

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

SB 222 (Wiener)
Version: March 28, 2025
Hearing Date: April 8, 2025
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: Yes
CK

SUBJECT

Climate disasters: civil actions

DIGEST

This bill establishes a cause of action against “responsible parties” for harms suffered as the result of “climate disasters.” This bill specifies that insurers, including the California FAIR Plan Association, have a right of subrogation against these responsible parties.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to California’s Fourth Climate Change Assessment, by 2100, the average annual maximum daily temperature is projected to increase by 5.6 to 8.8°F, water supply from snowpack is projected to decline by two-thirds, the average area burned in more frequent wildfires could increase by 77 percent with wildfire insurance estimated to see costs rise by 18 percent by 2055, and 31 to 67 percent of Southern California beaches may completely erode without large-scale human intervention, all under business-as-usual and moderate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. According to the United Nations, fossil fuels – coal, oil, and gas – are by far the largest contributor to global climate change, accounting for over 75 percent of global GHG emissions and nearly 90 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions.

This bill creates a cause of action for those harmed by “climate disasters,” storms, wildfires, and other events caused in part by climate change, against “responsible parties,” large companies engaged in the extraction, production, manufacture, marketing, or sale of fossil fuel products. Responsible parties are jointly, severally, and strictly liable for all associated damages and costs. The bill also provides insurers a right of subrogation against a responsible party and the right to bring an action pursuant to the above. The bill requires the California FAIR Plan Association to exercise this right of subrogation against a responsible party as provided.

This bill is sponsored by the Center for Climate Integrity, California Environmental Voters, and Extreme Weather Survivors. It is supported by a number of environmental and consumer advocacy groups, including Consumer Watchdog and Sierra Club California. It is opposed by a wide variety of business associations, labor groups, and oil and gas representatives, including the Western States Petroleum Association and the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California. Should this bill pass out of this Committee, it will next be heard in the Senate Insurance Committee.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing constitutional law:

- 1) Provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. (U.S. Const., 5th & 14th Amends.; Cal. Const., art. I, § 7.)

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, which provides for the cleanup of hazardous substances, as defined, and establishes a process for obtaining contribution from parties liable for the release or threatened release of those substances. (42 U.S.C., ch. 85, §§ 9601 et seq.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which declares that global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and environment of California, and that action taken by California to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases will have far-reaching effects by encouraging other states, the federal government, and other countries to act. (Health & Saf. Code, div. 25.5, §§ 38500 et seq.)
- 2) Requires, as part of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to determine the 1990 statewide GHG emissions level and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to that level to be achieved by 2020. (Health & Saf. Code, § 38550.)
- 3) Requires CARB to ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to at least 40 percent below the 1990 level by December 31, 2030, and allows CARB, until December 31, 2030, to adopt regulations that utilize market-based compliance mechanisms (i.e., the cap-and-trade program) to reduce GHG emissions. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 38562, 38566.)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes a person who suffered physical harm to their person or property alleged to be of at least \$10,000 in damages as a result of a “climate disaster” may bring a civil action, on behalf of themselves and other persons, against a “responsible party” to recover or obtain all of the following:
 - a) All damages to the person or property sustained in connection to the climate disaster.
 - b) Restitution.
 - c) Court costs, litigation expenses, and reasonable attorney’s fees.
 - d) Any other relief that the court or jury deems proper.
- 2) Defines the relevant terms, including:
 - a) “Climate disaster” means any of the following, provided that climate change was a contributing factor in the event’s frequency, severity, location, timing, or extent:
 - i. An extreme weather event, including a wildfire, heatwave, drought, windstorm, hurricane, tornado, or other storm.
 - ii. An event attributable to climate change, including a consequence connected to an extreme weather event, such as fire, flood, landslide, extreme temperature, precipitation, or air pollution.
 - iii. An event triggering the declaration of a state of emergency or local emergency, as defined in Section 8558 of the Government Code.
 - b) “Responsible party” means a firm, corporation, company, partnership, society, joint stock company, or any other entity or association, but excludes governmental entities, as provided, that meets all of the following criteria:
 - i. Has an aggregate market capitalization or worldwide annual revenue across the parent entity and all affiliated entities of at least \$500,000,000, as provided.
 - ii. Engaged in the extraction, production, manufacture, marketing, or sale of fossil fuel products.
 - iii. Did business in the state, was registered to do business in the state, was appointed an agent of the state, or otherwise had sufficient contacts with the state to be subject to the state’s jurisdiction.
- 3) Provides that responsible parties shall be strictly, jointly, and severally liable for the damages or restitution afforded under this section.
- 4) Provides that the action shall be filed within three years of the date that the physical harm to the person or property was or should have been discovered. Prohibits waiver of these rights.

