.

SB 1097 seeks to overturn this standard. It approaches this goal by changing—for the purposes of certain clean energy projects—many of the core definitions of CEQA, including how a ‘mitigated negative declaration’ is defined, how ‘substantial evidence’ is defined, and how “significant effect on the environment” is defined. SB 1097 allows lead agencies to forgo an EIR and instead do an ND/MND as long as there is more evidence than not that the project’s impacts will not be significant.

Put another way, under SB 1097, if a lead agency thinks that there is a 49% likelihood that a project has a significant effect on the environment, and a 51% likelihood that a project does not have a significant effect on the environment, the project would proceed under an ND/MND and not an EIR.

- 4) *More ND/MNDs, fewer EIRs: pros and cons.* Practically speaking, the outcome of flipping the existing standard of review for EIRs vs. ND/MNDs will be fewer EIRs and more ND/MNDs for clean energy and transmission projects.

If an ND/MND provides sufficient environmental review, then doing the more rigorous and time-consuming EIR would be a waste of time and resources. In addition, lead agencies may currently err on the side of doing EIRs if the

project is likely to be challenged since the “fair argument” standing in law today makes it easier to defend the decision to use EIR instead of an ND/MND.

On the other hand, using an ND/MND when there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts on the environment could mean that significant impacts go undisclosed to decision makers or the public, community input is limited, and those impacts remain unmitigated.

Perhaps most significantly, MNDs do not include analyses of alternatives, or consideration of cumulative and growth-inducing impacts. For large scale projects, considering alternatives is an essential component of ensuring that the project’s site is chosen with environmental parameters in mind. Likewise, clean energy projects are likely to have significant growth-inducing and cumulative impacts that should be considered through an environmental lens.

- 5) *Speeding through uncharted waters?* SB 1097 creates a new process with new standards for evaluating what environmental review documents should be used under CEQA, likely resulting in those projects moving forward with MNDs rather than with EIRs. This is intended to reduce the amount of time spent reviewing clean energy projects by moving clean energy projects through MD/MNDs, which are only a fraction of the length of EIR documents. If the environmental review done in EIRs is excessive for a given project, and moving environmental review for complex projects from an EIR to an ND/MND, SB 1097 could reduce timelines for clean energy projects: an important goal since the state lags significantly in achieving its clean energy goals.

However, it is not clear if EIRs environmental review is excessive for clean energy or merely appropriate. It is also not clear if moving complex projects that currently require EIRs into ND/MNDs would result in the time savings that apply to current EIRs vs. ND/MNDs, given that ND/MNDs do not currently contemplate such complex projects. ND/MNDs today are significantly shorter than EIRs because the projects they contemplate don’t have any outstanding effects on the environment, not because of some intrinsic property of an MND. Moving projects through MNDs when those projects have a 49% chance of having environmental projects could simply result in bulkier MNDs... and higher chances of litigation since the MND process of review, public engagement, and mitigation is not geared towards projects that still have a not-insignificant (49% or less) chance of having significant impacts on the environment.

Moreover, in changing definitions that have been baked into CEQA for decades for only a portion of the law, with new untested definitions, it is extremely likely that these projects and new standards of review will be subject to litigation, delaying the very projects they are intended to speed up.

Given that the Legislature and GO have recently adopted numerous streamlining measures for clean energy projects that work, SB 1097 creates a new process by which clean energy projects will be likely to have less thorough environmental review, rather than retaining the thorough environmental review in the EIR but moving those projects through faster timelines, as established by recent legislation in AB 205, SB 149, and in GO-131 E.

It is worth considering whether rejecting these very recent streamlining changes for clean energy in favor of new, untested changes to legal standard as proposed in SB 1097, which will take time for lead agencies and courts to become familiar and adept at interpreting, will result in time savings that would not otherwise have been achieved.

As such, the author and committee may wish to strike the portion of SB 1097 that overturns the fair argument standard for clean energy projects and related provisions including judicial streamlining for those clean energy projects with the new evidentiary standards.

DOUBLE REFERRAL:

If this measure is approved by the Senate Environmental Quality Committee, the do pass motion must include the action to re-refer the bill to the Senate Energy Utilities and Communications Committee.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 607 (Wiener) would have overturned the fair argument standard in CEQA for all projects, among many other substantial changes to CEQA.

SB 529 (Hertzberg, Chapter 357, Statutes of 2022) exempts an extension, expansion, upgrade, or other modification of an existing transmission line or substations from the requirement of a CPCN and directed the CPUC to revise its GO, by January 1, 2024, to instead use its permit to construct process for these approvals.

AB 205 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 21, Statutes of 2022) allows certain energy projects, including electric transmission lines between certain non-fossil fuel energy generation facilities to become certified leadership projects under the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2021 through a certification process through the CEC. With this certification, actions or proceedings related to the certification of an environmental impact report need to be resolved within 270 days to the extent feasible.

SOURCE:

RCRC

Abundance Network

Prosperity Action

SUPPORT:

Abundance Network

Advanced Energy United

American Clean Power- California

California Energy Storage Alliance

Climate Future California

Deploy Action

Independent Energy Producers Association

Large Scale Solar Association

Prosperity Action

Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)

Solar Energy Industries Association

The California Wind Energy Association (CALWEA)

OPPOSITION:

350 Bay Area Action

Biofuelwatch

California Coastal Protection Network

California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) Action

California Farm Bureau Federation

California Land Watch

California Native Plant Society

California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice

California Wildlife Foundation

Center for Biological Diversity

Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice

Center for Environmental Health

Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment
Citizens for the Preservation of Parks & Beaches
Clean Water Action
Cleaneearth4kids.org
Cleveland National Forest Foundation
Communities for a Better Environment
Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Center of San Diego
Forests Forever
Fresh Air Vallejo
Friends of Loma Alta Creek
Friends of Rose Canyon
Friends of the Lost Coast
Green Foothills
Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability
Los Angeles Audubon Society
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
Napa Solano Audubon Society
National Parks Conservation Association
Planning and Conservation League
San Diego Bird Alliance
San Francisco Bay Area Chapter Physicians for Social Responsibility
Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance
Save Our Forest and Ranchlands
Sierra Club California
Sierra Nevada Alliance
Socal 350 Climate Action
Solano County Orderly Growth Committee
The Urban Wildlands Group
We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review
Wholly H2o
Youth United for Community Action

-- END --