

Date of Hearing: June 21, 2022

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Mark Stone, Chair

SB 260 (Wiener) – As Amended June 2, 2022

As Proposed to be Amended

SENATE VOTE: 23-7

SUBJECT: CLIMATE CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

KEY ISSUE: IN ORDER TO PREVENT CORPORATE “GREENWASHING” REGARDING A COMPANY’S ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES, SHOULD CALIFORNIA REQUIRE COMPANIES TO PROVIDE SPECIFIED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS DATA TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE (SOS) AND FOR THE SOS TO MAKE THAT INFORMATION PUBLIC?

SYNOPSIS

The world’s opportunity for averting the worst impacts of climate change is rapidly closing. Despite California’s robust laws to curb the emission of greenhouse gasses and stop climate change, little is presently known about what steps, if any, large polluting companies are taking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, the public, investors, and policy makers have few tools to encourage large companies to assist in the effort to combat climate change. Accordingly, this bill would require American companies with more than one billion dollars of annual revenue that operate in California to disclose specified emissions data. For the purpose of the reporting, the bill proposes to use a 20 year old standard for corporate greenhouse gas emissions reporting developed by the World Resources Institute and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. Those standards would require reporting emissions in categories called Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3. This bill would additionally task the Air Resources Board with establishing regulations for the reporting program and the Secretary of State to collect the emissions data and publish the information on a publically available web platform. Finally, as proposed to be amended, this bill provides for administrative penalties for late disclosure filings and civil penalties for egregious violations of the statute.

This bill is supported by a coalition of statewide and grassroots environmental organizations who contend that understanding the role large companies’ play in emitting greenhouse gasses is an essential step to helping the state meet its climate change goals. This bill is strongly opposed by business organizations who argue that some of the disclosures are unnecessary, will potentially contain inaccurate data, and that this bill exposes large businesses to significant liability and needless public shaming. This bill was previously heard and approved by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources by a vote of 7 - 2.

SUMMARY: Enacts the Climate Corporate Accountability Act and requires large companies doing business in California to provide specified data related to the companies to provide specified greenhouse gas emissions data to the Secretary of State. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires the Air Resources Board, on or before January 1, 2024, to develop and adopt regulations to require a reporting entity to annually disclose to the Secretary of State, and

verify, all of the reporting entity's scope 1 emissions, scope 2 emissions, and scope 3 emissions.

- 2) Requires the regulations adopted in accordance with 1) to include, at minimum, the following:
 - a) A requirement that a reporting entity, starting in 2025 on or by a date to be determined by the Air Resources Board, and annually thereafter on or by that date, publicly disclose to the Secretary of State all of the reporting entity's scope 1 emissions and scope 2 emissions for the prior calendar year, and its scope 3 emissions for that same calendar year no later than 180 days after that date, using the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard developed by the World Resources Institute and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, including guidance for scope 3 emissions calculations that detail acceptable use of both primary and secondary data sources, including the use of industry average data, proxy data, and other generic data in its scope 3 emissions calculations;
 - b) A requirement that a reporting entity's public disclosure is made in a manner that is easily understandable and accessible to residents of the state;
 - c) A requirement that a reporting entity's public disclosure includes the name of the reporting entity and any fictitious names, trade names, assumed names, and logos used by the reporting entity; and
 - d) A requirement that a reporting entity's public disclosure is independently verified by a third-party auditor, approved by the Air Resources Board, with expertise in greenhouse gas emissions accounting, as specified.
- 3) Requires the Air Resources Board, on or before January 1, 2029 to review the information submitted pursuant to a) of 2), and update as necessary, the public disclosure deadlines established pursuant to clause (i) to evaluate trends in scope 3 emissions reporting and consider changes to the disclosure deadlines to ensure that scope 3 emissions data is disclosed to the Secretary of State as close in time as practicable to the deadline for reporting entities to disclose scope 1 emissions and scope 2 emissions data.
- 4) Requires, in developing the regulations required by 1), that the Air Resources Board consult with the following parties:
 - a) The Attorney General;
 - b) The Secretary of State;
 - c) Other government stakeholders, including, but not limited to, experts in climate science and corporate carbon emissions accounting;
 - d) Stakeholders representing consumer and environmental justice interests; and
 - e) Reporting entities that have demonstrated leadership in full-scope greenhouse gas emissions accounting and public disclosure and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