- 5) Clarifies that it does not limit the enforceability of other specified laws, replace specified funds and payouts, and does not relieve the liability of an entity for damages resulting from climate change, as provided by any other law. It further provides that it does not impose liability on speech or conduct protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or by the California Constitution.
- 6) Provides that an insurer has a right of subrogation against a responsible party, regardless of whether or not the insured has been made whole. In addition to its right of subrogation, an insurer may seek damages against a responsible party for a climate disaster pursuant to the above provisions to recover money paid for claims of a person resulting from a covered event.
- 7) Requires the California FAIR Plan Association to exercise its right of subrogation against a responsible party for a climate disaster, as provided.
- 8) Includes severability and urgency clauses.

COMMENTS

1. Climate change and fossil fuel companies

According to a recent report, it is estimated that Los Angeles County alone must invest at least \$12.5 billion through 2040 to protect residents from worsening climate hazards, including extreme heat, increasing precipitation, worsening wildfires, rising sea levels and climate-induced public health threats, which will largely be borne by local governmental entities. This does not include the costs of recovering from the disasters themselves, such as costs to fight fires, rebuilding infrastructure, and other personal and property damage. Furthermore, massive climate disasters are only on the rise. According to research conducted through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), climate disasters in California have skyrocketed:

From 1980-2024, there were 46 confirmed weather/climate disaster events with losses exceeding \$1 billion each to affect California. These events included 14 drought events, 6 flooding events, 3 freeze events, 4 severe storm events, and 19 wildfire events. The 1980–2024 annual average is 1.0 event (CPI-adjusted); the annual average for the most recent 5 years (2020–2024) is 1.6 events (CPI-adjusted).¹

¹ *Billion-Dollar Weather and Climate Disasters: California Summary*, National Centers for Environmental Information, <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/state-summary/CA>. All internet citations are current as of March 31, 2025.

As stated, fossil fuels and those responsible for extracting and manufacturing them, are at the heart of the problem:

Fossil fuels – coal, oil and gas – are by far the largest contributor to global climate change, accounting for over 75 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions and nearly 90 per cent of all carbon dioxide emissions.

As greenhouse gas emissions blanket the Earth, they trap the sun’s heat. This leads to global warming and climate change. The world is now warming faster than at any point in recorded history. Warmer temperatures over time are changing weather patterns and disrupting the usual balance of nature. This poses many risks to human beings and all other forms of life on Earth.²

The findings and declarations in the bill focus on this impact and the role fossil fuel companies have played:

- Major fossil fuel companies have known for decades that their products cause global warming and increase the frequency and severity of climate disasters. Despite this knowledge, they have not disclosed, have attempted to conceal, and have failed to warn of the climate dangers their products cause and have caused.
- Fossil fuel companies’ products, acts, and omissions have contributed to concrete and particularized injuries in this state from climate disasters. Fossil fuel companies’ products, acts, and omissions continue to pose a threat to the health, safety, and security of the residents, citizens, businesses, and visitors to this state.
- Responsible parties are large companies in the fossil fuel industry. Large fossil fuel companies have known since at least the 1960s that fossil fuel products produce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas pollution that warm the planet and change our climate in potentially catastrophic ways. Responsible parties knew they were producing harmful products. The large fossil fuel companies’ own scientists knew as early as the 1950s that these climate impacts would be catastrophic, and that there was only a narrow window of time in which action could be taken before the consequences became catastrophic.

A report from the Los Angeles Times chronicles some of this history:

² *Causes and Effects of Climate Change*, United Nations, <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/science/causes-effects-climate-change#:~:text=Fossil%20fuels%20%E2%80%93%20coal%2C%20oil%20and%20gas,per%20cent%20of%20all%20carbon%20dioxide%20emissions..>

Throughout much of the 1980s, Exxon earned a public reputation as a pioneer in climate change research. It sponsored workshops, funded academic research and conducted its own high-tech experiments exploring the science behind global warming.

