



ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE

Friday, June 5, 2026

9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Register for this meeting:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89513587528?pwd=vsPuxA2oMOn4zTPsUamZGBao7LLkX7.1>

Immediately after registering, you will receive a link and confirmation email to join the meeting.

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Max Perrey, Mayor, Mill Valley
Vice Chair Scott Bauer, Council Member, Eureka
Cal Cities President Gabe Quinto, Mayor, El Cerrito
Cal Cities Executive Director and CEO Carolyn Coleman

II. Building an Affordable California Act: CEQA Ballot Initiative (Attachment A) Action

Cal Cities Staff
Cal Chamber
Planning and Conservation League

III. Public Comment

IV. CEQA Exemption Graduate Research Project Informational

UC Davis Graduate Student Cohort, Environmental Management and Policy Program

V. SB 254 Report Update and Roundtable Informational

[Enhancing California's Resiliency to Natural Catastrophes](#)
All

VI. Legislative & Regulatory Updates Informational

Cal Cities Staff

VII. Adjourn

Next Virtual Meeting: Staff will notify committee members by **August 7** if the policy committee meets in September. If you have any questions, please contact [Meg Desmond](#), Cal Cities Program Manager, Legislative Administration.

Brown Act Reminder: The League of California Cities' Board of Directors has a policy of complying with the spirit of open meeting laws. Generally, off-agenda items may be taken up only if:

- 1) Two-thirds of the policy committee members find a need for immediate action exists and the need to take action came to the attention of the policy committee after the agenda was prepared (Note: If fewer than two-thirds of policy committee members are present, taking up an off-agenda item requires a unanimous vote); or*
 - 2) A majority of the policy committee finds an emergency (for example: work stoppage or disaster) exists.*
- A majority of a city council may not, consistent with the Brown Act, discuss specific substantive issues among themselves at League meetings. Any such discussion is subject to the Brown Act and must occur in a meeting that complies with its requirements.*

**Transportation, Communications, and Public Works Policy Committee
Environmental Quality Policy Committee
Housing Community and Economic Development Policy Committee
Ballot Measure Agenda Item**

Staff: Melissa Sparks-Kranz, Legislative Advocate
Brady Guertin, Legislative Advocate
Damon Conklin, Legislative Advocate
Leila Romero, Policy and Legislative Affairs Analyst

1. [Building an Affordable California Act](#) Ballot Initiative

Ballot Summary:

The Building an Affordable California Act (BACA) would create special procedures under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) that apply only to “essential projects.” Essential projects are specific types of housing, water, clean energy, public health, wildfire safety, broadband internet access, education facilities, and transportation (see essential project definitions in Section 7 below). The special CEQA and the PSA procedures include:

- A new pre-application screening for tribal cultural resources and changes to CEQA's existing tribal consultation process;
- Changing the “project alternative analysis” by allowing an applicant-developed single “project alternative”;
- New deadlines for the completion of environmental documents and project approvals;
- Payment of prevailing wages/project labor agreements for all essential projects and with special labor rules for housing projects;
- Limit the basis for challenging the approval of an essential project based upon defects in the environmental document.
- Essential project definitions.

Ballot Description:

BACA is a ballot initiative that would create an opt-in review process for essential projects under CEQA and PSA. A developer could opt-in for private projects; a public agency could opt-in for public projects. The following components are the major changes proposed by BACA:

Initial screening for tribal cultural resources and expanded tribal consultation

BACA would emphasize and strengthen the existing confidentiality requirements that apply to information regarding tribal cultural resources. Under the measure, the definition of “tribal cultural resource” would be expanded to include sites that are identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and a tribal government register maintained by a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer pursuant to federal law. BACA would add an “initial screening” as a step before tribal consultation under CEQA. The initial screening is proposed as a meet and confer process to identify and evaluate tribal cultural resources prior to an application being deemed complete. It should be noted that consulting tribes

are defined as federally recognized tribes only. During the meet and confer, treatment and protection methods, measures, and conditions to address impacts on tribal cultural resources, including avoidance and preservation in place, must be evaluated. BACA would add requirements to the process of tribal consultation, including that the city or lead agency would be required to (1) document why “avoidance and preservation in place” is not feasible through project design, buffering, or other protective measures; (2) consider and incorporate to the extent feasible the consulting tribe’s mitigation and treatment measures; (3) provide all technical reports to consulting tribe; (4) include inadvertent discovery measures (e.g. temporary halt in grading, etc.) when a project proposes construction-related ground disturbance.

