Date of Hearing: June 24, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON UTILITIES AND ENERGY
Cottie Petrie-Norris, Chair
SB 804 (Archuleta) – As Amended June 8, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 34-0

This bill has been referred back to the Assembly Utilities and Energy Committee pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2.

SUBJECT: Hydrogen Pipeline Safety Act

SUMMARY: Directs the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM), by January 1, 2028, to establish hydrogen pipeline safety standards and enforce those standards consistently across all jurisdictions of the state. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Designates the State Fire Marshal as the primary safety regulator for intrastate hydrogen pipelines in California, with exclusive jurisdiction over hydrogen pipeline safety.

2) Defines "hydrogen pipeline" as dedicated pipelines built after the bill's effective date to transport hydrogen gas. Excludes production facilities, tank trucks, vessels, etc. from this definition.

3) Requires the State Fire Marshal to adopt hydrogen pipeline safety standards by January 1, 2028, that at minimum match federal regulations, and exempts OSFM from the Administrative Procedures Act in this adoption.

4) Sets specific construction requirements for these hydrogen pipelines: i.e., only new, hydrogen-compatible materials resistant to corrosion/embrittlement, continuous leak monitoring systems, and design that allows internal inspection devices.

5) Requires existing hydrogen pipeline operators to file a safety assessment (covering prior leaks, inspection/maintenance needs) with the State Fire Marshal by July 1, 2027.

6) Mandates annual pressure testing, certified by an independent third-party tester chosen from a State Fire Marshal-approved list, with advance notice to local fire departments before any test.

7) Prohibits structures, fences, or obstructions within or adjacent to hydrogen pipeline easements that would block surface or aerial access.

8) Requires operators to share pipeline maps, safety data sheets, and emergency contingency plans with local fire departments, and meet with them at least once a year.

9) Establishes a public centralized database of intrastate hydrogen pipeline locations, ages, ownership, and inspection histories.

10) Requires annual State Fire Marshal inspections of all intrastate hydrogen pipelines starting January 1, 2027.

11) Mandates immediate reporting of any rupture, explosion, or fire to the local fire department and the Office of Emergency Services, which must then notify the State Fire Marshal.

12) Allows the State Fire Marshal to shut down pipelines for safety violations or immediate danger, and requires pipelines to stay offline after a rupture until the cause is determined.

13) Sets civil penalties up to the federal maximum for violations, and criminal penalties up to $25,000 and/or one year in jail for willful violations of this Act.

14) Creates the California Hydrogen Pipeline Safety Fund (with a Pipeline Operations Account and Local Training Account) funded by annual fees on hydrogen operators; penalty money goes toward hazardous liquid and hydrogen fire suppression training for local fire departments.

15) Preserves the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) authority over public utilities; where this Act and CPUC rules conflict, the more protective rule applies.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes OSFM, within the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal FIRE), to foster, promote and develop ways and means of protecting life and property against fire and panic. (Health and Safety Code §§ 13100-13100.1)

2) Requires OSFM to adopt hazardous liquid and carbon dioxide pipeline safety regulations that comply with federal law regarding hazardous liquid pipeline safety. Establishes certain recordkeeping and reporting requirements for hazardous liquid pipeline operators. (Government Code §§ 51010, et seq.)

3) Requires OSFM to adopt regulations by July 1, 2026, to regulate the transportation of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in a pipeline, including certain specified safety standards that, at a minimum, are as protective as the draft regulations proposed by the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). (Government Code §§ 51011.5-51015.06)

4) Authorizes the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to supervise and regulate every public utility in the state and permits the CPUC to do anything that is necessary and convenient to exercise its power and jurisdiction. Existing law provides the CPUC with broad authority to regulate any utility's rules, practices, equipment, appliances, facilities, or service if the CPUC finds that those rules, practices, equipment, appliances, facilities, or services are unjust, unreasonable, unsafe, improper, inadequate, or insufficient after conducting a hearing. (Public Utilities Code §§ 701 and 761)

5) Requires each gas corporation to develop a plan for the safe and reliable operation of its CPUC-regulated gas pipeline facility. Existing law specifies components that must be included in these plans and requires the CPUC to review and accept, modify, or reject the plan for each gas corporation. Under existing law, gas corporations are required to implement gas pipeline safety plans approved by the CPUC. (Public Utilities Code §§ 961 and 963)

6) Pursuant to federal law:

    a. Grants the United States Secretary of Transportation the regulatory and enforcement authority over gas and hazardous liquid pipelines, including hydrogen (H_2) pipelines. (49 United States Code § 60102)

    b. Prohibits the Secretary of Transportation from prescribing or enforcing safety standards and practices for an intrastate pipeline or intrastate pipeline facility to the extent that the safety standards and practices are regulated by a state authority, except as provided. (49 United States Code § 60105)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill was significantly amended on June 8, 2026. It is keyed fiscal and will be referred to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2, for its review.