But by 1990, the company, in public, took a different posture.

While still funding select research, it poured millions into a campaign that questioned climate change. Over the next 15 years, it took out prominent ads in the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, contending climate change science was murky and uncertain. And it argued regulations aimed at curbing global warming were ill-considered and premature.

How did one of the world's largest oil companies, a leader in climate research, become one of its biggest public skeptics?

The answer, gleaned from a trove of archived company documents and the recollections of former employees, is that Exxon, now known as Exxon Mobil, feared a growing public consensus would lead to financially burdensome policies.

Duane LeVine, Exxon's manager of science and strategy development, gave a primer to the company's board of directors in 1989, noting that scientists generally agreed gases released by burning fossil fuels could raise global temperatures significantly by the middle of the 21st century – between 2.7 and 8.1 degrees Fahrenheit – causing glaciers to melt and sea levels to rise, “with generally negative consequences.”

But he also made it clear the company was facing another threat as well – from public policymakers.

“Arguments that we can't tolerate delay and must act now can lead to irreversible and costly Draconian steps,” LeVine said.³

However, the connection between specific companies' emissions and specific disasters is complex, making legal liability difficult to establish. This is especially challenging given that emissions cause impacts over decades, exacerbating these attribution challenges. The concern is that these companies are privatizing profits while socializing the costs of climate impacts such as worsening and more frequent wildfires.

³ Katie Jennings, Dino Grandoni & Susanne Rust, *How Exxon went from leader to skeptic on climate change research* (October 23, 2015) Los Angeles Times, <https://graphics.latimes.com/exxon-research/>.

This bill attempts to bridge that gap and hold large fossil fuel companies liable – jointly, severally, and strictly liable – for the damages that are caused by climate disasters.

2. Charging large fossil fuel companies with the costs of climate change

This bill creates a cause of action for anyone that faces damages of at least \$10,000 as a result of a climate disaster, which includes a wide variety of occurrences, including weather events, or any event triggering a state of emergency so long as it is proven that climate change was a contributing factor in the event’s frequency, severity, location, timing, or extent. These actions can be brought against “responsible parties,” which are non-governmental entities that meet three criteria: they must have a market cap or annual revenue of at least \$500 million, as provided; have engaged in the extraction, production, manufacture, marketing, or sale of fossil fuel products at some point; and did, or registered to do, business in the state, or otherwise had sufficient contacts therein to be subject to the jurisdiction of California courts.

Plaintiffs in such actions are entitled to all damages sustained in connection with the climate disaster, along with restitution and costs and fees. The bill makes responsible parties jointly, severally, and strictly liable in such cases. This means that any qualified defendant may be held liable for the total amount of damages without needing to establish a failure to meet a standard of care or any specific intent on the part of the defendant. Plaintiffs need not produce evidence of a direct link between a company’s actions and the plaintiff’s harms.

To summarize, in order to succeed on a claim, a plaintiff would need to establish the following:

- That they suffered harm of at least \$10k within the previous three years (or discovered it within that timeframe).
- That the harm was a result of a qualifying event (storm, wildfire, etc.) for which climate change was a contributing factor.
- That the named company meets the market capitalization or revenue threshold; engaged, at any point, in any location, in the extraction, production, manufacture, marketing, or sale of fossil fuel products; and has contacts sufficient to exercise jurisdiction over them.

For illustrative purposes, if it is proven that climate change was a contributing factor to the frequency, severity, location, timing, or extent of the recent fires in Southern California, as scientific studies have already concluded,⁴ all affected residents, property

⁴ Matt McGrath, *Climate change made LA fires worse, scientists say* (January 28, 2025) BBC, <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cd9qy4knd8wo> (“Climate change was a major factor behind the hot, dry weather that gave rise to the devastating LA fires, a scientific study has confirmed”).

owners, and local governments would be authorized to recoup all damages to person and property associated with the wildfire, and any consequence thereof, from any individual massive oil or gas company that has done business in California. Of course, defendants in such cases are still eligible to seek indemnity and contribution from other liable parties.

The bill also authorizes insurers to seek damages through such actions and grants them a right of subrogation against a responsible party. It further requires the California FAIR Plan to exercise this right of subrogation if certain conditions are met. These elements of the bill will be discussed more thoroughly in the Senate Insurance Committee should the bill pass out of this Committee.

