

Date of Hearing: June 24, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON UTILITIES AND ENERGY

Cottie Petrie-Norris, Chair

SB 1245 (Stern) – As Amended June 15, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 36-0

SUBJECT: Sale of gasoline: petroleum: branded and unbranded: report

SUMMARY: Shifts the California Energy Commission's (CEC) triennial transportation fuels assessment from January 1 to July 1 and specifies the Division of Petroleum Market Oversight's (DPMO) annual market oversight report deadlines shall be submitted annually by July 1; directs the CEC to implement – not just recommend – its alternative gasoline specifications strategy considering both fees and conditions; and requires the 2027 DPMO report to analyze the branded versus unbranded price differential and import market competition barriers, among other considerations.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, also known as the CEC, consisting of five members appointed by the Governor, and specifies the duties of the CEC. Requires the CEC to assess trends in energy consumption and analyze the social, economic, and environmental consequences of these trends. (Public Resources Code § 25200 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the Petroleum Industry Information Reporting Act of 1980 (PIIRA), which requires oil refiners and marketers to submit specified data to the CEC and requires the CEC to analyze these data to identify trends in demand and supply for petroleum, including factors influencing gasoline price changes; and also requires retail transportation fueling stations to report specified information about their sales of gasoline, diesel, and other fuels to the CEC. (Public Resources Code § 25350 *et seq.*)
- 3) Establishes DPMO within the CEC to provide independent oversight and analysis of the transportation fuels market for the protection of consumers by identifying market design flaws, market power abuses, and any other manner by which market participants act to harm competition or act contrary to the best interests of the consumers in the state. (Public Resources Code § 25372 *et seq.*)
- 4) Establishes the ICFAC consisting of six members appointed by the Governor and one member each appointed by the Assembly Speaker and the Senate Committee on Rules. The ICFAC is charged with providing input to the CEC on the development of the triennial transportation fuels assessment and the effects of refiners' inventories of fuel and feedstocks and blending components on the price of transportation fuels. (Public Resources Code §§ 25373, 25354.4, 25371)
- 5) Requires the CEC to submit an analysis every three years assessing the transportation fuels market in California, known as the Transportation Fuels Assessment (TFA). (Public Resources Code §§ 25371-25371.3).

- 6) Requires the CEC in the July 2027 TFA to evaluate the cost and supply impacts of allowing the sale of gasoline with alternative specifications in California. Directs the CEC, in coordination with CARB, to recommend a strategy to facilitate the sale of gasoline with those alternative specifications if the evaluation finds that allowing for its sale is likely to support a reliable and affordable supply of transportation fuel in California. The strategy shall consider i) a trigger, based on market conditions, for when the alternative spec gasoline may be sold; ii) the existing variance process; iii) the use of a variance fee applied to the sale of the alternative spec gasoline to mitigate for any increase in emissions. (Public Resources Code § 25371 (a)(1)(I))
- 7) Requires the CEC and CARB, by December 31, 2024, to prepare a Transportation Fuels Transition Plan that includes a discussion of how to ensure that the supply of petroleum and alternative transportation fuels is affordable, reliable, equitable, and adequate to meet the demand for transportation fuels. Requires the report to be prepared in consultation with the state's fuel producers and refiners and a multistakeholder, multiagency workgroup, including CalEPA and CRNA, convened by the CEC and CARB to identify mechanisms to plan for and monitor progress toward the state's reliable, safe, equitable, and affordable transition away from petroleum fuels in line with declining instate petroleum demand. (Public Resources Code § 25371.3)
- 8) Establishes the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as the air pollution control agency in California and requires CARB, among other things, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources. (Health and Safety Code § 39500)
- 9) Requires CARB to adopt and implement technologically feasible emission standards for new motor vehicles to, among other things, ensure compliance with state and federal air quality laws, and prohibit vehicles that do not comply with those emissions standards from being certified for use in the state. (Health and Safety Code § 43100)
- 10) Requires CARB to adopt motor vehicle fuel specification requirements for the control of air contaminants and air pollution where it is necessary, cost effective, and technologically feasible. (Health and Safety Code § 43013)
- 11) Authorizes CARB to grant variances from motor vehicle gasoline fuel specifications and requires a fee be assessed for fuel that would not meet specifications. (Health and Safety Code § 43013)
- 12) Requires CARB to achieve maximum feasible emissions reduction from vehicles, including specified reduction in nitrous oxide (NOx), particulates, carbon monoxide, and other types of air pollution from vehicles. (Health and Safety Code § 43018)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill was recently substantially amended. The prior version was determined by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to not have a significant fiscal impact, sending the bill to the Senate Floor pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8.