- 5) Requires, on or before January 1, 2026, the Air Resources Board to prepare a report on the public disclosures made by reporting entities to the Secretary of State pursuant to a) of 2) and the associated regulations adopted by the Air Resources Board and that in preparing the report, the Air Resources Board must consider, at a minimum, greenhouse gas emissions from reporting entities in the context of state greenhouse gas emissions reduction and climate goals.
- 6) Requires the Secretary of State to create a publically accessible digital platform that will house all disclosures submitted by reporting entities to the Secretary of State under the regulations adopted by the Air Resources Board in accordance with 2).
- 7) Requires the digital platform developed in accordance with 6) to be capable of featuring individual reporting entity disclosures, and allow consumers to view reported data elements aggregated in a variety of ways, including multiyear data, in a manner that is easily understandable and accessible to residents of the state, as specified.
- 8) Requires the Secretary of State, within 30 days of the receipt of information from disclosures made by reporting entities to post the information to the digital platform developed in accordance with 6).
- 9) Requires the Secretary of State, within 30 days of receipt of the report from the Air Resources Board required pursuant to 5), to transmit that report to the relevant committees of the Legislature.
- 10) Requires the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Air Resources Board and the Attorney General, to adopt regulations relating to the enforcement of this section, including the imposition of administrative and civil penalties for violations of this bill.
- 11) Provides that a reporting entity that fails to timely disclose its scope 1 emissions, scope 2 emissions, and scope 3 emissions to the Secretary of State by the deadlines established by the Air Resources Board, or whose public disclosure is incomplete, is liable for an administrative penalty of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) per day that the violation continues for the first 30 days and fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per day that the violation continues thereafter.
- 12) Provides that an incomplete report for the purposes of 11) is a report that does not contain all information required by the regulations adopted pursuant to 2).
- 13) Provides a reporting entity that repeatedly or intentionally violates the regulations developed by the Air Resources Board pursuant to 2) is to be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000) per violation which can be assessed by the Attorney General and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General in a court of competent jurisdiction.
- 14) Defines the following:
 - a) "Reporting entity" means a partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other business entity formed under the laws of this state, the laws of any other state of the United States or the District of Columbia, or under an act of the Congress of the United

States with total annual revenues in excess of one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) and that does business in California;

- b) “Scope 1 emissions” means all direct greenhouse gas emissions that stem from sources that a reporting entity owns or directly controls, regardless of location, including, but not limited to, fuel combustion activities;
 - c) “Scope 2 emissions” means indirect greenhouse gas emissions from electricity purchased and used by a reporting entity, regardless of location; and
 - d) “Scope 3 emissions” means indirect greenhouse gas emissions, other than scope 2 emissions, from activities of a reporting entity that stem from sources that the reporting entity does not own or directly control and may include, but are not limited to, emissions associated with the reporting entity’s supply chain, business travel, employee commutes, procurement, waste, and water usage, regardless of location.
- 15) Makes various findings and declarations regarding California’s emission reductions, the state’s economy, the role businesses and consumer consumption plays in greenhouse gas emissions, the right of consumers to know businesses’ climate impacts, and the need for the proposed legislation.
- 16) Adopts a severability clause.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the Air Resources Board and tasks the Board with, among other duties, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources and coordinate, encourage, and review the efforts of all levels of government as they affect air quality. (Health & Safety Code Section 39500 *et seq.*)
- 2) Requires, pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the Air Resources Board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to 1990 levels by 2020, to ensure that statewide greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to at least 40% below the 2020 statewide limit no later than December 31, 2030, and to adopt rules and regulations to achieve maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. (Health & Safety Code Sections 38550, 38562 & 38566.)
- 3) Requires the Air Resources Board to adopt regulations that, among other things, require monitoring and annual reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from greenhouse gas emission sources within the state, beginning with the sources or categories of sources that contribute the most to statewide emissions; and provides that, for the cap-and-trade program, entities that voluntarily participated in the California Climate Action Registry prior to December 31, 2006, and had developed a greenhouse gas emission reporting program would not be required to significantly alter their reporting or verification program except as necessary for compliance. (Health & Safety Code Section 38530.)
- 4) Requires the Air Resources Board to make available, and update annually, the emissions of greenhouse gasses, criteria pollutants, and toxic air contaminants from each facility that reports to the Air Resources Board, and requires the Air Resources Board to make an annual report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Climate Change Policies on the reported

emissions of greenhouse gases, criteria pollutants, and toxic air contaminants from all sectors covered by its scoping plan. (Health & Safety Code Section 38531.)