According to the author:

Californians are paying a devastating price for the climate crisis, as escalating disasters destroy entire communities and drive insurance costs through the roof. Containing these costs is critical to our recovery and to the future of our state. By forcing the fossil fuel companies driving the climate crisis to pay their fair share, we can help stabilize our insurance market and help the victims of climate disasters recover. SB 222 provides a specific cause of action for ratepayers and insurers, including the FAIR Plan, to recover damages from responsible parties. If successful, these lawsuits will improve insurance affordability in California by shifting the burden of increased insurance costs away from California ratepayers to the fossil fuel companies driving the climate crisis. Major fossil fuel companies intentionally misled the public for decades about the impacts of their products, and now Californians are paying the price with devastating wildfires, mud slides, sea level rise, and skyrocketing insurance costs.

3. Legal concerns with the bill

Pointing to the fact that the bill charges a select number of fossil fuel companies with billions in potential liability based on past conduct and holds only one contributor to climate change, albeit one of the largest, responsible for all the damage, opposition to the bill asserts that the bill suffers from a number of legal infirmities.

A coalition of groups in opposition, including the Civil Justice Association of California and the California Fresh Fruit Association, argue the bill is unconstitutional and will lead to lengthy litigation challenges:

Even with amendments, SB 222 is still riddled with legal issues, including the following Constitutional violations:

- Violates due process: The bill would apply billions in liability related to climate-related disasters to energy companies, using vague and retroactive standards without requiring proof of causation. The bill also would still prevent energy companies from limiting liability to intentional conduct or in proportion to fault, by making them jointly, severally, and strictly liable.
- Violates equal protection: The bill would hold a single industry responsible for all the costs associated with climate-related disasters, ignoring the global nature of climate change and the multitude of sources contributing to the global issue.
- Violates the Fifth, Fourteenth, and potentially the Eighth Amendment. The bill would levy excessive fines by creating billions in retroactive liability.

As a result of these substantial legal flaws, SB 222 would still generate a host of costly legal challenges to its provisions that would last for decades.

As to the issue of holding these companies liable for damages based on their past conduct, it is “well established that legislative Acts adjusting the burdens and benefits of economic life come to the Court with a presumption of constitutionality, and that the burden is on one complaining of a due process violation to establish that the legislature has acted in an arbitrary and irrational way.”⁵ That deference “is no less applicable” to legislation in the field of economic policy “when that legislation is applied retroactively.”⁶ “This is true even though the effect of the legislation is to impose a new duty or liability based on past acts.”⁷ To satisfy the demands of due process, the retroactive application of the legislation must be “justified by a rational legislative purpose.”⁸ Under this approach, the Court upheld a federal statute requiring mine operators to compensate coal miners who were employees and contracted black lung disease in the mines before the enactment of the statute.⁹ The Court found “that the imposition of liability for the effects of disabilities bred in the past is justified as a rational measure to spread the costs of the employees’ disabilities to those who have profited from the fruits of their labor[:] the operators and the coal consumers.”¹⁰

The Federal Circuit, after reviewing the case law on retroactivity, articulated the test as follows:

⁵ *Pension Ben. Guar. Corp. v. R.A. Gray & Co.* (1984) 467 U.S. 717, 729.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Id.* at p. 730.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co.* (1976) 428 U.S. 1, 6.

¹⁰ *Id.* at p. 18.

[W]e perceive that the imposition of even severe retroactive obligations for past acts will be found rational and will be held constitutional under the Due Process Clause if two conditions are satisfied: (1) Congress reasonably concluded that the party subjected to retroactive obligations benefited from activity that contributed to a societal problem, and liability is not disproportionately imposed on that party; and (2) the imposition of retroactive liability would not be contrary to that party's reasonable expectations.¹¹

Applying those conditions here, the Legislature could easily conclude that fossil fuel companies benefitted from the activity that contributed to the climate crisis. It is also probably fair to say that fossil fuel companies should have a reasonable expectation of being required to pay *something* to help affected parties cover the massive damages resulting from the climate crisis. Less clear, however, is whether holding a handful of fossil fuel companies liable for the full amount of damages resulting from every climate disaster is (1) proportionate, or (2) contrary to a fossil fuel company's reasonable expectations.