BACKGROUND:

How California's Fuel Market Differs from the Rest of the Nation – California's fuel market operates with underlying conditions that distinguish it from most other states. As outlined in past background papers from this committee,¹ the state can imprecisely be considered a fuel island. There are no pipeline inflows of finished gasoline; the pipelines connecting California to Arizona and Nevada move product outward, not in; and rail has not emerged as a viable alternative at any significant scale. The only practical avenue for outside supply is marine imports, which take three to six weeks to arrive from facilities capable of producing California-specification fuel.² That specification – California Reformulated Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending, or CARBOB – is unique among the states. This poses the second underlying constraint: gasoline meeting the standards of any neighboring state cannot substitute for California supply, and out-of-state CARBOB production is limited to a small number of refineries worldwide.³ The third constraint is market structure. Petroleum refining is a high fixed-cost industry with significant barriers to entry. California's in-state refining has historically been concentrated among a small number of large producers. As the 2024 Transportation Fuels Assessment (TFA) noted, "the risk of market power appears to be more pronounced than in other states."⁴

In October 2024, Phillips 66 announced a planned closure of its Wilmington refinery by year's end 2025.⁵ And in April 2025, Valero announced the planned closure of its Benicia refinery by April 2026.⁶ These conversions and closures are not unique to the state, as nationally consolidation and closures are occurring.⁷ However, the immediate impact in California is the real potential for significant supply constraints and likely price increases. As of May 2026, seven refineries produce CARBOB in California, making an already concentrated market more so. To the committee's knowledge, infrastructure has not kept pace with these closures: dock facilities likely need upgrades; storage capacity may be lacking; and there is no known plan to build either at the needed scale. Little concerted planning has been undertaken to expand California's import capacity, and local governments have been reluctant to embrace the transition – unsurprisingly, given the tax revenue and jobs that terminal operations do not adequately cover compared to what the refinery provided.⁸

The TFA – These pinch points highlight the difficulty state agencies, local communities, the industry, and its workforce face in developing solutions that 1) help smooth the decarbonization transition; 2) protect consumers and keep costs low; 3) maintain the workforce; and 4) ensure the health and safety of both the workforce and the public. One of the requirements under SBX1-2 (Skinner, Chapter 1, Statutes of 2023) was a report – the Transportation Fuels Assessment (TFA)

¹ Among others, see May 5, 2026 hearing, "Fueling Uncertainty: Assessing California's Petroleum Supply Resilience and Strategic Planning," https://autl.assembly.ca.gov/system/files/2026-05/05.05.2026_petroleum-background.pdf and May 28, 2025 hearing, "Outlook for California's Transportation Fuels Sector," https://autl.assembly.ca.gov/system/files/2025-05/05.28_petroleum-oversight-hearing-background.pdf

² Pg. 15, Gee and Berliner and Wong. 2024 TFA, *Ibid.*

³ Pg. 10 and 15, Gee and Berliner and Wong. 2024 TFA, *Ibid.*

⁴ Pg. 7, Gee and Berliner and Wong. 2024 TFA, *Ibid.*

⁵ Phillips 66 news release; "Phillips 66 provides notice of its plan to cease operations at Los Angeles-area refinery;" October 16, 2024; <https://investor.phillips66.com/financial-information/news-releases/news-release-details/2024/Phillips-66-provides-notice-of-its-plan-to-cease-operations-at-Los-Angeles-area-refinery/default.aspx>.

⁶ Matthew Green; "Potential Valero Refinery Closure Leaves Benicia, State Officials Scrambling for Alternatives;" *KQED*; April 26, 2025; <https://www.kqed.org/news/12037668/potential-valero-refinery-closure-leaves-benicia-state-officials-scrambling-to-pick-up-pieces>

⁷ Such as LyondellBasell in Texas, Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery in Louisiana, and PBF Energy refinery in Paulsboro, New Jersey.