BACKGROUND:

California's Hydrogen Future – As in most matters of long-term, deep decarbonization, there is a range of plausible futures for the use of hydrogen in California. The California Air Resources Board's 2022 Scoping Plan Update envisioned a mix of technologies providing California's burgeoning hydrogen supply.[1] 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 in the draft scoping plan update considered using only electrolysis to meet the projected demand for hydrogen.[2] It found that doing so would require 40 gigawatts (GW) of renewable electricity dedicated to electrolysis: an amount roughly equivalent to today's statewide summer peak grid demand. Instead, the final update prescribed a mix of steam methane reforming of biomethane, gasification of biomass with carbon capture, and electrolysis from (21 GW of) off-grid solar resources to produce the statewide hydrogen supply needed in 2045.[3] The next scoping plan update will be in 2027.

H_2 General Safety – Hydrogen has unique physical and chemical properties, such as its small molecular size, low ignition energy, wide flammability range (4% to 75% in air), and tendency to cause material embrittlement, especially in metals.[4] These characteristics necessitate specialized engineering controls, materials, and safety standards to prevent leaks, detect incidents early, and ensure safe storage, transport, and use. Agencies like the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) are actively researching and developing regulations to address these challenges, particularly as

---

[1] CARB, *2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality*; December 2022; https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2023-04/2022-sp.pdf
[2] See footnote 151, pg. 88, CARB *2022 Scoping Plan; Ibid.*
[3] CARB, 2022 Scoping Plan Appendix H, AB 32 GHG Inventory Sector Modeling; https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-01/nc-2022-sp-appendix-h-ab-32-ghg-inventory-sector-modeling.pdf.pdf
[4] U.S. Department of Energy Hydrogen Program; https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/safety-codes-and-standards

hydrogen use expands under initiatives like the Hydrogen Energy Earthshot.[5, 6] Ongoing efforts include updating codes and standards related to pipeline materials, advanced leak detection technologies, and emergency response protocols to ensure hydrogen can be safely integrated into the broader energy system. In addition to designing safety features into hydrogen systems, training in safe hydrogen handling practices and testing is a key element for ensuring the safe use of hydrogen.

H_2 Pipeline Safety – In 2018, the Legislature passed SB 1369 (Skinner, Chapter 567, Statutes of 2018), which defined green electrolytic hydrogen and required the CPUC, CEC and CARB to consider potential uses of green electrolytic hydrogen. As part of its duties to implement SB 1369, the CPUC commissioned a study with researchers from the University of California at Riverside on the operational and safety concerns associated with injecting hydrogen into the existing natural gas pipeline system at various percentages of hydrogen blended with natural gas. The CPUC published this study in July 2022. Among its findings, the study concluded the following:

- Blending up to 5% hydrogen into the natural gas stream is generally safe.
- Blending above 5% hydrogen into natural gas pipelines results in a greater chance of pipeline leaks and embrittlement of steel pipes.
- Hydrogen blends above 5% could require modifications of appliances such as stoves and water heaters to avoid leaks and equipment malfunction.
- Hydrogen blends of more than 20% increase the likelihood that blends will permeate plastic pipes, increasing the risk of gas explosions outside the pipeline.
- Due to the lower energy content of hydrogen gas, more hydrogen-blended natural gas will be needed to deliver the same amount of energy to users compared to pure natural gas.

The study also indicated that additional research, including real-world demonstrations in utility infrastructure, is needed to ensure that hydrogen pipeline injection is safe for the conditions specific to California.