BACA would also prohibit a lead agency from approving a project unless (1) tribal consultation has ended in good faith; (2) agreed upon mitigation measures have been incorporated as enforceable conditions; and (3) the lead agency has determined, based upon substantial evidence, that avoidance and preservation in place is not feasible and other measures have been incorporated to minimize the impacts.

New Pre-Application Preliminary Scoping and Streamlined Alternatives

BACA would add a new preliminary scoping step, which includes a 60-day process prior to an applicant submitting an application that requires at least two meetings between the project applicant and the lead agency to discuss potential alternatives and to identify potentially impacted areas.

BACA would allow the project applicant to develop one proposed project alternative which, aside from the “no project” alternative, would be the only alternative analyzed in an environmental impact report prepared for the project.

Shorter deadlines for the completion of environmental documents

Under BACA, the following deadlines would be imposed on lead agencies:

- An environmental impact report must be completed within 365 days of a complete application.
- A negative declaration must be completed within 180 days of a complete application.
- All other determinations must be made within 90 days.
- A final decision on the project must be made at the same time as the approval of the environmental document.

If a deadline is missed, the lead agency would be required to complete the document, including an environmental impact report, within 60 days of a request by the project applicant.

Additionally, the initiative would require a public agency to circulate an environmental review document for an essential project for public comment periods as follows:

- 20 days for a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration or other document requiring public circulation under state law.
- 45 days for a draft environmental impact report or subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report.

The public comment periods cannot be extended, except by a court.

Under BACA, if an agency determines an application for an essential project is incomplete, the applicant would be required, within 90 days, to submit additional information and/or a revised application. The agency would then have 30 days to determine if the additional information made the application complete.

Prevailing wages and labor agreements

BACA would require that specific prevailing wage/project labor agreements be required for specific types of essential projects, including the following:

- The labor standards of SB 35 (2017) applying to housing projects over 85 feet in height, including:
 - Contractors and subcontractors must pay prevailing wages
 - Use skilled and trained labor (apprenticeship programs)
 - Projects with 50+ units must use a "Project Labor Agreement" or certified payroll records
- The labor standards in AB 130 (2025) would apply to all housing projects, including:
 - Required prevailing wage for 100% lower-income housing projects
 - The use of a skilled and trained workforce for buildings over 85 feet in height
- Requires all construction workers are paid prevailing wages for all essential projects, except housing projects.

Limits to the basis for challenging an environmental document

Under BACA, trial court and appellate proceedings must be completed within 270 days, unless extended by the court for up to an additional 90 days. If a court identifies a deficiency in the approval of the environmental document, the portion of the project not affected by that deficiency can proceed while the deficiency is corrected.

A person challenging a city's compliance with CEQA for an essential project is limited to arguing that the city has failed to comply with "objective existing laws". According to the sponsors, this means that a project opponent would be limited to claims that an approval violated an objective standard in effect on the date the application was deemed complete. They explain that this means that a project opponent would not be able to challenge approval or authorization of a project on subjective grounds, such as failure to consider subjective measures of environmental impacts.

The initiative would limit the basis for CEQA challenges and only allow the following public comment information to be included in the administrative record for an essential project:

- Electronic and written comments received during the set public comment periods
- Electronic and written comments received at least 48 hours prior to a public hearing or noticed decision on the environmental review documentation for the essential project, for CEQA determinations with no comment period.
- Electronic and written comments received prior to a public hearing or appeal of a CEQA determination on issues that could not have been raised during the public comment period due to significant changes to the essential project that precluded the issues from being raised or new information that was not known.
- Oral testimony at a noticed and recorded public hearing.

All other public comments would be disregarded and excluded from the administrative record.

