
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Senator Blakespear, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: SB 1350
Author: McNerney
Version: 2/20/2026
Urgency: No
Consultant: Heather Walters

Hearing Date: 4/22/2026
Fiscal: Yes

SUBJECT: Energy: renewable electrical generation facilities: definition

DIGEST: This bill expands the definition of “renewable electrical generation facility” as it pertains to the Renewable Portfolio Standard to include facilities converting hydrogen gas to electricity in a turbine, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines a “renewable electrical generation facility” as a facility that uses biomass, solar thermal, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, fuel cells using renewable fuels, small hydroelectric generation of 30 megawatts (MW) or less, digester gas, municipal solid waste conversion, landfill gas, ocean wave, ocean thermal, or tidal current. To meet the definition of a renewable electrical generation facility, the facility must be in state, have its first point of connection to the transmission network of a balancing authority area primarily located within the state, or has its first point of interconnection to the transmission network outside the state, within the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) and meets certain specified requirements. (Public Resources Code §25741)
- 2) Defines an “eligible renewable energy resource” as an electrical generating facility that meets the definition of a “renewable electrical generation facility” in the Public Resources Code, subject to specified conditions. (Public Resources Code §399.12)
- 3) Establishes the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) program and establishes a goal of procuring at least 60% of total retail sales of electricity from renewable energy resources by December 31, 2030, with specified benchmarks up to that date. Existing law requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to oversee electrical corporations’ compliance with renewable energy procurement mandates and requires the California Energy Commission (CEC)

to oversee electric publicly owned utility (POU) renewable energy procurement compliance. (Public Utilities Code §399.11 et. seq.)

- 4) Defines a renewable energy credit (REC) and requires the CEC to design and implement an accounting system to verify electric utilities' compliance with the RPS, to ensure that electricity generated by an eligible renewable energy resource is counted only once for the purpose of meeting the RPS, to certify RECs produced by eligible renewable energy resources, and to verify retail product claims. (Public Utilities Code §399.25)
- 5) Defines “green electrolytic hydrogen” as hydrogen gas produced through electrolysis and does not include hydrogen gas manufactured using steam reforming or any other conversion technology that produces hydrogen from a fossil fuel feedstock. (Public Utilities Code §400.2)
- 6) Requires the CPUC, CEC and California Air Resources Board (CARB) to consider green electrolytic hydrogen an eligible form of energy storage and consider its potential uses. (Public Utilities Code §400.3)
- 7) Requires CARB to evaluate by June 1, 2024, market barriers to accelerate the use of green hydrogen, potential beneficial uses of hydrogen, and an estimate of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions that can be achieved through deploying green hydrogen in various settings. Existing law requires CARB's evaluation to include an analysis of life-cycle GHG emissions from various forms of hydrogen, including green hydrogen. (Health and Safety Code §38561.8)
- 8) Requires the CEC to administer a program to provide financial incentives to hydrogen projects that produce, process, deliver, store, or use hydrogen. Existing law specifies that hydrogen projects are only eligible for these incentives if the hydrogen is derived from water using RPS-eligible energy resources, or hydrogen derived from RPS-eligible energy resources. Existing law specifies that the CEC may only provide these financial incentives to projects that help reduce sector-wide emissions, as determined by the CEC. (Public Resources Code §25664–25664.1)

This bill expands the definition of a “renewable electrical generation facility” for the purpose of the RPS if the facility's turbines use a fuel already included in the RPS.

Background

- 1) *Hydrogen today.* Hydrogen is an energy carrier that can be used to store, move, and deliver energy produced from other sources. Currently, the U.S. is estimated to produce 10 million metric tons (MMT) of hydrogen, resulting in about 100 MMT of GHG emissions, per year. The hydrogen produced in the U.S. is primarily used in refining (55%) or chemical processes (35%), and is almost entirely produced by steam methane reforming (SMR) of fossil natural gas. Hydrogen can also be used, primarily through fuel cell technology, as energy storage and a transportation fuel.

By using low-cost, abundant, electricity from intermittent renewables during the day to produce hydrogen, and then using that hydrogen in fuel cells to provide power at other times, hydrogen can act as a chemical form of storage for low- or zero-carbon electricity. However, in practice, electrolyzer technology is still prohibitively expensive and unable to economically cycle on and off in line with the availability of intermittent renewables. While technology continues to improve and bring this role closer to a cost-effective reality, it is not widely used today. However, hydrogen can be (and in some places is) blended with natural gas and combusted in a traditional turbine generator.