- 5) Defines “doing business” in California as engaging in any transaction for the purpose of financial gain within California, being organized or commercially domiciled in California, or having California sales, property, or payroll exceed \$610,395, \$61,040, and \$61,040, respectively, as of 2020. (Revenue & Taxation Code Sections 17041 & 23101.)

FISCAL EFFECT: As currently in print this bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS: Seeking to prevent corporate “greenwashing,” the practice whereby a company advertises environmentally friendly measures as a way to gain customers, but does not necessarily have environmentally sound practices in place throughout the company, this bill would require enhanced disclosures of corporate greenhouse gas emissions by large companies doing business in California. In support of this measure the author states:

SB 260, the Climate Corporate Accountability Act, requires public and private US-based corporations who do business in California and which have over \$1 billion in annual revenue to report their greenhouse gas emissions from their direct activities, the activities of their supply chain, and other major emission sources by 2025. This emissions data will be published publicly and accessible via an online platform.

California has been at the forefront of climate policy in recent decades, establishing a successful cap and trade program, committing to preserve 30% of California’s lands in their natural state, and setting and achieving ambitious emission reduction targets. These reductions were partially met, and continue to be bolstered by the emission reporting requirements as laid out in the California Global Warming Solutions Act. These requirements, however, only apply to electricity generators, industrial facilities, fuel suppliers, and other major emitters, missing many sources of corporate pollution. Without the same requirements for these corporate entities, California is left without proper information and will not be able to accurately regulate and reduce these emissions. Filling this gap with detailed data regarding corporate activities is a crucial next step for the State to ensure that we continue to decrease the rampant greenhouse gases that are destroying our planet.

California, like the rest of the world, is already deeply impacted by climate change, with worsening droughts, floods, and the unforgettable devastation brought on by an influx of massive wildfires – the top five largest wildfires in the State’s history have all occurred in 2018 or later. We no longer have the time to rely on massive corporations to voluntarily report their emissions, and cannot afford any possibility that the emissions we are being told about have been altered or manipulated to ensure a positive public-facing appearance for a particular company. Rather, these corporations must be required to transparently report their activities and the emissions associated with them. Californians are watching their State get irrevocably harmed by climate change, and they have a right to know who is at the forefront of the pollution causing this. SB 260 would bolster California’s position as a leader on climate change, will allow for consumers to make informed decisions regarding their patronage of these corporations, and will give policymakers the specific data required to significantly decrease corporate emissions.

Despite California’s world-leading efforts to combat climate change, the threat grows by the year. California has long been a world leader in trying to combat the growing harms caused by

climate change. Despite these efforts, human activities have already caused between .8 and 1.2 degrees Celsius of global warming and the problem is only growing. (Allen, et al., *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2018), Chapter 1, at p. 51, available at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/>.) In fact climate scientists warn that if the earth warms another .3 degrees Celsius the planet is likely to cross a threshold where the damage will become irreversible and significant humanitarian impacts will be felt around the world. (*Ibid.*) In California, the state is already seeing the impacts of climate change as evidenced by two crippling droughts in a decade, record-shattering wildfires that display never-before-seen fire behavior, and more powerful Pacific storms (albeit occurring far less frequently than before).