⁸ Julie Small, *KQED*, *Ibid.*

– that the CEC must submit every three years to identify methods to ensure a reliable supply of affordable and safe transportation fuels in California. The TFA shall evaluate the price of transportation fuels and consider market demand at regular intervals out to 20 years. It shall also include an analysis of refinery maintenance operations and evaluate ways to manage necessary maintenance among the various facilities.⁹

In August 2024, the CEC submitted its first TFA.¹⁰ The final chapter, “Policy Options to Mitigate Price Spikes,” offered a discussion of potential ideas to help stabilize, or mitigate impacts to, California’s fuel market. The ideas ranged from targeting supply or demand to ideas that would be substantially more difficult to implement. These include media alerts of potential fuel shortages to move consumers to conserve; setting up a strategic reserve; or state ownership of a Jones Act tanker¹¹ to provide “stand-by” support to move fuel between domestic ports.¹² The TFA also included an idea to “create a fee-based non-CARBOB allowance program that can be activated during a price spike or in response to a reasonable expectation of one. Revenue from fees would be used for air quality improvement strategies in non-attainment regions or other EJ communities.”¹³

While some of these proposals may have seemed outside the realm of possibilities in 2024, the global shocks to the petroleum market that have occurred since the Iranian closure of the Strait of Hormuz may push many options on the table for consideration in mitigating potential petroleum price volatility. The federal government, for instance, has released an historic 172 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve,¹⁴ announced a limited waiver of the Jones Act to allow foreign-flag vessels to flow freely between U.S. ports,¹⁵ and the federal Environmental Protection Agency has issued a temporary emergency fuel waiver to allow nationwide sales of E15 (15% ethanol blended gasoline).¹⁶

Under SB 327 (Grayson, Chapter 118, Statutes of 2025) a more detailed analysis was mandated for the 2027 TFA: an evaluation of the impacts and potential implementation pathway for selling alternative specification fuel in California. For the July 2027 TFA the CEC must evaluate the cost and supply impacts of allowing the sale of gasoline with alternative specifications in California, and work in coordination with CARB to recommend a strategy to facilitate the sale of gasoline with those alternative specifications if the evaluation finds that allowing for its sale is likely to support a reliable and affordable supply of transportation fuel in California. The strategy must consider 1) a trigger, based on market conditions, for when the alternative specification

⁹ Public Resources Code §§ 25371-25371.1

¹⁰ CEC, *Transportation Fuels Assessment*, August 2024; CEC-200-2024-003-CMF.

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=258521&DocumentContentId=94552>

¹¹ The Jones Act requires that any cargo traveling by sea between two U.S. ports must be built in the U.S. and be crewed by mostly U.S. citizens.

¹² See the tables on pgs. 57-76 of the Transportation Fuels Assessment for the exhaustive list of ideas; CEC, *Transportation Fuels Assessment*, August 2024; CEC-200-2024-003-CMF.

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=258521&DocumentContentId=94552>

¹³ CEC’s *TFA*, pg. 65; *Ibid*.

¹⁴ US Department of Energy, March 11, 2026, <https://www.energy.gov/articles/united-states-release-172-million-barrels-oil-strategic-petroleum-reserve>

¹⁵ Megan Cerullo, “Trump Waives Jones Act for 60 days in effort to ease energy prices,” March 18, 2026, *CBS News*, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/jones-act-trump-waiver-60-days-iran-war/>

¹⁶ EPA Press Release, March 25, 2026, <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-fortifies-domestic-fuel-supply-provides-americans-relief-pump-approving-nationwide>

gasoline may be sold; 2) the existing variance process; and 3) the use of a variance fee applied to the sale of the alternative specification gasoline to mitigate for any increase in emissions.

California's Specialized Gasoline – CARB has implemented a series of regulations over the past decades resulting in the specific, reformulated blend of gasoline that gas stations in California sell today: CARBOB. These requirements reduced or eliminated components of fuels that posed a public health risk, and that could be removed while complying with the statutory mandate that CARB's regulations optimize for feasibility and cost-effectiveness. Each new specification also incrementally reduced emissions of smog, toxic air contaminants, and other air pollutants. While neighboring states, including Arizona, may require their own specifications, they are distinct from California's fuel specifications.