While not one of the seven GHGs recognized by California, hydrogen does in fact induce an indirect net warming effect when introduced to the atmosphere. A recent study conducted by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) and published in *Environmental Science & Technology* found that the warming effects of hydrogen emissions could considerably affect life cycle assessments of hydrogen. EDF stated that even for renewable-based green hydrogen electrolysis pathways, high hydrogen emissions could reduce the near-term climate benefits by up to 25%.

- 2) *Hydrogen tomorrow.* As in most matters of long-term, deep decarbonization, there is a range of plausible futures for the use of hydrogen in California. CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan Update envisioned a mix of technologies providing California's burgeoning hydrogen supply. Although it is not explicitly clear exactly which end-uses are expected to be powered by hydrogen, some sectors appear to be entirely reliant on hydrogen to decarbonize. Iron and steel production, ammonia synthesis, and some functions in oil refining will almost certainly require hydrogen, and supplying that hydrogen in a sustainable manner will require major scale-up of the paltry clean hydrogen production that exists today.

What is not as clear is where that clean hydrogen will come from. One of the scenarios considered in the draft scoping plan update considered using only electrolysis to meet the projected demand for hydrogen. It found that doing so would require 40 GW of renewable electricity dedicated to electrolysis: an amount roughly equivalent to peak grid demand in summer today. Instead, the final update prescribed a mix of SMR of biomethane and biomass gasification with CCS to produce hydrogen, along with electrolysis from (21 GW of) off-grid solar resources.

The federal government had previously bet on hydrogen being a major part of our decarbonized future. On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed into law the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), which included \$8 billion to the Department of Energy (DOE) to establish hydrogen research and pilots across the country, known as the Regional Clean Hydrogen Hubs Program (H2Hubs). This legislation led to the establishment of California's clean hydrogen hub administrator, known as the Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems (ARCHES). In October 2025, the Trump Administration cut the federal funding for California's hydrogen hub program. As a result, the Governor paused the development of ARCHES in November 2025. In February 2026, California and 12 other states filed suit against the Trump Administration in response to the federal government's \$1.2 billion termination of California's ARCHES grant.

- 3) *The Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Program.* The Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires all load-serving entities (LSEs) in California to procure a portion of their electricity sales from eligible renewable resources. The procurement goal was updated by SB 100 (de León, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) to 60% of energy procured by LSEs be from eligible renewable energy resources by 2030. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and CEC jointly implement the RPS program. The CEC certifies facilities that generate renewable energy as eligible for the RPS. The CEC's RPS certification of a facility means the facility can generate electricity that may be used by a retail seller or publicly owned utility (POU) to satisfy its RPS procurement requirements.

Some of the myriad categories of RPS-eligible electricity sources (i.e. biomass, solar thermal, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, fuel cells using renewable fuels, small hydroelectric generation of 30 megawatts or less, digester gas, municipal solid waste conversion, landfill gas, ocean wave, ocean thermal, or tidal current) have resource-specific requirements. Hydrogen fuel cells are one; there are requirements on where the hydrogen used in the fuel cell may be sourced. It must come from non-fossil fuel feedstocks or other RPS-eligible

electricity, and must not be double-counted. In other words, you cannot use a fuel cell to turn a non-RPS-eligible energy into RPS-eligible energy.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, “CA has committed to reaching 100% clean energy by 2045. Clean hydrogen made from renewable sources, is a clean and safe fuel source that can be used to transition some of our *existing* energy infrastructure into clean energy infrastructure – reducing costs of the energy transition for ratepayers, helping better integrate renewables, and providing good union jobs in the process. SB 1350 will help California meet its clean energy goals by allowing power plants to get Renewables Portfolio Standard credit while using green hydrogen to power their turbines – as they currently do when they use biogas, and as fuel cells do when they use hydrogen. This will stimulate investment in clean hydrogen projects in CA that will decarbonize both the power system and transportation system.”
- 2) *Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications amendments.* This bill was heard on April 13, 2026 in the Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications (SEUC) committee. The bill passed with a commitment to amendments described in the committee analysis, which due to timing constraints will be incorporated as part of this committee’s actions on the bill. Thus, those amendments are not in print today.