Overlapping Oversight – PHMSA, under the Department of Transportation, has exclusive federal authority over ***inter***state pipeline facilities.[7] An interstate pipeline is one used in the transportation of hazardous liquid or gas in interstate or foreign commerce. Typically, these lines cross state borders or begin in federal waters. As of 2015, there were 1,188 miles of interstate pipeline in California.[8] State agencies may regulate portions of interstate pipelines located within the state, if there is an agreement between PHMSA and the agency. For hazardous liquid pipelines, that agreement is with OSFM; for gas pipelines, it is the CPUC. These agencies are only allowed to enter into an agreement with PHMSA if given all regulatory and enforcement

[5] https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/research-and-development/hydrogen-safety-research
[6] https://www.nrel.gov/hydrogen/hydrogen-safety.html
[7] 49 USC § 60101, et seq.
[8] Cal FIRE-OSFM Pipeline Safety Division "Information Sheet"; October 21, 2015; https://antr.assembly.ca.gov/sites/antr.assembly.ca.gov/files/Pipeline%20Hearing%20%2810%2021%2015%29_CALFIRE%20FactSheet%20.pdf

authority of the pipelines subject to the agreement. PHMSA maintains these agreements as certifications through the Office of Pipeline Safety, which are updated annually.[9]

OSFM and the CPUC share the regulation over ***intra***state pipeline facilities. OSFM regulates intrastate hazardous *liquid* pipelines pursuant to the Elder California Pipeline Safety Act of 1981.[10] Whereas the CPUC regulates intrastate *gas* pipelines (both natural gas and liquid petroleum gas). An intrastate pipeline is defined as a pipeline that is located entirely within state borders, including offshore state waters. As of 2015, there were 4,500 miles of intrastate pipeline in California, although that number was predicted to grow.[11] The vast majority of pipelines in California carry petroleum based hazardous liquids.[12]

The federal definition of "gas" for purposes of the Pipeline Safety Act includes "natural gas, flammable gas, or toxic or corrosive gas."[13] As such, hydrogen pipelines are included in PHMSA jurisdiction. The pipelines are regulated under the general gas pipeline safety regulations, similarly to natural gas pipelines,[14] due to PHMSA not yet having a hydrogen-specific rule. In 2023, PHMSA started developing new regulations specific to hydrogen pipelines in response to the Biden Administration's Hydrogen Energy Earthshot Initiative and the scaling up of "clean hydrogen" industries.[15] While PHMSA issued a final rule on gas pipeline leak detection and repair in January 2025, which enhances safety measures for gas pipelines in general, specific regulations tailored exclusively for hydrogen pipelines are still under development.[16]

As of December 2020, there were 1,608 miles of active hydrogen pipelines in the United States.[17] Over 90% of these pipelines are located along the Gulf Coast in Texas, Louisiana, and Alabama, primarily serving refineries and ammonia plants in the region.[18] Comparatively short hydrogen pipelines are located elsewhere in Texas, Louisiana, and in 9 other states. California has 16 miles of hydrogen pipeline, Indiana has 14 miles, and the remaining 7 states have fewer

---

[9] U.S. Department of Transportation, PHMSA website; "Regulatory Fact Sheet: California;" https://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/FactSheets/States/CA_State_PL_Safety_Regulatory_Fact_Sheet.htm?nocache=1716; accessed April 16, 2025.
[10] Gov. Code, § 51010, et seq.
[11] Cal FIRE-OSFM Pipeline Safety Division "Information Sheet"; October 21, 2015; https://antr.assembly.ca.gov/sites/antr.assembly.ca.gov/files/Pipeline%20Hearing%20%2810%2021%2015%29_CALFIRE%20FactSheet%20.pdf
[12] According to a 2015 background paper prepared by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources for "Joint Informational Hearing: Oil Pipeline Safety: Testing Methods and Frequency;" Santa Barbara, CA; October 21, 2015.
[13] 49 United States Code § 60101(a)(2)
[14] 49 United States Code § 192
[15] Vincent Holohan, PHMSA presentation, "2024 DOE HFTO Workshop: Hydrogen Infrastructure Strategies to Enable Deployment in High-Impact Sectors;" January 18, 2024; https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-02/h2-infrastructure-strategies-workshop-holohan.pdf
[16] PHMSA Final rule; 4910-60-W; "Pipeline Safety: Gas Pipeline Leak Detection and Repair;" RIN 2137-AF51; https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/2025-01/PHMSA%20Final%20Rule%20-%20Gas%20Pipeline%20Leak%20Detection%20and%20Repair%20-%20As%20submitted.pdf
[17] Paul Parfomak, "Pipeline Transportation of Hydrogen: Regulation, Research, and Policy;" *Congressional Research Service;* March 2, 2021. https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/R/PDF/R46700/R46700.3.pdf
[18] Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), "Gas Distribution, Gas Gathering, Gas Transmission, Hazardous Liquids, Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG), and Underground Natural Gas Storage (UNGS) Annual Report Data," Form 7100.2-1 operator filings database, 2020, available at https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/dataand-statistics/pipeline/gas-distribution-gas-gathering-gas-transmission-hazardous-liquids. The other states with hydrogen pipelines are Kansas, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, and Washington.