Essential project definitions

BACA defines "essential projects" as the following types of projects that could use the streamlined review process outlined in the initiative:

- "Essential broadband Internet access project" means a project to provide mass-market retail service by wire service, wireless service, or radio to customers in this state that provides the capability to transmit data to, and receive data from, all or substantially all Internet endpoints, including, but not limited to, any capabilities that are incidental to and enable the operation of the communications service, but excluding dial-up Internet access service.
- "Essential clean energy project" means a project that supports California's climate, energy efficiency, reliability, electrification, sustainability, or clean energy objectives through one or more of the following:
 - Producing, generating, or storing electricity derived from renewable or sustainable resources, including, but not limited to, solar, wind, geothermal, fuel cells that comply with the emissions standards adopted by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to distributed generation certification program requirements, small hydroelectric generation of 30 megawatts or less, digester gas, municipal solid waste conversion, landfill gas, ocean wave, ocean thermal, or tidal current, and associated transmission lines.
 - Producing, generating, storing, transmitting, or distributing clean hydrogen, which is not derived from a fossil fuel feedstock.
 - Developing, constructing, or installing microgrids and associated infrastructure.
 - Capturing, transporting, and/or storing carbon dioxide emissions for permanent isolation from sources including, but not limited to, energy production, manufacturing, or refining facilities.
 - Developing, constructing, upgrading, or expanding transmission or distribution system components identified in a transmission planning process approved by the Independent System Operator or in an Integrated Energy Policy Report, including financing of such facilities, assets, or components through sale, lease, assignment, mortgage, or other disposition or encumbrance requiring state agency approval.
- "Essential education facility project" means the acquisition, construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation, improvement, furnishing, or equipping of an educational facility.
- "Essential housing project" means all of the following:
 - Residential units only.
 - A mixed-use development.
 - Transitional housing, emergency shelters, or supportive housing.
 - Farmworker housing.
 - Group living accommodations, meaning building(s) or portion of any building(s) designed for or accommodating a residential use by persons not living together as a household, typically without separate kitchens or bathroom facilities for each room or unit. This use includes, without limitation, convents, monasteries, and other types of organizational housing.
 - Student housing units, meaning any residential units or group living accommodation intended for use by students, including, without limitation, dormitory-style student housing and suite-style student housing.

- Senior housing units, meaning any residential units or group living accommodation of any size intended for occupation by persons 55 years of age or over, including, without limitation, the following:
 - An intergenerational housing development;
 - senior congregate housing;
 - A senior citizen housing development;
 - A residential care facility for the elderly; and
 - A continuing care retirement community.
 - A subdivision or common interest development, consisting of residential units or unimproved residential lots.
 - A conversion of an existing commercial building to residential use.
- "Essential water project" means any project or action to construct, expand, repair, replace, improve, or augment any of the following:
 - a "public water system";
 - a system that directly or indirectly provides water to a public water system; or
 - a system which is generally described and within the scope of the State's Water Resilience Portfolio.
 - Essential water project does not include the Delta conveyance facilities.
- "Essential public health project" means a medical treatment facility.
- "Essential public safety project" means a first responder facility or a wildfire risk reduction project. A wildfire risk reduction project limited to vegetation management, fuel reduction, creating or maintaining fuel breaks, or reducing fuel loading that is undertaken directly by a public agency using its own employees shall be deemed to comply with this paragraph if the public agency's employees working on the project are covered by a collective bargaining agreement or other state civil service laws that provide equivalent wage, training, and safety standards.
- "Essential transportation project" means the following:
 - Any project that requires fuel tax revenues to be used exclusively for planning, constructing, improving, maintaining, and operating public streets and highways, including associated environmental mitigation and administrative costs. It also covers public facilities for nonmotorized traffic, such as pedestrian and bicycle paths, or projects where revenues for the planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways, such as light rail systems, environmental mitigation and maintenance of structures and right-of-way.
 - Electric vehicle charging and refueling infrastructure.
 - Essential transportation projects does not include any component of the high speed rail.

Background:

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires state and local agencies, as lead agencies, to identify, analyze and mitigate, if possible, the environmental impacts of proposed projects before their approval. Enacted in 1970, CEQA has been a tool for environmental analysis, government transparency, and public participation.. Based on an initial evaluation of a proposed project, the lead agency will determine if the proposed project may have significant impacts on the environment. If not made exempt from CEQA by either a categorical or statutory exemption, the lead agency will determine the type of environmental document that is necessary, a mitigation negative declaration where

significant impacts can be mitigated, or an environmental impact report which is a full environmental analysis that includes the consideration of project alternatives, including a "no project alternative", and mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of the proposed project to a level of insignificance.

The current timelines for CEQA are generally considered directory not mandatory. Such timelines include completing the initial study within 30 days of receiving the application, completing and adopting a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration within 180 days once the application is complete, and 365 days or one year to complete and certify an environmental impact report from the date the application is complete. Notices of exemption must be posted for 30 days before the decision can be finalized. There are statutes of limitations for filing lawsuits that vary depending on the type of environmental documentation, including 35 days after the agency posts a notice of exemption, 30 days after the agency posts a notice of determination for environmental documentation, and if no notices are filed, a lawsuit can be pursued 180 days from the date that the project is approved.

The Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) was enacted in 1977 in order to expedite the processing of permits for development projects. The PSA achieves this goal by setting forth various time limits within which state and local government agencies must either approve or disapprove a project. The PSA clock does not start until the applicant submits a complete permit application. The agency has 30 days after an application is submitted in which to inform the applicant of whether the application is complete. If the agency does not inform the applicant within that 30-day period, the application will be "deemed complete" if the application is for a development project, even if the application is deficient. A new 30-day period begins with each re-submission of an application. However, the PSA's time limits may be extended once and only one for a period of up to 90 days upon the mutual consent of the agency and the applicant. Agencies are required to make lists available to the public that specify in detail the information required for an application. The PSA applies only to "development projects", which means any project undertaken for the purpose of development, which includes a project involving the issuance of a permit for construction or reconstruction but not a permit to operate. Although the PSA generally applies only to "development projects" that require the exercise of discretion, housing development projects that are subject to a ministerial approval process are subject to the PSA.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

Categorical Exemption for Nonindustrial Infill Projects. Cal Cities supports expanding categorical exemptions to include development projects in urbanized areas that are consistent with general plans, zoning and cumulative impact projections analyzed in a Master EIR. Such projects should be limited infill and nonindustrial. Cal Cities supports legislation that exempts public works projects, within the existing right-of-way, from CEQA if approved by the city in which the project takes place.

Streamlining. Cal Cities supports expanding the definition of "emergency" under CEQA to include projects that mitigate a high threat to life and property as a result of a catastrophic wildfire.

Significance Thresholds. Cal Cities opposes the creation of a new mandate requiring each city to develop boilerplate significance thresholds. Cal Cities also opposes a single statewide set of standards for determining significance at the local level. Instead, Cal Cities supports requiring that each EIR contain significance thresholds formally adopted by the lead agency for the project.

Consideration of Socio-Economic Factors. Cal Cities opposes adding social, economic, recreational or other factors to be considered when analyzing the significance of environmental impacts.

Level of Detail for Alternatives. Cal Cities supports requiring that projects of statewide, regional or area-wide significance describe at least two feasible project alternatives with a level of detail equal to the proposed project.

No Project Alternative. Cal Cities opposes the elimination of the “no project alternative.”

Good Faith Settlements. Cal Cities supports discouraging lawsuits that have little merit by (1) eliminating the application of a multiplier analysis to the amount of attorneys fees awarded in a lawsuit that is subject to a settlement agreement; and (2) by precluding the adoption of measures or project conditions as part of a settlement agreement that do not mitigate a significant effect on the environment.

Court Remedies. Cal Cities supports legislation that would clarify a court's ability to fashion a remedy that is specific to the project and limited to only those aspects of the project held invalid under CEQA.

Effect on the Environment. Cal Cities supports narrowing the definition of “project” to prevent CEQA lawsuits on non-environmental matters.

Transportation

Cal Cities opposes efforts to exempt the High-Speed Rail project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and any other effort that would eliminate an opportunity for local input.

Public Works

Cal Cities supports expedited permitting when the work is necessary to ensure the integrity of utilities, provided that local permitting and plan review framework and requirements are met.

Fiscal Impact:

According the Legislative Analyst's Office, BACA would likely reach costs in the tens of millions of dollars annually during the initial years of implementation for both administrative and legal costs of local and state public agencies. For private projects, government agencies' administrative and legal costs typically can be covered by fees and reimbursements paid by project applicants. Over the long term, the annual net fiscal effects are uncertain, but state and local governments could experience net savings due to reduced administrative and legal workload. The net fiscal effects on state trial courts

ranging from annual savings of up to the tens of millions of dollars to annual costs of up to the low tens of millions of dollars.

Staff Comments:

BACA is a proposed initiative for the November 2026 ballot, sponsored by the California Chamber of Commerce, to streamline CEQA and the PSA to ensure that essential projects can be built in a more "affordable" and faster timeline, with less litigation and delay. While in recent years the Legislature has focused on CEQA exemptions, including [AB 130 and SB 131 from 2025](#), under BACA's framework projects would still go through CEQA, but if opted in, essential projects could go through a more streamlined process as outlined in the initiative. There are both pros and cons to the measure that could significantly impact cities or support streamlining for city public works projects, particularly in the transportation, water and energy sectors.