Briefly, the SEUC amendments state that a facility converting hydrogen gas to electricity in a turbine may qualify as a renewable electrical generation facility, as long as:

- a) The hydrogen in the turbine is solely derived from a non-fossil-based feedstock or through the electrolysis of water using RPS-eligible electricity;
- b) The electricity used to derive the hydrogen is not counted towards a compliance obligation or claimed for any other program as renewable generation;
- c) The turbines have the capacity to use a fuel where hydrogen comprises not less than 20% by volume, with the possibility of the CEC adopting a higher blend; and
- d) The applicant submits CEC-specified information on the hydrogen production process.

These amendments take steps towards ensuring that any RPS-eligible electricity coming from hydrogen blended in turbines is held to high standards. However, even with these guardrails in place, projects could still significantly contribute directly and indirectly to GHG and criteria air pollutant emissions.

- 3) *Hydrogen: one proton, many flavors.* As a general rule, lower-emissions hydrogen is more expensive than higher-emissions, and hydrogen users will preferably use the lowest-cost hydrogen they are able to use in a given application. This creates an inherent tension where without imposing appropriate guardrails, incentives, and/or mandates, cleaner hydrogen will rarely if ever be chosen over the more-polluting alternative for a given application.

Particularly after the SEUC amendments, there are two distinct parts of the hydrogen supply chain that must be considered separately in this bill: production and combustion. Each stage introduces unique risks and opportunities to affect the process's overall emissions intensity.

- a) *Hydrogen production.* Hydrogen can be produced from many different pathways, and the vast majority of hydrogen today is produced through steam methane reforming (SMR) of fossil natural gas. This is, by a wide margin, the lowest cost hydrogen available today.

Two main pathways exist for what is generally considered “green” or “renewable” hydrogen: electrolysis of water using renewable energy or chemical processing of biogenic methane sources (potentially either via SMR or pyrolysis). These are, to varying degrees, significantly more costly than fossil fuel-derived hydrogen.

Electrolysis (the splitting of water using electricity) *can* be done with very few associated GHG emissions, but is not inherently low-emission. Setting the appropriate conditions to ensure that electrolytic hydrogen has low carbon intensity has been the subject of significant ongoing debate (see “The Three Pillars” below). Biogenic hydrogen, too, can vary considerably in its associated carbon intensity depending on the specific parameters of its production and feedstock.

In the SEUC amendments, hydrogen production is held to a higher standard primarily through the requirement that the hydrogen used in a turbine be either not derived from fossil fuel feedstocks or made through the electrolysis of water using RPS-eligible electricity. However, even electrolytic hydrogen using nominally clean electricity can still generate significant GHG emissions without additional conditions.

- b) *Gas-to-power.* The second part of the hydrogen supply chain implicated in this bill is the combustion of a hydrogen-natural gas mix to generate

electricity. Regardless of the provenance of the molecule, there are many environmental considerations around a powerplant burning hydrogen.

For one, hydrogen is much less energy-dense by volume than natural gas, meaning a much greater volume must be burned to produce the same amount of energy. Another consideration is the pollutants that result from hydrogen's combustion. Although hydrogen gas does not contain any carbon atoms, under most conditions burning it still produces significant oxides of nitrogen (NOx), which are themselves GHGs as well as major contributors to local air quality impacts and smog formation.

In the amendments committed to in the previous committee, hydrogen combustion in a turbine is held to a higher standard primarily through the requirement that an eligible turbine burning a blend of hydrogen and natural gas must be capable of at least a 20% hydrogen content. This somewhat addresses the energy density issue (i.e. at lower hydrogen contents than 20%, the gas mixture could result in no emissions savings because of the energy losses), but it does nothing to address the NOx impacts.

- 4) *The Three Pillars*. Designed as part of the 2022 Inflation Reduction Act to support the development of a U.S. hydrogen economy, the federal Section 45V clean hydrogen production tax credit offers up to \$3.00 per kilogram for the lowest GHG emission hydrogen. Defining the carbon intensity of that hydrogen has driven significant discussion of how to define and verify clean hydrogen. In a situation where a hydrogen producer simply builds a new renewable energy resource to directly power their operations, such as the Element project in Lancaster, this is a simple task. However, when energy attribute certificates (EACs) are used to account for clean electricity generated and used elsewhere, this quickly becomes wickedly complicated.