than 10 miles each.[19] By comparison, there are over 300,000 miles of U.S. natural gas transmission pipeline (not counting distribution mains) located in the 48 contiguous states and Alaska.

COMMENTS:

1) *Author's Statement.* According to the author, "California is leading the clean energy transition, and hydrogen is poised to play a critical role in decarbonizing sectors such as cement production, aviation, and heavy-duty transportation. As hydrogen infrastructure expands, safety must remain the top priority for California's pipeline network. Yet existing regulations have not kept pace with the growth of hydrogen projects. Senate Bill 804, the Hydrogen Pipeline Safety Act, addresses this gap by requiring the Office of the State Fire Marshal to develop safety standards specifically tailored to hydrogen's unique characteristics and risks. By strengthening oversight and establishing clear safety requirements, SB 804 will support the responsible deployment of hydrogen infrastructure while protecting public health, safeguarding the environment, and maintaining public confidence in California's clean energy future."

2) *Purpose of Bill.* The current version of this bill reflects several months of work by the author to identify how best to enhance the prior version of this measure, which directed the Office of the State Fire Marshal to develop regulations for hydrogen pipelines without much detail on implementation or objectives. This recently amended bill establishes a prescriptive safety regulatory framework for hydrogen pipelines, largely modeled after the Elder Act, the governing statute for hazardous liquid (e.g., petroleum) pipelines in the state. This bill gives the State Fire Marshal exclusive authority to set and enforce safety standards for intrastate hydrogen pipelines – covering design, construction, testing, monitoring, inspection, and emergency response – while positioning California to also act as a federal agent for interstate pipelines within the state. The underlying goal is to enable hydrogen's role in a clean energy transition without compromising public safety or environmental integrity.

3) *Definitional Clarification.* This bill defines "hydrogen pipelines" as dedicated pipelines that have been constructed on or after January 1, 2028, for the purpose of transporting hydrogen gas. Yet, the bill also creates requirements on "existing" hydrogen pipelines, which contradicts the definitional limitation that all hydrogen pipelines are "new." *To remove this confusion, the committee recommends striking the construction date limitation in the definition of "hydrogen pipeline" and instead adding the limitation – either before or after the safety regulations are complete – to the applicable provisions for "existing" or "new" pipelines. The committee further recommends specifying hydrogen pipelines for the purposes of this bill are "transmission" pipelines, to distinguish from distribution pipelines that may carry hydrogen gas directly to residential or business customers.*

4) *The Missing Middle – Who's Watching the Blending?* This bill focuses on all aspects of the safety of dedicated hydrogen pipelines. As noted above, PHMSA has exclusive jurisdiction over pipelines, while the CPUC regulates intrastate gas pipelines and OSFM regulates intrastate liquid pipelines. Several other state agencies also play roles in

[19] *Ibid.*

regulating intrastate pipelines. CalGEM regulates oil and gas production pipelines and wells within or near an oil field, the State Lands Commission manages offshore oil production, and the CPUC regulates in-state utility facilities, including the rates charged by petroleum pipelines acting as common carriers. Currently, the state regulator for hydrogen pipelines is unclear or unspecified.