Recognizing the growing threat of climate change, and Congress's absolute paralysis in addressing the issue, California has enacted sweeping measures to address climate change. In 2006, the Legislature adopted AB 32 (Nunez) Chap. 488, Stats. 2006, putting California on a path to reach 1990 greenhouse gas emission levels by 2020. Not only did California achieve that goal before 2020, but in 2016, the state set a new target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to at least 40 percent below the 1990 level by December 31, 2030, and codified the Air Resources Board's Cap and Trade emissions reduction program. (SB 32 (Pavley) Chap. 249, Stats. 2016.) In the years since the passage of SB 32, the Legislature has also enacted policies and allocated billions of dollars to reduce the risk of wildfire, reinforce the state's water infrastructure, harden local infrastructure for the impacts of climate change, address some of the greenhouse gas related issues posed by plastic pollution, and seek to redress the harms from shorter-lived climate pollutants.

Seeking to attract environmentally conscious customers, many companies seek to highlight their environmentally friendly practices. Recognizing that many Americans are growing increasingly concerned about climate change, many businesses are seeking to generate goodwill by promoting their efforts to reduce the company's climate impacts. However, some reports indicate that many of these efforts are more about public perception than actual, meaningful change in corporate behavior. This marketing tactic is known as "greenwashing." (Ro, *Some of the Favorite Corporate Greenwashing Tactics of Clothing Companies*, Forbes (Apr. 12, 2021), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/christinero/2021/04/12/some-of-the-favorite-greenwashing-tactics-of-clothing-companies/?sh=60918e647609>.) Far too often, the claims made by many companies are more about boosting their bottom line than actually addressing the impacts of climate change.

However, in 2001 the World Resources Institute and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, as part of their Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard introduced a framework for tracking emissions produced by businesses. The three-tiered framework seeks to track emissions across all stages of the business process including emissions related to the supply chain, energy procurement, and even employee travel. Generally, Scope 1 covers direct emissions from owned or controlled sources, such as fuel combustion, company vehicles, or fugitive emissions. Scope 2 covers indirect emissions from the generation of purchased electricity, steam, heating and cooling consumed by the reporting company. Finally, Scope 3 includes all other indirect emissions that occur in a company's value chain, such as purchased goods and services, business travel, employee commuting, waste disposal, use of sold products, transportation and distribution, investments, and leased assets and franchises.

Thankfully, in an effort to put more concrete information behind their environmental claims, some companies are now voluntarily reporting their Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. However, many companies still appear reluctant to report tangible data on their environmental footprint.

This bill. Seeking to advance the most effective and impactful climate reduction strategies this bill aims to better understand the level of greenhouse gas emissions that are the result of business activity. This bill would task the Air Resources Board with developing regulations regarding disclosures of Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 emissions. The disclosures would be required by any American company that does more than one billion dollars in business annually and operates in California to disclose greenhouse gas emissions data. The bill provides that those disclosures would be made to the Secretary of State, who would then post the information on a publically available digital platform. This bill also specifically defines the various categories of emissions. Additionally, the bill directs the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and Air Resources Board, to develop regulations related to enforcing this bill. Finally, the bill provides for administrative penalties of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) per day for reporting violations for the first 30 days, and fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per day for violations continuing thereafter. Should a company be a repeat offender, as proposed to be amended, the bill authorizes the Attorney General to seek civil penalties of up to one million dollars.

Proposed federal rules are similar to, but less ambitious than, this measure. California is not alone in seeking to better understand greenhouse gas emissions related to large companies. The United States Securities and Exchange Commission is currently developing regulations to require disclosure of certain Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions data. (Proposed changes to 17 CFR Sections 210, 229, 232, 239, & 249, Securities and Exchange Commission Release Nos. 33-11042; 34-94478; File No. S7-10-22.) It should be noted that this bill is more ambitious than the federal proposal in several ways. First, given that the Securities and Exchange Commission can only regulate publically traded companies, this bill would also include privately held firms. Additionally, this bill requires Scope 3 emissions reporting, a substantially broader category than those required by the federal regulations. Finally, this bill make the information available to the public, as opposed to just investors. While it is likely that concerned investors will have a greater likelihood of success in forcing changes to company practices, the information is nonetheless helpful to increase public transparency and for policy makers to utilize for potential future greenhouse gas emission regulations.