In a white paper published in December of 2023, the U.S. Department of Energy sought to describe the necessary safeguards to ensure that electricity EACs used for hydrogen production truly contributed to reduced GHG emissions.¹ The framework used in that white paper has been colloquially referred to as the “Three Pillars” and has stood as an example of the robust considerations necessary to ensure nominal GHG emission reductions represent real-world improvements.

¹ Assessing Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Associated with Electricity Use for the Section 45V Clean Hydrogen Production Tax Credit. U.S. DOE. https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2023-12/Assessing_Lifecycle_Greenhouse_Gas_Emissions_Associated_with_Electricity_Use_for_the_Section_45V_Clean_Hydrogen_Production_Tax_Credit.pdf

After over a year of deliberations and over 30,000 public comments, the U.S. Treasury’s final hydrogen 45V guidance established the rules for qualifying electrolytic hydrogen projects.² The rules generally maintain the “three pillars” overall structure — requiring producers to build and deliver clean power, at the time of production, to hydrogen projects to qualify for the tax credit.³ Notably, some provisions of the final 45V guidance work different in California and Washington, due to the presence of certain state laws.

The following sections briefly describe each of the three pillars, what outcome is risked by ignoring it, and where 45V ended up in the final regulations.

- a) *Pillar 1: Additionality.* Electricity made to produce hydrogen must be generated from new resources, rather than shifting clean power that is simply used elsewhere today. Without guardrails on additionality, what looks like a reduction in emissions on paper could in fact make no overall difference (e.g. a factory using clean energy now whose clean energy goes towards hydrogen production instead may turn to procuring electricity from higher-emission sources, offsetting the apparent clean energy the hydrogen production claims). In the final 45V regulations, the existence of California’s cap-and-trade and RPS policies meant the state had an exemption from this pillar, with the logic being that once the state’s entire grid was clean, inducing further electricity demand would only be met with renewable energy supply.
- b) *Pillar 2: Hourly matching.* When RECs are used to transfer the environmental attributes of clean electricity, the real-world impacts of the electricity generation become murky. Many electrolyzers available today cannot ramp up and down with the availability of abundant, cheap electricity from renewables, and must operate around the clock. Without hourly matching of RECs to electrolysis, increased demand during peak, polluting times could be balanced out with the purchase of low-cost clean energy credits from, say, solar during the day. Despite significant pushes across public and private entities to move towards hourly matching, the software and infrastructure for doing so is not yet universal. As such, the final 45V credits allowed the hourly matching requirement to phase-in in 2030, to give the system time to enable doing so.

² Credit for Production of Clean Hydrogen and Energy Credit. 1/10/2025. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/01/10/2024-31513/credit-for-production-of-clean-hydrogen-and-energy-credit>

³ Implementing the 45V Rule: What it Means for Green Hydrogen Projects. Taylor Krause, Evan Brooks, Nathan Iyer for RMI. March 3, 2025

- c) *Pillar 3: Deliverability.* Similarly to hourly matching needing to ensure REC represented real-world conditions across time, deliverability considers real-world conditions across space. The use of specific grid infrastructure can at time face real-world constraints like congestion and reliability. Using a REC generated elsewhere—even at the appropriately hourly-matched time—does nothing to prevent or disincentivize these detrimental local effects. The final 45V regulations required RECs to generally be generated in the same “National Transmission Needs Study” region, to somewhat narrow the geographic scope of where RECs could be counted and used. California is its own region for these purposes.
- 5) *SB 1350: one bill, two missions.* By establishing criteria for hydrogen blended into natural gas for combustion in turbines to be an RPS-eligible energy resource, SB 1350 attempts to feed two birds with one scone. The bill would resolve a longstanding debate around how sufficiently renewable hydrogen for such use could be defined, and in so doing would provide an offtake opportunity for a specific hydrogen production project: Element Resources’s Lancaster Clean Energy Center.