While hydrogen pipelines are not explicitly an existing authority of the CPUC, the CPUC's jurisdiction over gas utilities positions it as a potential regulator for hydrogen infrastructure as the industry evolves and gas utilities expand into this space. Certainly, in circumstances where existing utility pipelines would be used, such as hydrogen blending in a common carrier natural gas pipeline, the CPUC would regulate. The CPUC has to date limited hydrogen blending to pilot projects kept off the common carrier pipe, but as hydrogen blending expands, the gap posed by this bill becomes more significant. By moving safety authority for dedicated hydrogen pipelines to the State Fire Marshal, this bill has the potential to further complicate an already unclear oversight picture: a pipeline carrying a hydrogen-natural gas blend would presumably remain under CPUC jurisdiction, while a dedicated hydrogen pipeline would fall under OSFM. The bill does not directly address this boundary, leaving open the question of whether a pipeline's regulatory home could shift depending on the concentration of hydrogen it carries; a threshold the bill sets at over 90% by volume. This ambiguity could create confusion for operators, local fire departments, and regulators alike, particularly as blending levels and pipeline uses evolve over time.

This bill does attempt to clarify this regulatory gap by affirming the authority of the CPUC to regulate the rates and service of public utilities and asserts if a conflict between regulations adopted by the OSFM and the CPUC arises as it relates to hydrogen facilities, the more protective requirements shall apply. However, this seems to contradict the legislative intent at the top of the bill that notes the Fire Marshal's "exclusive" jurisdiction over hydrogen pipeline safety. *To relieve this contradiction, the committee recommends deleting the word "exclusive" in subparagraph (b) of Section 1.*

5) *Timing Mismatch.* Section 51020.04 of this bill directs the State Fire Marshal to adopt federal pipeline safety regulations – essentially incorporating existing federal standards into state law – and notably exempts that rulemaking from the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), requiring only filing with the Office of Administrative Law. Section 51020.08 then separately requires the State Fire Marshal to adopt hydrogen pipeline safety standards that meet or exceed a new set of specific requirements by January 1, 2028. This creates both a timing mismatch and a conceptual confusion: it is unclear whether the Fire Marshal first adopts federal minimums under 51020.04 and then layers additional standards on top under 51020.08, or whether 51020.08 effectively supersedes 51020.04 once the 2028 deadline is met. The relationship between the two sections is not explained, and the APA exemption in 51020.04 raises an additional concern: bypassing normal rulemaking procedures reduces public notice and comment opportunities for what could be consequential safety standards. *The committee recommends amendments to resolve this anachronistic structure by clarifying the sequencing and intent of these two rulemaking directives, and to strike the APA exemption to ensure the public retains its standard role in the regulatory process*.

6) *Easement Considerations.* Section 51020.18 of the bill includes easement and access provisions drawn directly from petroleum pipeline law. While a baseline protection in statute has value, dedicated hydrogen transmission pipelines are new enough that there isn't comparable real-world failure data known to the committee. So borrowing the petroleum standard seems like a precaution rather than something calibrated correctly for hydrogen's actual risk profile.

   The aerial observation requirement illustrates the problem well: for petroleum pipelines, patrol flights look for oil sheen, soil staining, or dead vegetation – surface-level contamination that is visually detectable. Hydrogen behaves differently. It is odorless, colorless, and far less dense than air, meaning it disperses upward almost immediately rather than pooling or staining the ground. The visual cues that make aerial observation a meaningful safety tool for petroleum lines largely do not exist for hydrogen leaks, so prohibiting shrubbery to preserve sightlines may be doing less safety work than the petroleum template assumes, even if keeping the corridor clear for ground access remains worthwhile. The anti-encroachment framing also reflects a different historical problem: petroleum pipeline law was designed to protect corridors that already existed from being built over by later development. Hydrogen transmission pipelines present the inverse challenge: the easement does not yet exist and must be carved out of land that is likely already developed, owned, and built around other uses. The relevant questions are where the pipeline should go, how wide the corridor needs to be, and what it can be sited adjacent to; questions that anti-encroachment language in the present bill is not designed to answer. *Given this, the committee recommends amendments to Section 51020.18 that still preserve the easement protections in the bill but add acknowledgement to the possible operational differences between hydrogen and petroleum pipes. Additionally, the committee recommends permitting the Fire Marshal to adopt regulations to address the implementation of this section.*