Opponents to this measure contend they cannot reasonably comply with this bill, despite many details of the program that still remain to be determined. This measure is strongly opposed by a coalition of business groups who, primarily, oppose the inclusion of Scope 3 data in the reporting requirements of this bill. The opposition argues that Scope 3 emissions data is too difficult to collect and properly verify, as it requires collecting data from multiple companies, as well as employees. Writing in opposition, they suggest, “it will be nearly impossible for [the Air Resources Board] to “verify” emissions data that is, by its very nature, subjective, inaccurate, and often incomplete.”

There is little disputing that Scope 3 data does require significant effort to obtain, and depending on how one company interacts with others, may result in some overlapping emissions data being reported. Additionally, the opposition is not incorrect in noting that the data may not be as precise as the data reported under Scope 1 and Scope 2 data. However, it should be noted that this bill does require the data to be completely accurate. Additionally, the rulemaking process, of which business stakeholders are explicitly required to be a part of, can adopt standards for data accuracy within a margin for error. Finally, the bill’s enforcement provisions do not mention data accuracy; rather the enforcement provisions apply penalties for a failure to provide timely or

complete reporting information. Again, the rulemaking process can address any issues regarding data accuracy and what can be deemed a complete disclosure.

Proposed author's amendments clarify the civil penalty provisions of the bill. In addition to administrative penalties for incomplete or late reporting, the bill in print also contains a civil penalty provision that would be triggered for any other violation of the bill not stemming from the disclosure regulations. However, when examining the bill, it appears the only mandate for compliance is related to the regulations. The author's office notes that the current civil penalty language was designed to punish repeat or egregious violations of the disclosure requirements. Given the ambiguity in the existing language the current paragraph (4) of subdivision (f) of the proposed Health and Safety Code Section 38532 will be removed from the bill, and replaced as follows:

(4) A reporting entity that repeatedly or intentionally violates the regulations developed by the state board pursuant to subdivision (c) shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000) per violation which shall be assessed by the Attorney General and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General in a court of competent jurisdiction. ~~For violations of this section other than those described in paragraph (3), a reporting entity shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000) per violation, which civil penalty shall be assessed by the Attorney General and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General in a court of competent jurisdiction.~~

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is supported by a coalition of statewide and grassroots environmental advocates. In support of the bill, California Environmental Voters writes:

Many communities in California are on the front lines of the climate crisis, facing the human impacts head-on. In 2020 alone, wildfires burned over 4 million acres and the state struggled with the impacts of historic drought, loss of snowpack, continuing sea level rise, deadly heat waves, diminishing regional agricultural returns, exacerbated air and water pollution, and related climate impacts. And while all of California is impacted, we also know that climate impacts fall disproportionately on low-income communities and on Black, Indigenous and People of Color. Yet, the very corporations who are most responsible for the pollution which has caused the climate crisis ask individuals to make changes in their own lives to solve the problem, rather than own the responsibility to change their own practices.

By requiring reporting of both direct emissions from these corporations, and any emissions produced from their supply chains and other indirect emissions SB 260 creates the data infrastructure to drive down corporate carbon emissions. This mandate of comprehensive climate pollution transparency would be the first in the nation and would establish a public right to know which companies are polluting our environmental commons, how much they are emitting, and if they are decreasing - or increasing - their climate emissions, offering a transparent and public way of verifying corporate claims of climate leadership.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION: As noted, this bill is opposed by a broad coalition of business organizations. The California Chamber of Commerce writes in opposition:

Because there is no objective criteria for assessing Scope 3 emissions data, two companies with similar actual Scope 3 emissions may report significantly different data depending on

the company and/or methodology used. This fundamentally compromises the notion that SB 260 is intended as a transparency measure; data transparency is valuable only when what is being reported is accurate and allows for an “apples to apples” comparison between the data being provided by each entity. SB 260, however, will allow one company to tout its emissions data while another company is criticized for its emissions data, even though their emissions data may be comparable.