The Lancaster Clean Energy Center is slated to be the largest off-grid renewable green hydrogen production project in the U.S. It would produce at least 21,000 metric tons of hydrogen annually on a 2,100 acre site roughly 90 miles from the Los Angeles basin.⁴ The project is an exemplary demonstration of green hydrogen production; it would be powered by 100% behind-the-meter solar panels, resolving all of the issues with electricity utilization that necessitate guardrails like the three pillars. The power is additional because they are building it. It is deliverable because it is directly connected to the facility. It does not require additional temporal matching provisions because it is directly provided electricity, not abstract RECs. To the extent that California’s future will rely on hydrogen for certain sectors, generating that hydrogen in facilities like the Lancaster Clean Energy Center should be strongly encouraged.

However, the project is currently facing an impending challenge in that over \$600 million of existing solar tax credits that the project relies for financing require—due to recent changes from the federal government—the project to break ground by July 4th of this year. It should be noted that as written, SB 1350 would not go into effect until January 1, 2027, so the author should (and is) considering alternative courses of action for addressing this problem more immediately.

⁴ Lancaster Clean Energy Center. <https://www.elementresources.com/our-projects/lancaster-energy-center/>

To indirectly support the Lancaster Clean Energy Center, SB 1350 enables natural gas turbines to blend hydrogen into their gas and burn it to generate electricity that would count as an eligible renewable energy resource for the RPS. To be clear, the Lancaster project would not itself be utilizing these turbines. Rather, the intent of SB 1350 is to allow natural gas turbines capable of using the hydrogen (such as what is intended for Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's Scattergood facility) to be counted as RPS-eligible resources when using the hydrogen produced by facilities like Lancaster Clean Energy Center. In this way, SB 1350 would provide an incentive to certain natural gas powerplants, which would in turn induce demand for hydrogen from certain production facilities, which would in turn assure the Lancaster project that there will be sufficient demand for their product. This should support Lancaster Clean Energy Center in securing financing.

- 6) *Raising the bar in hydrogen production.* Within the context of the bill before the committee today, the author is attempting to set the standards that will dictate how RPS-eligible electricity can be generated from a blend of hydrogen and natural gas. Some standards were added in the SEUC amendments, some from the RPS Guidebook's definition of qualifying hydrogen for fuel cell and linear generator use, and some more specific to this bill. Those standards help stave off some of the worst outcomes that could come from making a natural gas blend RPS-eligible, but there is a need for further strengthening.

For the production of the hydrogen that is blended in the eligible turbine, it is important to set high standards for its emissions impacts. Otherwise it could be possible that creating this RPS-eligible electricity could contribute to overall sector-wide GHG emission increases. While the three pillars framework introduced in the context of the 45V tax credit is useful, it is not an entirely apt set of standards across the board for the purposes of this bill.

The committee may wish to require the manufacture of hydrogen used for blending in RPS-eligible gas turbines to not result in resource shuffling.

Doing so will prevent the worst outcomes the additionality pillar is intended to address: situations where more polluting electricity is generated as an indirect result of clean energy being used for the hydrogen. Given the fledgling state of hydrogen blending in natural gas turbines in the state today (to staff's knowledge there are only two sites making such investments today), it may be inappropriate to require a more rigid requirement for strictly new resources, particularly in light of the final 45V tax credit giving California a special exemption. However, care should be taken to not tie the hands of the CEC in case future circumstances create a situation where the bar for additionality

should be raised further. The author may, going forward, wish to consider the future potential of requiring new and incremental renewable energy resources.

Moreover, the committee may wish to require that the manufacture of hydrogen used for blending in RPS-eligible gas turbines not use unbundled RECs.

Similarly, doing so would advance protections somewhat in line with the hourly matching pillar, while also recognizing that such requirements may not be realistic today. The final 45V credits recognized that such requirements are not practicable today due to the state of the industry, and phase them in in 2030. Similarly, the author may wish to consider the future potential of requiring some kind of temporal matching of RECs to hydrogen production.

It should be noted that none of these standards in any way jeopardize the eligibility of hydrogen produced at the Lancaster Clean Energy Center. Because of the 100% behind-the-meter solar utilized there, the hydrogen will easily exceed these standards. In fact, by having lower standards on the hydrogen production could create a situation whereby the Lancaster project would need to compete against competitors who use cheap, ineffective RECs to appear on paper to be just as clean.