7) *Fee Fairness.* Section 51020.40 of the bill authorizes the State Fire Marshal to assess an annual fee on hydrogen pipeline operators to cover the costs of implementing this chapter. But as written, that fee would fall exclusively on Air Products who note, in their opposition letter to the bill, are the only hydrogen pipeline operators currently in California today. This is a meaningful concern for two reasons. First, the upfront costs of implementation are not trivial: developing the regulations required under Sections 51020.08 and 51020.12, standing up the inspection program, and building the centralized database all represent new work and likely new positions that would need to be funded beginning in 2027, before the regulatory framework is fully in place. Concentrating those costs on a single operator creates both a practical funding problem and a fairness question. Second, the fee as written is siloed in a new chapter entirely separate from the Elder Act, meaning OSFM cannot straightforwardly pool it with fees collected from existing hazardous liquid pipeline operators — those fees are specific to Elder Act implementation. One potential fix would be to amend the Elder Act's fee provision to encompass both pipeline operators and hydrogen pipeline operators and cover costs incurred under both chapters, though that approach raises its own question of whether operators like Crimson and Kinder Morgan should bear any share of costs for a regulatory program they do not currently participate in. This represents a quandary. *The committee recommends striking the hydrogen-specific fee authority in Section 51020.40 and instead amending the Elder Act's existing fee provisions (Government Code §§ 51019-51019.1) to include hydrogen pipeline operators alongside all other pipeline*

operators already subject to OSFM jurisdiction, thereby broadening the funding pool and distributing implementation costs across a larger operator base. The committee encourages the author to work with OSFM and impacted operators to clarify this funding mechanism, and to recommend any further clarifications needed to align the fee structure in a manner that ensures the program can be adequately funded without placing a disproportionate and potentially unworkable burden on a single operator.

8) *Other Amendments. The committee recommends additional technical and clarifying amendments such as striking redundant provisions, reorganizing, and deleting erroneous language.*

9) *Related Legislation.*

SB 1350 (McNerney) provides that a turbine converting hydrogen to electricity may be considered a renewable electric generating facility for purposes of the Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) if specified criteria are met. Status: pending hearing in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

10) *Prior Legislation.*

AB 716 (Carrillo, 2025) requires the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) to adopt the National Fire Protection Association Hydrogen Technologies Code as the statewide fire safety standards and guidelines for hydrogen production, storage, and distribution facilities, as specified. Status: Held under submission in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

SB 614 (Stern) requires OSFM to adopt regulations by July 1, 2026, to regulate the transportation of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in a pipeline, including certain specified safety standards that, at a minimum, are as protective as the draft regulations proposed by the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). Status: Chapter 529, Statutes of 2025.

AB 2204 (Bennett, 2024) establishes a goal, by an unspecified date, for all in-state hydrogen production, and specifically excludes any fossil fuel use as either a feedstock or energy source in the production process. Also requires the hydrogen to show the use of new and incremental renewable generation, temporal matching, and geographic deliverability. Status: Died in the Assembly Committee on Utilities and Energy.

SB 1418 (Archuleta) requires every city and county to adopt an ordinance to create an expedited, streamlined permitting process for hydrogen-fueling stations. Status: Chapter 607, Statutes of 2024.

SB 1420 (Caballero) provides for expedited California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and California Energy Commission (CEC) review for hydrogen production facilities that have received state or federal funding. Status: Chapter 608, Statutes of 2024.

AB 1550 (Bennett, 2023) 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." Status: Died on the Assembly Floor.

SB 414 (Allen, 2023) required CARB, upon appropriation, to complete an assessment of the use of hydrogen in specified applications. Status: Died in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

SB 1075 (Skinner) 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, and an estimate of reduced GHG emissions achievable through the use of green hydrogen. Status: Chapter 363, Statutes of 2022.

AB 157 (Committee on Budget) authorized GO-Biz to take steps to prepare and submit an application to receive funding from the regional clean hydrogen hubs program or to otherwise participate in the regional clean hydrogen hubs program. The bill also established a definition of clean hydrogen. Status: Chapter 570, Statutes of 2022.

SB 1369 (Skinner) 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. Status: Chapter 567, Statutes of 2018.

11) *Double Referral.* This bill is double referred. Upon passage in this committee, it will be referred to the Assembly Committee on Emergency Management for its review.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California State Pipe Trades Council
Environmental Defense Fund
State Building and Construction Trades Council

Oppose

Pipeline Safety Trust

Oppose Unless Amended

Air Products and Chemicals, INC.

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