In response to some of these concerns, the author states:

One key difference between retroactive liability laws that violate the Due Process Clause and those that do not is whether the government has shown that such application has a "legitimate legislative purpose furthered by rational means."

Here, the state of California has the legitimate legislative purpose of addressing the costs and impacts of climate disasters, and that purpose is addressed by a rational means, the use of the courts to consider complex questions of liability and causation.

Furthermore, courts have repeatedly found in the hazardous waste context that the imposition of financial liability on parties that caused past environmental harm does not violate due process.

While the temporal and geographic scope of the harm here is more expansive, the principles and objectives of strict, joint, and several liability can operate in the same manner.

Similarly, the goal of remediating the damage suffered during climate disasters is legitimate.

¹¹ *Commonwealth Edison Co. v. U.S.* (Fed. Cir. 2001) 271 F.3d 1327, 1346.

The author also argues that the equal protection claims are misplaced:

It is true that equal protection of the law under the 14th Amendment to the US Constitution applies to a broad range of corporate entities, and can be invoked by corporate litigants.¹² However, “The Fourteenth Amendment guarantee of equal protection of the laws does not... require that all persons be dealt with identically. Rather, when distinctions are drawn, the Constitution mandates that the state justify them by showing either a rational relationship between the classification and the state interest to be served thereby, or, in certain limited situations, by showing a compelling state interest.” *Burgener v. California Adult Auth.*, 407 F. Supp. 561, 565 (N.D. Cal. 1976).

4. Stakeholder positions

The sponsors of the bill, the Center for Climate Integrity, California Environmental Voters, and Extreme Weather Survivors, write:

SB 222’s requirement that the FAIR Plan exercise its right of subrogation against oil and gas companies to recover claims paid toward large climate-driven events such as catastrophic wildfires will help save the FAIR Plan from insolvency, stop costly rate hikes for Californians who have no other insurance options, and limit long-term state subsidies or bonding that will saddle taxpayers with costs for decades. SB 222 also gives the Californians who are now suffering from the aftermath of this deception, in the form of loss of property and life from climate disasters and extreme weather events, a critical tool to recover their losses from the very companies most responsible for their injuries. Finally, SB 222 measurably addresses California’s climate-driven insurance crisis by providing insurers a direct cause of action to recover for harms to their business that result from climate-related impacts and increase insurance costs for Californians.

A coalition of environmental and consumer advocacy groups, including the Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment and the Consumer Federation of California, make the case for the bill:

Climate catastrophes are already beginning to ravage landscapes across the globe and California is no different. In 2020 alone, California saw five of its twenty largest wildfires on record and this trend is only projected to get worse. California is currently grappling with this crisis as fires

¹² See *Metro. Life Ins. Co. v. Ward*, 470 U.S. 869, 881 n.9 (1985) (citing the “well established” Equal Protection Clause rights of corporations); *Santa Clara Cnty. v. S. Pac. R.R. Co.*, 118 U.S. 394, 396 (1886) (noting that the Court agreed that the Equal Protection Clause applied to corporations at issue).

continue to erupt across Los Angeles. Further, while wildfires have certainly been the face of California's climate struggles, the state is no stranger to drought and loss of snowpack, sea level rise, diminishing agricultural return in certain areas, and innumerable other impacts that often compound on one another. All of this is due to excessive pollution of greenhouse gases (GHG) into our atmosphere. What may be worse still – we know many of the common culprits of this pollution are oil and gas companies who for decades knew about the impacts of their fossil fuel products and the resulting pollution that would warm the planet and contribute to climate change. Despite this knowledge, oil and gas companies willfully engaged in an effort to deceive the public.

Writing in opposition, the California State Association of Electrical Workers and the California State Pipe Trades Council assert:

As unions representing skilled construction workers across California, we have long been at the forefront of our state's response to climate change. Our members have built and maintained the infrastructure supporting California's ambitious renewable energy goals, including solar farms, wind installations, clean hydrogen projects, and advanced energy storage projects. At the same time, we also represent thousands of highly trained professionals who work in the energy sector, ensuring that California's power plants, refineries, and industrial infrastructure remain safe and operational. California's energy transition is a complex, multi-decade effort that cannot be achieved overnight, and our state still relies on oil and gas to function.