- 7) *Raising the bar for hydrogen utilization.* Beyond the production of the hydrogen, since SB 1350 would allow for the combustion of hydrogen in a natural gas blend to generate RPS-eligible electricity, it is important to hold that stage of the process to high standards as well. Particularly given the facts that burning hydrogen has the potential to produce significant volumes of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), that NO_x are a major contributor to smog formation in the very same highly-NO_x-polluted air basin where the Lancaster and Scattergood projects reside, and that simply ensuring a 20% blend of hydrogen does not address this issue, it may be necessary to add more guardrails onto the burning of hydrogen in these blends.

The committee may wish to require any facility burning a blend of hydrogen and natural gas to result in a net decrease in NO_x and other air pollutants from the electrical sector.

Moreover, a future where California increasingly relies on hydrogen for its clean energy and decarbonization goals will have to contend with the physical realities of hydrogen. It is an extremely small molecule, and as such leaks and embrittlement have been found to be significant risks when storing and transporting the gas, particularly in retrofitted existing infrastructure. Given the

safety considerations and indirect GHG effects hydrogen can cause, these issues should be taken seriously as the industry scales up. However, there are not yet clear and applicable guidelines that could be applied.

Going forward, the author should consider stipulating the procurement and use of hydrogen in these applications to align with best practices regarding hydrogen production, distribution, storage, and use that are available at the time a facility applies for certification as a renewable energy resource.

- 8) *Committee amendments. Staff recommends the committee adopt the bolded amendments contained in comments 6 and 7 above.*

DOUBLE REFERRAL:

This measure was heard in Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee on April 13, 2026, and passed out of committee with a vote of 15-0.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 1420 (Caballero, Chapter 608, Statutes of 2024), as heard by this committee, defined “renewable hydrogen” and “qualified clean hydrogen,” and included those classes of hydrogen in a set of transportation fuel content standards for 2025, 2030, and 2045; added them to two existing permit streamlining mechanisms created by recent legislation; and made changes to the RPS to enable their inclusion as eligible resources.

AB 2204 (Bennett, 2024) would require all hydrogen produced or used in California by date certain to be green hydrogen that excludes fossil fuels as a feedstock or an energy source in the production process, and that complies with any applicable requirements regarding the three pillars. AB 2204 was not heard in committee.

SB 663 (Archuleta, 2023) would have made electrical generation facilities using renewable hydrogen, as defined, eligible for certification under the RPS. This bill was moved to the inactive file on the Senate Floor and subsequently died.

SB 414 (Allen, 2023) would have required CARB, in consultation with the CEC and CPUC, to develop an assessment of hydrogen use for specified applications including electricity generation. This assessment would include cost, energy

efficiency, and health, safety, environmental, and climate risks. This bill died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1550 (Bennett, 2023) would have required, on and after January 1, 2045, all hydrogen produced and used in California for either the generation of electricity or the fueling of vehicles be “renewable hydrogen of biological origin” or “renewable hydrogen of nonbiological origin” and also would have made a facility that generates electricity using these two specified categories of hydrogen an eligible renewable energy resource. This bill died on the Assembly Floor.

SB 1075 (Skinner, Chapter 363, Statutes of 2022) directs CARB, in consultation with the CPUC and CEC, to develop an evaluation by June 1, 2024 which includes, among other topics, policy recommendations regarding the use of green hydrogen in the state, an estimate of reduced GHG emissions achievable through the use of green hydrogen, the cost of green hydrogen, the potential use for other forms of hydrogen (not green hydrogen), health and environmental impacts of various forms of hydrogen, and strategies to support hydrogen infrastructure.

SB 1369 (Skinner, Chapter 567, Statutes of 2018) requires the CPUC, CARB, and CEC to consider green electrolytic hydrogen an eligible form of energy storage, and to consider other potential uses of green electrolytic hydrogen. It defines “green electrolytic hydrogen” as hydrogen gas produced for electrolysis, excluding hydrogen gas manufactured using steam reforming or any other technology using a fossil fuel feedstock.

SOURCE: Green Hydrogen Coalition

SUPPORT:

Air Products and Chemicals, INC.
California Hydrogen Business Council
Capstone Green Energy
City of Vernon
Element Resources, INC.
Geokiln Energy Innovation, INC.
Green Hydrogen Coalition
Northern California Power Agency
Pts Advance, LLC
Sierra Energy
Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California

Sustain Social
The Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas

OPPOSITION:

California Environmental Justice Alliance Action, a Project of Tides Advocacy
Earthjustice
Environmental Protection Information Center
Sierra Club
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)
Union of Concerned Scientists

-- END --