The Variance Process – In 1995, the Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) sponsored a bill directing CARB to adopt regulations that allow for variances from state-imposed motor vehicle fuel specifications. A variance is a temporary exemption the CARB Executive Officer grants, allowing deviation from certain fuel specification regulations when compliance is not possible due to circumstances beyond the applicant's control. CARB only grants a variance when the individual company is seeking relief from a regulation due to a specific hardship it is experiencing. CARB only grants variances to the applying entity and are not generally broad or applicable to all regulated entities.

An entity pays a variance application fee of \$6,700 to CARB. In addition, CARB levies a fee of \$0.15 on the applicant for each gallon of gasoline sold or released for sale under a variance during the term of the variance to offset the deleterious air quality effects of the non-CARBOB fuel. CARB only grants a variance for the minimum amount of time necessary for the applicant to attain compliance with applicable regulations. CARB does not grant variances of more than 120 days except for variances related to physical catastrophes. CARB may extend a variance for up to 90 additional days if the applicant demonstrates that the original justification for granting the variance continues to exist.

COMMENTS:

- 1) *Author's Statement.* According to the author, "California's challenge is no longer simply reducing petroleum demand—it is managing the transition responsibly. As the state moves through the mid-transition period, refinery capacity, fuel imports, market concentration, and fuel specifications will increasingly determine whether consumers experience affordability and reliability or volatility and disruption. Last year, Senate Bill 237 directed agencies to assess the cost and supply impacts of allowing the sale of gasoline with alternative specifications to support a reliable and affordable supply of transportation fuels in California. This year, SB 1245 will empower the state to implement a strategy to facilitate the sale of gasoline with those alternative specifications and use fees and conditions to mitigate any changes in air pollution. This bill will also empower the Division of Petroleum Market Oversight to play a critical role in this effort by providing independent analysis of fuel markets and identifying supply constraints and structural weaknesses that may harm consumers. Ultimately, SB 1245 is about ensuring that California's energy transition remains affordable, reliable, transparent, and consumer-focused while preserving the state's long-term climate and energy security goals."
- 2) *Purpose of bill.* This bill seeks to adjust accountability and transparency timelines for California's transportation fuels oversight by shifting the triennial TFA from January 1 to

July 1, and the Division of Petroleum Market Oversight's annual report to July 1. The bill additionally requires DPMO's 2027 report to specifically investigate why branded gasoline costs more than unbranded and what's limiting competition in fuel imports.

The bill also enables the CEC to adopt a strategy to facilitate the sale of non-CARBOB gasoline. Existing law requires the CEC, in coordination with CARB, to recommend such a strategy; this bill enables them to implement one if the CEC finds that allowing the sale of non-CARBOB gasoline supports a reliable and affordable fuel supply. This provision seems the most consequential in the bill. While not requiring the CEC to adopt a strategy for allowing the sale of non-CARBOB gasoline in California, the bill likewise does not require any further Legislative intervention should the agencies determine it is prudent to do so.

The author frames the bill as a response to California's shifting challenge: managing an energy transition already underway. Building on SB 237's directive to study alternative gasoline specifications, this bill pushes the state from analysis to action by requiring implementation of that strategy, with fees and conditions to offset any emissions impact. It also expands DPMO's role in flagging market weaknesses that could hurt consumers. The author's broader goal is to ensure an energy transition that stays affordable and reliable for consumers without sacrificing the state's climate commitments.

- 3) *It's time we talked about CARBOB.* SB 1245 directs the CEC, in coordination with CARB, to move from recommending to implementing a strategy that facilitates the sale of gasoline with alternative specifications. Over the three decades since CARBOB's underlying specifications were set, the technical basis for the standard itself has shifted in ways that bear directly on what this bill is now asking the CEC and CARB to implement. CARB's Predictive Model still regulates the same eight fuel properties (RVP, T50, T90, aromatics, olefins, oxygen, sulfur, benzene) it was built around when CARBOB was finalized in 2003, using vehicle data largely from the 1980s through early 2000s.¹⁷

Since then, two independent developments have narrowed the gap between CARBOB-grade fuel and conventional gasoline to the point that the original rationale for CARBOB is no longer as meaningful: nationwide rules already cut sulfur in all gasoline to the same low level as CARBOB and matched CARBOB's benzene limit, while the near-universal switch to 10% ethanol blends pulled regular gasoline's aromatic and olefin content closer to CARBOB.¹⁸ Layered on top of that, vehicle technology has moved even further. Federal standards have reduced exhaust and evaporative emissions by one to two orders of magnitude relative to the vehicles the original fuel-effects models were calibrated on, and the federal test programs have found mostly "statistically insignificant" emissions effects from the very properties CARBOB still controls.¹⁹ In other words, the case for CARBOB's specific stringency was built on a vehicle fleet and a regulatory baseline that have both since changed underneath it.