SB 222 unfairly targets the oil and gas industry while ignoring the broader systemic factors that contribute to climate change. If the goal is to reduce emissions and protect Californians from climate-related disasters, then solutions must be comprehensive, science-based, and equitable – not politically motivated attacks on a single sector.

This legislation will also have far-reaching economic consequences. The uncertainty created by decades of litigation against a legal industry that provides tens of thousands of good-paying, unionized jobs in California will lead to more industrial closures and job losses.

SUPPORT

Center for Climate Integrity (sponsor)
California Environmental Voters (sponsor)
Extreme Weather Survivors (sponsor)
350 Bay Area Action

350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
350 Humboldt
350 Sacramento
Action for The Climate Emergency
Active San Gabriel Valley
Americans for Financial Reform
Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)
Azul
Ban Sup (single Use Plastic)
California Climate Action
California Nightlife Association (CALNIGHT)
California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice
California Voices for Progress
Center for International Environmental Law
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment
Central California Environmental Justice Alliance
Central California Environmental Justice Network
CFT- a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Clean Water Action
Cleaneearth4kids.org
Climate Action California
Climate Equity Policy Center
Climate First: Replacing Oil & Gas (CFROG)
Climate Hawks Vote
Climate Reality Project
Climate Reality Project, San Fernando Valley
Community Water Center
Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Watchdog
Courage California
Democrats of Rossmoor
Elder's Climate Action Norcal
Elders Climate Action (ECA) Northern CA Chapter
Elders Climate Action Social Chapter
Elders Climate Action Southern California Chapter
Extreme Weather Survivors
Food and Water Watch
Fossil Free California
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Green America
Green Latinos
Greenpeace USA
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
Mothers Out Front

National Association of Consumer Advocates
National Community Reinvestment Coalition
Natural Resources Defense Council
Nextgen California
Norcal Elder Climate Action
Oil Change International
Planning and Conservation League
Public Citizen
Rise Economy
San Diego 350
San Francisco Baykeeper
San Francisco Cannabis Retailers Alliance
San Francisco City Attorney's Office (UNREG)
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
Santa Monica Democratic Club
Sierra Club California
Sierra Nevada Alliance
Sustainable Rossmoor
The Climate Center
The Climate Reality Project California
The Democrats of Rossmoor
Transform
Union of Concerned Scientists
Voices for Progress
Worksafe

OPPOSITION

Agricultural Energy Consumers Association
American Chemistry Council
American Pistachio Growers
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
American Tort Reform Association
Bay Area Council
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Conference of Carpenters
California Fresh Fruit Association
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA)

California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Renewable Transportation Alliance
California Retailers Association
California Rice Commission
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
California Taxpayers Association (CALTAX)
Central Valley Business Federation
Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
Council of Industries
County of Kern
East Bay Leadership Council
Family Business Association of California
Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce
Grower-shipper Association of Central California
Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce (HAIC)
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
Industrial Association of Contra Costa County
Kern Citizens for Energy
Los Angeles County Business Federation (BIZFED)
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB)
Nisei Farmers League
Orange County Business Council
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Southern California Leadership Council
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)
Western Plant Health Association
Western Propane Gas Association
Western States Petroleum Association

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: SB 684 (Menjivar, 2025) establishes the Polluters Pay Climate Superfund Act of 2025, which requires fossil fuel companies that meet specified criteria to pay to the state the costs incurred from 1990 to 2045 as a result of climate change caused by emissions from 1990-2024, based on the company's proportional share of global fossil fuel emissions in that period. This bill is currently in this Committee.

Prior Legislation:

SB 1497 (Menjivar, 2024) was substantially similar to SB 684 (Menjivar, 2025), except that it sought to recover damages for harms caused by emissions from 2000 through 2020. SB 1497 died on the Senate Floor.

SB 253 (Wiener, Ch. 382, Stats. 2023) required any partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other U.S. business entity with total annual revenues in excess of \$1 billion and that does business in California to publicly report their annual GHG emissions, as specified by CARB, beginning January 1, 2026.

SB 1327 (Hertzberg, Ch. 146, Stats. 2022) established privately-enforced civil causes of action against persons who manufacture or cause to be manufactured, distribute, transport, or import into the state, or cause to be distributed or transported or imported into the state, keep for sale or offer or expose for sale, or give or lend certain firearms.