Cities and counties are often the lead agency under CEQA and act as the local permitting authority for most development projects, as well as local public works projects. BACA would impose significant changes to the way in which cities currently operate as lead agencies, creating two different processes for how lead agencies would administratively review an essential project under BACA versus a non-essential project. This will require cities to staff appropriately for such changes and to be extremely knowledgeable about the differences between the BACA streamlined pathway and current CEQA and PSA processes.

The initial tribal screening and project alternative preliminary scoping could help facilitate early discussions related to tribal cultural resources and to narrow down to a preferred project alternative prior to CEQA and project application review. However, there could be challenges with both processes occurring prior to and outside of the environmental review process. Cities would have to review tribal-related mitigation measures, and if there is mutual agreement, such mitigation measures would be included as enforceable project conditions before reviewing the actual project scope. Similarly, narrowing down to one project alternative could save a city time in its environmental documentation, but the preliminary scoping would occur prior to understanding the extent of the project.

While the measure would simply make enforceable the existing deadlines in the CEQA Guidelines for completing the environmental documentation, cities would be tasked with completing all environmental documentation with 60 days if such deadlines are not met and the project would be expedited to move forward for both approval of the project and the environmental documents at the same time. This could put added pressure on cities to approve projects or expedite the environmental review and conduct as thorough as a review of the potential impacts of the essential project.

The labor standards included in BACA are consistent with existing laws, however they would be applied to the broader set of essential projects as defined in the measure. Additionally, it would be very challenging for a city to process a project in phases if some phases do not meet the definition of an essential project, but the whole of the project is allowed to use BACA's streamlined process, as is allowed under the measure. Further, if an applicant chooses to process the project in parts or phases as an essential project, or if there are ancillary parts of an essential project, then the entire project must comply with

the prevailing wage or labor agreement requirements. This approach could possibly require public agencies to meet specific prevailing wage or labor agreements if providing an “ancillary” benefit to a project (e.g. new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facility to support the essential housing project). While some labor standards might be appropriate for certain types of essential projects, others may not apply as directly, such as wildfire prevention and resilience projects.

The BACA initiative changes to the standard of review of an essential project application. By requiring that essential projects must comply with “objective existing laws”, cities would be required to have checklists prior to project application submission that include all existing law, statute, or regulations that provide an objective threshold for the evaluation to take place. Cal Cities has asked the sponsors for an explanation of what the “objective existing laws” are and it is unclear what those are and how they would be used to limit litigation. The sponsors of the measure explained that this language is meant to prevent project challenges based on approval of a project on subjective grounds “such as failure to consider subjective measures of environmental impacts” (e.g., according to the sponsors, subjective aesthetic impacts or subjective biological impacts).

The timelines in BACA are similar to current law, under the PSA. The initiative expands the types of projects eligible under these timelines based on the essential project definition. It is likely that there could be an increase in the administrative role the city has as the lead agency in reviewing project applications within the timelines.

Providing a statute of limitation on court decisions to 270 days and limiting the basis of the administrative record could be helpful in expediting CEQA litigation.

Such considerations do make it challenging to weigh if BACA would provide greater efficiencies in processing such essential projects or more challenges for cities as lead agencies under CEQA.

Support:

- California Chamber of Commerce (sponsor)
- CA/HI State Conference NAACP
- California League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- National Diversity Coalition
- LeadingAge California
- 21st Century Alliance
- Common Good
- National Action Network Sacramento
- California Hospital Association
- American Clean Power California
- California Energy Storage Alliance
- California Hydrogen Coalition
- California Hydrogen Business Council
- California Water Association
- California Wind Energy Association
- Environmental Policy Innovation Center
- Large-Scale Solar Association