Because assessing Scope 3 emissions data with any degree of accuracy is not yet possible, the Scope 3 emissions guidance is often evolving. For example, the guidelines are currently being updated to focus on Scope 3 emissions associated with land use and biogenic carbon and thus will impact Scope 3 emissions data for any materials derived from bio-based sources such as food/agricultural derived materials, etc. These updates not only underscore that Scope 3 emissions data reporting is still in its infancy stage, but it also raises compliance issues in terms of what guidance reporting entities must follow in the event the guidance, or portions thereof, are in the process of being updated.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations
350 Bay Area Action
350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
350 Humboldt: Grass Roots Climate Action
350 Sacramento
350 Silicon Valley
350 South Bay Los Angeles
350 Southland Legislative Alliance
Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
As You Sow
Audubon California
Berkeley; City of
Breathe California
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
California Environmental Justice League
California Environmental Voters
California Interfaith Power & Light
California League of Conservation Voters
California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice
California State Council of Service Employees International Union
Carbon Accountable
Center for Oceanic Awareness, Research, & Education
Change Begins With Me Indivisible Group
City of Los Angeles
Clean Water Action
Cleaneart4kids.org
Climate Action Campaign
Climate Center; the

Climate Equity Policy Center
Climate Health Now
Climate Reality Project, California Coalition
Climate Reality Project, Los Angeles Chapter
Climate Reality Project, San Diego Chapter
Climate Reality Project, San Fernando Valley
Climate Reality Project, Silicon Valley
Climate Reality San Francisco Bay Area Chapter
Coalition for A California Green New Deal
Coalition for Clean Air
Courage California
Culver City Democratic Club
Dayenu: a Jewish Call to Climate Action
Defenders of Wildlife
Democratic Party of The San Fernando Valley
Earthjustice
Elders Climate Action NorCal Chapter
Elders Climate Action SoCal Chapter
Environmental Defense Fund
Fossil Free California
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks
Friends of Public Banking Santa Rosa
Friends of The Earth U.S.
Green New Deal At UCSD
Greenbelt Alliance
Greenlining Institute; the
Idle No More SF Bay
Indivisible California
Jobs With Justice San Francisco
Kitchen Rainmakers
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
Los Angeles County Democratic Party
National Parks Conservation Association
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Northern California Recycling Association
Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action
Persefoni AI, INC.
Plastic Oceans International
Plastic Pollution Coalition
Plug in America
Rising Sun Center for Opportunity
Romero Institute
Sacramento Area Congregations Together
San Diego 350
San Diego Green New Deal Alliance
San Francisco Baykeeper
Save Our Shores
Save the Bay

Sierra Club California
Silicon Valley Democratic Club
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action
Sunrise Bay Area
Sunrise Berkeley High School
Sunrise Chico
Sunrise Claremont Colleges
Sunrise Contra Costa
Sunrise Glendale
Sunrise Kern County
Sunrise LA Crescenta
Sunrise LA Youth
Sunrise Los Angeles
Sunrise Movement Bay Area
Sunrise Orange County
Sunrise Redding
Sunrise Sacramento
Sunrise San Francisco University High School
Sunrise Santa Barbara
Sunrise Sonoma
Sunrise UC Berkeley
Sunrise UC Irvine
The 5 Gyres Institute
The Nature Conservancy
Together We Will/Indivisible - Los Gatos
UC Green New Deal Coalition
Union of Concerned Scientists
UPTA-CWA
Wildfires to Wildflowers
Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation

Opposition

Agricultural Council of California
Alliance for Automotive Innovation
American Bankers Association
American Chemistry Council
American Council of Life Insurers
American Forest & Paper Association
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Association of California Life & Health Insurance Companies
Brea Chamber of Commerce
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
Cal Asian Chamber of Commerce
California Apartment Association
California Bankers Association
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association

California Cement Manufacturers Environmental Coalition
California Chamber of Commerce
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association
California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA)
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Railroads
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
California Trucking Association
Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
Chemical Industry Council of California
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
EMA Truck & Engine Manufacturers Association
Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce
Harbor Association of Industry & Commerce
Household and Commercial Products Association
Innovating Commerce Serving Communities
Lodi Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
NAIOP of California
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Orange County Business Council
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce
Plumbing Manufacturers International
Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Technet
Tenaska
Tulare Chamber of Commerce
Western Independent Refiners Association
Western States Petroleum Association
Western Wood Preservers Institute
Wilmington Chamber of Commerce

Oppose Unless Amended

Airlines for America

Analysis Prepared by: Nicholas Liedtke / JUD. / (916) 319-2334