¹⁷ Memorandum from Paul Machiele, "Revisiting Reformulated Gasoline Standards," Fuel Policy Advisors, June 25, 2025.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

This shift matters for SB 1245 because the bill is not asking for another round of study. It requires the CEC to implement a strategy for alternative gasoline specifications, with fees and conditions to manage any emissions risk. The technical research suggests that emissions risk is now smaller and better characterized than it was when CARBOB was designed.

That technical case for relaxation rests heavily on modern vehicles, though, and California's fleet is not uniformly modern. A recent study by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)²⁰ found that while pre-2004 gasoline cars and trucks make up just 10% of vehicle miles traveled statewide, they account for 69% of NO_x, 56% of VOC, 43% of PM_{2.5}, and 49% of toxics emissions from the passenger fleet²¹ — meaning the pollution risk from loosening CARBOB falls disproportionately on a shrinking population of older cars rather than the modern fleet the obsolescence argument is built on. This is exactly why the fee consideration of the implementation strategy in existing law matters: the UCS study models a 25 cent per gallon mitigation fee funding a Clean Cars 4 All-style replacement of 500,000 pre-2004 vehicles (90% with EVs), and finds the resulting emissions reductions outweigh the pollution increase from allowing non-CARBOB gasoline statewide.²² In other words, the fee isn't just an emissions offset on paper. It targets the actual remaining source of fuel-sensitivity in the fleet, turning fuel flexibility into a net pollution reduction rather than a tradeoff.

- 4) *What are the market expectations with non-CARBOB sales?* As often noted by the petroleum industry, California refiners have spent a significant amount of money upgrading facilities to produce CARBOB gasoline, a cleaner-burning reformulated fuel required only in California. If the state relaxes those standards and allows cheaper out-of-state fuel to enter the market, even temporarily, those investments could be effectively stranded.

However, as noted above, the state adopted CARBOB in the late 1990s. Many investments made 30 years ago to comply with these standards should already be substantially or completely depreciated, meaning the original capital costs for CARBOB-compliance have likely been recovered through three decades of operations and pricing. While compliance with CARBOB-specifications is not a one-time investment – ongoing capital expenditures to maintain and upgrade equipment are necessary – it may be the case that the industry's argument is not to protect refiners from their sunk costs but rather to protect refiners' ongoing market position.

In other words, the concern seems to be market stability: abrupt relaxation of standards could disrupt refinery economics in ways that accelerate disorderly exit from the California market. California refiners have historically realized a disproportionate share of their annual margins during periods of supply constraint, when reduced competition and elevated prices allow them to recover costs across their operations. Nothing would prevent California refineries from switching to making non-CARBOB; in fact, a certain percentage of refined fuel made daily in California is non-CARBOB. However, this bill

²⁰ Klein and Martin, "Fuel flexibility + cleaner cars," *Working Paper*, March 2026; <https://files.ucs.org/2026/fuel-flexibility-mitigation.pdf>

²¹ pg. 9-10, *Ibid.*

²² Pg. 7,10, *Ibid.*

would expose in-state refiners to more domestic and international competition by allowing those non-CARBOB-attenuated refineries to bring in their finished product and sell it (granted, likely with a fee applied) within California.

Existing law seeks to address some of these market stability concerns by constraining the CEC's non-CARBOB implementation to only if 1) the CEC evaluates and finds that allowing the sale of non-CARBOB gasoline supports a reliable and affordable supply of fuels and 2) the CEC's strategy considers, at a minimum: a) a trigger for when non-CARBOB may be sold; b) the existing CARB variance process; and c) the application of fees and conditions associated with the sale of non-CARBOB gasoline.