- Agricultural Council of California
- California Biomass Energy Alliance
- Wine Institute
- Breakthrough Institute
- Western Municipal Water District
- Supply Chain Federation
- Coalition of Labor, Agriculture & Business of Santa Barbara County
- Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce
- Associated General Contractors of California (AGC)
- CalBroadband
- US Telecom
- Wireless Infrastructure Association
- Southern California Contractors Association
- United Contractors
- California Construction and Industry Materials Association
- Associated Equipment Distributors
- Building Owners and Managers Association – California
- California Business Properties Association
- California Council for Affordable Housing
- Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
- Housing Action Coalition
- Circulate Planning and Policy
- Leading Builders of America
- California Assisted Living Association
- California Building Industry Association
- North State Building Industry Association
- California Chamber of Commerce
- American Indian Chamber of Commerce of California
- California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
- California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
- Sacramento Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
- California Taxpayer Protection Committee
- Family Business Association of California
- Asian Industry B2B
- New California Coalition
- California Downtown Association
- Central City Association of Los Angeles
- LA County BizFed
- Bay Area Council
- Downtown San Diego Partnership
- California Business Roundtable
- LA County Taxpayer's Association
- Beaumont Chamber of Commerce
- Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
- Central Valley BizFed
- Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Corona Chamber of Commerce
- El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

- Fairfield-Suisun Chamber of Commerce
- Fontana Chamber of Commerce
- Fresno Chamber of Commerce
- Gateway Chambers Alliance
- Glendora Chamber of Commerce
- Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce
- Greater Ontario Business Council
- Greater Tehachapi Chamber of Commerce
- Greater West Covina Business Association
- Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce
- Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
- Lake County Chamber of Commerce
- Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Lomita Chamber of Commerce
- Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
- Mission Viejo Chamber of Commerce
- Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Moorpark Chamber of Commerce
- Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
- North Orange County Chamber
- Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
- Paradise Ridge Chamber of Commerce
- Placer County Taxpayers Association
- Pomona Chamber of Commerce
- Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
- Redding Chamber of Commerce
- Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
- Redlands Chamber of Commerce
- Rosemead Chamber of Commerce
- Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
- San Clemente Chamber of Commerce
- Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- San Dimas Chamber of Commerce
- San Marcos Chamber of Commerce
- Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
- Sherman Oaks Encino Chamber of Commerce
- Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce
- South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
- South County Chambers of Commerce
- South Orange County Economic Coalition
- Southern California Wine Country Economic Development Coalition
- Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
- Tri-County Chambers Alliance
- United Chambers of Commerce of the San Fernando Valley

- Upland Chamber of Commerce
- Valley Industry and Commerce Association
- West Ventura County Business Alliance
- Westside Council of Chambers of Commerce

Opposition:

- 350 Bay Area
- 350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
- 350 Contra Costa Action
- 350 Humboldt
- 2100iff Strategies
- Advocates for the Environment
- American River Conservancy
- American River Trees
- Anza Borrego Foundation
- APEN Action
- Arroyos & Foothills Conservancy
- As You Sow
- ASK Environmental, San Diego
- Azul
- Ban SUP (Single Use Plastic)
- Bay Area—System Change not Climate Change
- Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association
- Beyond Pesticides
- Beyond Plastics
- Biofuelwatch
- Brentwood Alliance of Canyons & Hillsides
- California Coastal Protection Network
- California Coastkeeper Alliance
- California Council of Land Trusts
- California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) Action
- California Land Watch
- California Native Plant Society
- California Native Plant Society, Alta Peak Chapter
- California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice
- California River Watch
- California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
- California Wildlife Foundation/California Oaks
- Californians Against Waste
- Californians for Safe Energy Storage
- Californians for Western Wilderness
- CalWild
- Canyon Back Alliance
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
- Center for Environmental Health
- Center for Food Safety
- Center for Public Environmental Oversight

- Citizens Advocating for Roblar Rural Quality (CARRQ)
- Citizens for Los Angeles Wildlife (CLAW)
- Citizens for the Preservation of Parks & Beaches
- Citizens' Climate Lobby
- Clean Air Coalition of North Whittier and Avocado Heights
- Clean Water Action
- CleanEarth4Kids.org
- Cleveland National Forest Foundation
- Climate Action California
- Climate Action Campaign at Humboldt UU Fellowship
- Climate Reality Project Orange Co Chapter
- Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles
- Coast Action Group
- Coastal Corridor Alliance
- Coastal Ranches Conservancy
- Comite Civico Del Valle, Inc.
- Committees for Land, Air, Water and Species (CLAWS)
- Communities for a Better Environment
- Conservation Biology Institute
- Courage California
- Defend Them All
- Defenders of Wildlife
- Dharma Cloud Technology
- Earthjustice
- Earthworks
- Elders Climate Action (ECA) Northern California (NorCal) Chapter
- Elders Climate Action (ECA) Southern California (SoCal) Chapter
- Elfin Forest / Harmony Grove Town Council
- Endangered Habitats League
- Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
- Environmental Center of San Diego
- Environmental Council of Sacramento
- Environmental Defense Center
- Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
- Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC)
- Families Advocating For Chemical and Toxics Safety
- Food & Water Watch
- Food Access LA
- Forest Unlimited
- Forests Forever
- Fossil Free California
- Fresh Air Vallejo
- Fridays For Future Palo Alto
- Friends of Griffith Park
- Friends of Gualala River
- Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks
- Friends of Jenner Creek
- Friends of Lafferty Park