- 5) *Don't forget about consumers.* While the petroleum sector is quick to acknowledge the market disruption and fiscal uncertainty this bill may cause in-state refining majors, it is important to note that the very point of their concern stems from the introduction of additional fuel supply into the market. Traditional economics dictates this action should drive down costs to consumers, a policy goal of many on this committee. Periods of high gasoline prices and supply disruptions hit lower-income Californians disproportionately. A temporary non-CARBOB import pathway, as potentially provided by this bill, could provide a direct and relatively fast-acting mechanism to relieve the burden of expensive gasoline during supply shortages. Whether the tradeoff is worthwhile between what is good for the consumer or what may impact in-state refining depends heavily on how the CEC sets the trigger and associated non-CARBOB fee; something that is not detailed in this bill.
- 6) *Additional considerations: the DPMO report.* This bill is opposed by the California Fuels and Convenience Alliance (CFCA), who object to the provisions directing DPMO to study and discuss branded and unbranded gasoline price differentials, and specifically the inclusion of consideration of divorcement. Divorcement, which would prohibit oil companies from owning or operating retail fuel outlets, is not the prime objective of DPMO's report but part of the "discussion of potential policy solutions." However, the CFCA notes "little evidence" that divorcement would help lower fuel costs. If research exists suggesting divorcement is not a productive exercise for DPMO, CFCA may wish to provide it to the author for further consideration. Moreover, CFCA raises concern that the scope of the DPMO report is such that many different gasoline stations would be subpoenaed for data on their pricing, going back for more than five years. This could be particularly difficult and costly to comply with for the smaller retailers, which make up the majority of California's gas station sector.
- 7) *Related Legislation.*

AB 2672 (Hart) requires the CEC to adopt regulations identifying the specific conditions under which gasoline sellers are obligated to seek and use a waiver to sell gasoline not meeting California's motor vehicle fuel specifications. Status: pending action in this committee.

SB 1259 (Blakespear) requires oil refiners, no later than December 31, 2028, to submit to the State Water Resources Control Board a draft retirement plan setting forth information concerning decommissioning and site remediation for every refinery it owns, operates, or controls. Status: set for hearing in this committee on July 1, 2026.

SB 1337 (Richardson) establishes an Interagency Working Group on Transportation Fuels Transition Strategy led by the California Energy Commission (CEC) with membership from other state agencies and local entities to address transportation fuels policy and coordination. Status: set for hearing in this committee on June 24, 2026.

8) *Prior Legislation.*

AB 406 (Bennett) an earlier version required the CEC to propose recommendations to implement solutions for mitigating impacts to the transportation fuels market outlined in the CEC's TFA, and required CARB, the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), or other relevant state agencies to provide to the CEC any information the CEC deems necessary for preparing the TFA. Status: *amended to an unrelated topic*; Schiavo, Chapter 148, Statutes of 2025.

SB 237 (Grayson), among its provisions, required the CEC to submit an assessment to the Legislature and the Governor that evaluates the recommendations and strategies put forward by Commissioner Gunda in the letter dated June 27, 2025. This *Draft 237 Assessment* was submitted to the Legislature on May 1, 2026. Status: Chapter 118, Statutes of 2025.

AB X2-1 (Hart) made changes to, and expanded on, SBX1-2 related to transportation fuels, including changes to the Independent Consumer Fuels Advisory Committee. Status: Chapter 1, Statutes of 2023-24 Second Extraordinary Session.

SB X1-2 (Skinner) proposed several policies to address gasoline supply and pricing, including authorizing the CEC to establish a maximum gross gasoline refining margin and penalty on gasoline sold by refiners in the state. The bill also established a new independent division at the CEC, the DPMO, to provide independent oversight and analysis of the transportation fuels markets and established the ICFAC at the CEC. Status: Chapter 1, Statutes of 2023-24 First Extraordinary Session.

SB 709 (Maddy) required CARB to promulgate regulations that allow for variances from state-imposed motor vehicle fuel specifications. Status: Chapter 675, Statutes of 1995.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Environmental Defense Fund
Nextgen California
Union of Concerned Scientists

Oppose Unless Amended

California Fuels and Convenience Alliance

Analysis Prepared by: Laura Shybut / U. & E. / (916) 319-2083