- Friends of Loma Alta Creek
- Friends of Rose Canyon
- Friends of Rose Creek
- Friends of the Eel River
- Friends of the Mark West Watershed
- Friends of the River
- Golden Gate Bird Alliance
- Green Foothills
- Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice
- Greenbelt Alliance
- Greenfield Walking Group
- GreenLA Coalition
- Greenspace the Cambria Land Trust
- GreenSpacesMV
- Habitat 2020
- Hills For Everyone
- Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY)
- Humboldt Waterkeeper
- Imperial Valley Equity and Justice
- Indivisible Alameda
- Indivisible CA Green Team
- Indivisible East Contra Costa
- Indivisible Monterey
- Indivisible Santa Cruz County
- Keep Coyote Creek Beautiful
- Keep Tahoe Blue
- Klamath Forest Alliance
- Laguna Greenbelt, Inc.
- Learning Disabilities Association of California
- Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
- Little Manila Rising
- Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
- Los Angeles Audubon Society
- Los Angeles Climate Reality Project
- Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
- Los Angeles Waterkeeper
- Los Cerritos Wetlands Land Trust
- Los Padres ForestWatch
- Madrone Audubon Society
- Marin Baylands Advocates
- Marin Conservation League
- Morongo Basin Conservation Association
- Mothers Out Front, Silicon Valley
- Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center
- Mountain Area Preservation
- Napa-Solano Audubon
- National Wildlife Federation
- Non-Toxic Communities

- Non-Toxic Neighborhoods
- North Coast Rivers Alliance
- NOW (Neighbors of West County)
- O.W.L. Foundation
- Oil and Gas Action Network
- Orchard City Indivisible Climate Justice
- Oswit Land Trust
- Our City SF
- Pacific Forest Trust
- Physicians for Social Responsibility — Los Angeles
- Planning and Conservation League
- Preserve Calavera
- Preserve Orange County
- Protect Monterey County
- Protect San Benito County
- Public Interest Coalition
- Resource Renewal Institute
- River Otter Ecology Project
- Riverside Neighbors Opposing Warehouses (R-NOW)
- Robert Redford Conservancy Pitzer College
- Russian Riverkeeper
- Sacramento Area Creeks Council
- San Bruno Mountain Watch
- San Diego Bird Alliance
- San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
- SanDiego350
- Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance
- Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE)
- Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
- Save Mount Diablo
- Save Temescal Valley Now
- Save the Bay
- Save the Park
- Save the Sonoma Coast
- SD-SQUEL
- Sequoia Riverlands Trust
- SHIFT Bay Area
- Sierra Club California
- Sierra County Land Trust
- Sierra Watch
- Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action
- SoCal 350 Climate Action
- Solano County Orderly Growth Committee
- Sonoma County Climate Activist Network (SoCoCAN!)
- Sonoma Ecology Center
- Sonoma Land Trust
- Sonoma Mountain Preservation
- SPRAWLDEF

- Stop OAK Expansion Coalition
- Sunflower Alliance
- Surfrider Foundation
- The Chaparral Lands Conservancy
- The Climate Alliance
- The Escondido Creek Conservancy
- The Last Plastic Straw
- The SummerTree Institute
- The Urban Wildlands Group
- Third Act SF Bay Area
- Turtle Island Restoration Network
- United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles (UN4LA)
- Verdant Venice Group
- Waterbird Habitat Project
- We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review
- West Adams Heritage Association
- West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs
- West Sonoma County Rural Alliance
- Western Center on Law & Poverty
- Western Watersheds Project
- Wholly H2O
- Wilderness Within
- YardSmartMarin
- Youth United for Community Action

Staff Recommendation:

Cal Cities staff recommend the Policy Committee discuss the ballot measure and determine if they would like to recommend a position to the Board of Directors.

Committee Recommendation: