

Date of Hearing: June 15, 2022

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Chair

SB 379 (Wiener) – As Amended May 31, 2022

SENATE VOTE: 31-1

SUBJECT: Residential solar energy systems: permitting.

SUMMARY: Requires counties and cities to implement an online, automated permitting platform for residential solar energy systems. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires, pursuant to the compliance schedule in this bill, a city, county, or city and county, in consultation with the local fire department, district, or authority, to implement an online, automated permitting platform, such as SolarAPP+, that meets both of the following requirements:
 - a) The platform verifies code compliance and issues permits in real time or allows the city, county, or city and county to issue permits in real time to a licensed contractor for a residential solar energy system that is no larger than 38.4 kilowatts alternating current nameplate rating and a residential energy storage system paired with a residential solar energy system that is no larger than 38.4 kilowatts alternating current nameplate rating.
 - b) The platform is consistent with the system parameters and configurations, including an inspection checklist, of SolarAPP+.
- 2) Requires, consistent with the compliance schedule in this bill, a city, county, or city and county to amend its ordinance adopted pursuant to existing law (which requires each county and city to adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems) to authorize a residential solar energy system and a residential energy storage system to use the online, automated permitting platform.
- 3) Provides that a city, county, or city and county is not required to permit an application for a residential solar energy system or residential energy storage system through the online automated permitting platform pursuant to this bill if the system configuration is not eligible for SolarAPP+ at the time the application is submitted to the jurisdiction.
- 4) Exempts a city with a population of fewer than 5,000 and a county with a population of fewer than 150,000, including each city within that county, from the requirements of 1) and 2), above.
- 5) Requires a city with a population of 50,000 or fewer that is not exempt pursuant to 4), above, to satisfy the requirements of 1) and 2), above, by September 30, 2024.
- 6) Requires a city, county, or city and county with a population of greater than 50,000 that is not exempt pursuant to 4), above, to satisfy the requirements of 1) and 2), above, by September 30, 2023.

- 7) Requires a city, county, or city and county, or a fire department, district, or authority, to report to the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (Energy Commission) when it is in compliance with the requirements of 1) and 2), above.
- 8) Requires the Energy Commission to set guidelines for cities, counties, and cities and counties to report to the commission on the number of permits issued for residential solar energy systems and residential energy storage systems paired with residential solar energy systems and the relevant characteristics of those systems. A city, county, or city and county shall annually report to the Energy Commission pursuant to those guidelines within one year of implementing the online, automated solar permitting system pursuant to the requirements of 1) and 2), above.
- 9) Requires a city, county, or city and county to self-certify its compliance with this bill when applying for funds from the Energy Commission after the applicable date in the compliance schedule in 5) and 6), above, other than the \$20 million dollars in funds available, pursuant to Section 76 of Chapter 69 of the Statutes of 2021, from the Energy Commission for automated solar permitting.
- 10) Provides that this bill does not limit or otherwise affect the generator interconnection requirements and approval process for a local publicly owned electric utility (POU), as defined, or an electrical corporation, as defined.
- 11) Provides that all liabilities and immunities, as specified, applicable to cities, counties, and cities and counties shall apply to any permits issued through an online, automated permitting platform and any inspections conducted in connection with those permits.
- 12) Provides the following definitions for the purposes of the bill:
 - a) “Energy Commission” means the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission.
 - b) “Residential energy storage system” means commercially available technology, located behind a customer’s residential utility meter, that is capable of absorbing electricity generated from a colocated electricity generator or from the electrical grid, storing it for a period of time, and thereafter discharging it to meet the energy or power needs of the host customer or for export.
 - c) “Residential solar energy system” means any configuration of solar energy devices that collects and distributes solar energy for the purpose of generating electricity and that has a single residential interconnection with the electric utility transmission or distribution network.
 - d) “SolarAPP+” means the most recent version of a web-based portal, developed by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), that automates plan review, produces code-compliant approvals, and issues permits for residential solar energy systems and residential energy storage systems paired with residential solar energy systems.

- 13) Makes a number of findings and declarations regarding permitting fees or soft costs to solar and storage projects and the purposes of this bill.
- 14) Provides that no reimbursement is required by this bill pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, as specified.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires counties and cities to administratively approve applications to install solar energy systems through the issuance of a building permit or similar nondiscretionary permit.
- 2) Requires counties and cities to develop a streamlined permitting process for the installation of small residential rooftop solar energy systems, as specified.
- 3) Prescribes and limits permit fees that counties and cities may charge for residential and commercial solar energy systems.
- 4) Creates the Energy Commission in the Natural Resources Agency and prescribes its duties, which include administering programs for the installation of solar energy systems.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- One-time CEC costs of approximately \$150,000 for 1 PY of staff time to develop and adopt guidelines through the Office of Administrative Law. The CEC may also incur additional one-time and ongoing costs to establish and administer systems to accommodate the solar energy and storage system permitting data reported by cities and counties to the CEC. (Energy Resources Programs Account)
- By requiring specified local officials to report information on the numbers of permits issued and the characteristics of solar energy and storage systems to the CEC, this bill creates a state-mandated local program. To the extent the Commission on State Mandates determines that the reporting provisions create a new program or impose a higher level of service on local agencies, those local agencies could claim state reimbursement for those local costs (General Fund). Staff notes that local costs to implement an online automated permitting platform are not likely to be reimbursable because cities and counties may set permit fees to offset those costs.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement.** According to the author, "SB 379 requires jurisdictions of a certain size to implement an automated online solar permitting system for residential rooftop solar systems. Although the costs of solar hardware have decreased by 80% in the past 15 years, the 'soft' costs associated with permitting are still a massive barrier. Beyond the cost, the unnecessary delays associated with solar permitting result in upwards of 10% of applicants rescinding their application prior to approval. This is a major hindrance to California's clean energy goals, as current models suggest that the state will need to triple solar and wind capacity in order to meet 100% renewable energy by 2045.

“In order to address this delay and the costs associated with permitting, SB 379 will require that an online automated permitting system be utilized. In jurisdictions such as San Jose, the implementation of an automated system resulted in an increase in solar applications of over 600%. This system and the increase in applications that followed not only generated more revenue for San Jose through permitting fees, but also allowed for building officials to focus on other administrative tasks due to the ease and simplicity that an automated online system brings.

“Although San Jose created their own software, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), in coordination with the Department of Energy, solar industry partners, and building safety experts, has created an open source software called SolarAPP+. SolarAPP+ allows for a simplified onboarding and adoption of automated permitting, as it only requires the jurisdiction to have an email account. SB 379 does not require that SolarAPP+ be utilized, but ensures that some form of automated online permitting be available so that residents can be efficiently approved for solar systems, and so that building departments are no longer inundated and slowed by solar permits.”

- 2) **Background.** The California Legislature enacted the Solar Rights Act in 1978 to protect a homeowner’s right to install a solar energy system by limiting a homeowner association's ability to object to such installations through its covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs). The Solar Rights Act allows CC&Rs to include provisions that impose reasonable restrictions on solar energy systems. Reasonable restrictions include those that: do not significantly increase the cost of the solar system; do not significantly decrease the system’s efficiency or specified performance; and, allow for an alternative system of comparable cost, efficiency and benefits. "Significant" is further defined as those restrictions that increase the system’s cost by more than 20% or decrease the system’s efficiency by more than 20%.

AB 2473 (Wolk), Chapter 789, Statutes of 2004, updated the Solar Rights Act by specifying standards for what constitutes "significant" increases in solar energy system costs or decreases in those systems' efficiency. The bill also declared that solar energy system installation is a matter of statewide concern, and made a local government's grant of permission to install a solar energy system ministerial rather than discretionary, unless the permitting agency has good cause to believe doing so would create an adverse impact on public health or safety. In this case, the permitting agency is allowed to require a discretionary permit. The local government cannot refuse to approve an application, unless it makes detailed written findings based on substantial evidence that granting the permit will create specific adverse impacts on public health or safety. If conditions are placed on an approval to mitigate public health or safety impacts, the required mitigation must be designed to accomplish its goal at the lowest possible cost.

- 3) **Local Permit Fees.** Current law prohibits local agencies from charging fees for permit processing and inspection that exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged. Fee revenue must only be used to defray the cost of permit processing and enforcement and cannot be used for general revenue purposes.
- 4) **Soft Costs of Solar Energy Systems.** It is widely acknowledged that the cost of installing solar energy systems in California and the United States has dropped dramatically over the past decade. Initial reductions were attributed to cheaper solar panels. In recent years, though, this decline has been due to decreasing soft costs. Soft costs include sales taxes,

supply chain costs, installer/developer profit, indirect corporate costs, transaction/financing costs, customer acquisition, permitting, and other non-hardware costs. Although soft costs have been declining, they have not dropped as dramatically as hard costs. According to NREL, soft costs comprised about 64 percent of the total system price for residential solar PV systems in 2020.

- 5) **Solar Energy System Permit Fees.** To address some soft costs, the Legislature capped building permit fees that local agencies can charge for residential and commercial solar energy systems. SB 1222 (Leno), Chapter 614, Statutes of 2012, placed caps on the amount of permit fees a city or county can charge for residential or commercial rooftop solar energy systems. For a residential rooftop solar energy system, a city or county was precluded from charging a permit fee that exceeded \$500 (plus \$15 per kW for each kW above 15kW).

SB 1222 bill also prohibited, for a commercial rooftop solar energy system, a city or county from charging a permit fee that exceeded \$1,000 for systems up to 50kW (plus \$7 kW for each kW between 51kW and 250 kW, and \$5 per kW for each kW above 250 kW). These caps were limited specifically to rooftop PV systems, and did not apply to PV systems installed elsewhere on a building, or to solar thermal systems.

SB 1222 allowed a city or county to charge permit fees exceeding these caps, provided the city or county made a written finding and adopted a resolution or ordinance showing substantial evidence of the reasonable cost to issue the permit.

AB 1414 (Friedman), Chapter 849, Statutes of 2017, made a number of changes to these permit fee caps. It reduced the fee cap and applied the cap beyond rooftop solar PV installations only, to include any PV systems and solar thermal systems, with specified size limitations. The bill maintained the permit fee cap on commercial rooftop solar energy systems, but applied the cap beyond rooftop solar PV installations to include PV systems generally and solar thermal systems, also with specified size limitations.

AB 1414 caps fees as follows:

	Base Fee	Additional Fees
Residential	\$450 for PV systems up to 15 kilowatt (kW) or solar thermal systems up to 10 kilowatt thermal (kWth)	\$15 per kW for each kW above 15kW \$15 per kWth for each kWth above 10kWth
Commercial	\$1,000 for PV systems up to 50kW or solar thermal systems up to 30kWth	\$7 kW for each additional kW between 51kW and 250 kW, plus \$5 per kW for each kW above 250 kW \$7 per kWth for each kWth between 30kWth and 260kWth, plus \$5 per kWth for each kWth above 260kWth

AB 1414 continued to allow a city or a county to charge a permit fee that exceeds the specified caps if the city or county makes a written finding and adopts a resolution or ordinance that provides substantial evidence of the reasonable cost to issue the permit. However, this bill required additional elements in the written finding.

AB 1414 also amended the meaning of “solar energy system” to specify that a solar energy system includes any PV device or technology that is integrated into a building, including, but not limited to, PV windows, siding, and roofing shingles or tiles. The bill added a cross-reference to this amended definition, to apply to the permit fee caps.

AB 1124 (Friedman), Chapter 235, Statutes of 2021, subsequently revised the definition of “solar energy system” as the term is used for the purpose of local permitting of such systems, including the allowable fees a local agency may charge, and clarified the permit fees local agencies may charge for commercial solar energy systems. Specifically, AB 1124 expanded the definition of “solar energy system” to include solar racking, solar mounting, and elevated solar support structures, including, but not limited to, solar carports, solar shade structures, solar awnings, solar canopies, and solar patio covers, regardless of whether the feature is on the ground or on a building.

- 6) **Solar Energy System Permit Process.** AB 2188 (Muratsuchi), Chapter 521, Statutes of 2014, required every city and county, by September 30, 2015, to adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems. AB 2188 defined "small rooftop solar energy systems" as systems that meet all of the following:
- a) A solar energy system that is no larger than 10 kW alternating current nameplate rating or 30 kW thermal.
 - b) A solar energy system that conforms to all applicable state fire, structural, electrical, and other building codes as adopted or amended by the city, county, or city and county and applicable safety and performance standards established by the California Electrical Code, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and accredited testing laboratories such as Underwriters Laboratories and, where applicable, rules of the Public Utilities Commission regarding safety and reliability.
 - c) A solar energy system that is installed on a single family dwelling or a duplex.
 - d) A solar panel or module array that does not exceed the maximum legal building height.

AB 2188 required each city and county to develop a checklist of all requirements that allow rooftop solar energy systems to be eligible for expedited review, and requires all complete applications that meet the requirement for expedited review, and meet the requirements of the checklist, to be approved and all permits and authorizations to be issued.

AB 2188 also required each city and county to publish its application checklist and document requirements on a publicly accessible Internet Web site if the local agency maintains one, and to allow for the electronic signature on all forms, applications and other documents. In developing its ordinance, each city or county must substantially conform its expedited, streamlined permitting process with the recommendations for expedited permitting, including

the checklists and standard plans contained in the most current version of the Solar Guidebook adopted by OPR.

A city or county is allowed to adopt an ordinance that modifies the checklists and standards found in the Solar Guidebook due to unique climactic, geological, seismological, or topographical conditions. If a city or county determines that it is unable to authorize the acceptance of an electronic signature on all documents in lieu of a wet signature, the city or county must state, in the required ordinance, the reasons for its inability to accept electronic signatures. In this case, acceptance of an electronic signature is not required.

AB 2188 required all cities and counties to accept permit applications and all associated documents via email, the internet, or facsimile. The bill also specified that only one inspection is required for small residential rooftop solar energy systems that qualify for expedited review, as specified.

- 7) **SolarAPP+**. SolarAPP+ is an online platform for rapid permitting of solar energy systems that can check an application for code compliance and instantly issue an approval or denial. The NREL developed this software in collaboration with the following entities:
- a) International Code Council, which develops the code behind the California Residential and Building Codes.
 - b) The National Fire Protection Association, which develops the code behind the California Electrical Code.
 - c) UL (formerly known as Underwriters Laboratories), which develops some of the standards for the equipment that make up a solar energy system (e.g., solar modules).
 - d) The International Association of Electrical Inspectors.

SolarAPP+ integrates with certain popular software programs used by planning departments, but can also be operated as a standalone application. This software is provided for free to local jurisdictions. Solar project applicants pay an administrative fee to defray the costs of developing the program.

- 8) **Grant Funding for Online Solar Permitting**. The 2021-22 Budget appropriated \$20 million to the Energy Commission to support a grant program for cities, counties, or cities and counties to establish online solar permitting via SB 129 (Skinner), Chapter 69, Statutes of 2021. The Energy Commission has begun to develop the California Automated Permit Processing Program (CalAPP) to implement this grant program and anticipates holding a public workshop on CalAPP in early 2022.
- 9) **Bill Summary**. This bill requires cities and counties to implement an online, automated permitting platform, such as SolarAPP+, that verifies code compliance and issues permits in real time to a licensed contractor for a solar energy system and an energy storage system paired with a solar energy system. The platform must be consistent with the system parameters and configurations of SolarAPP+, including an inspection checklist, and must be developed in consultation with the local fire department, district, or authority.

This bill limits the maximum size of a solar energy system that must be permitted through this platform to 38.4 kW. A city or county is not required to permit an application through the platform if the system configuration is not eligible for SolarAPP+ at the time the application is submitted. Cities and counties must also update their ordinances for streamlined solar permitting to allow a residential solar energy system and an energy storage system to use the online, automated permitting platform.

This bill exempts the following from its provisions:

- a) Cities with a population of fewer than 5,000.
- b) Counties with a population of fewer than 150,000, and the cities within those counties.

The bill also delays implementation for other cities and counties, as follows:

- c) A city with a population of 50,000 or fewer that is not exempted above must meet the bill's requirements by September 30, 2024.
- d) A city or county with a population of greater than 50,000 that is not exempted above must meet the bill's requirements by September 30, 2023.

Cities, counties, and fire agencies must report to the Energy Commission once they comply with the requirements of the bill.

This bill requires the Energy Commission to set guidelines for cities and counties to report on the number of permits issued and the relevant characteristics of those systems. Cities and counties must annually report to the Energy Commission pursuant to those guidelines within one year of implementing the online permitting system. The bill also requires a city or county to certify its compliance with the bill when applying for funds from the Energy Commission, other than the funding for the grant program established by the 2021-22 Budget Act.

This bill is sponsored by Environment California & SPUR

10) **Policy Considerations.** The Committee may wish to consider the following:

- a) **Ordinance Update.** As noted above, AB 2188 required cities and counties to adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems. This bill requires cities and counties to update these ordinances to allow a residential solar energy system and a residential energy storage system to use the online, automated permitting platform required by the bill. It is not clear why this ordinance would need to be updated, because the bill already requires cities and counties to implement the online permitting platform. In addition, the types of solar energy systems identified in AB 2188 are not identical to the type of solar energy systems identified in this bill or SolarAPP+, which could create confusion between the statutes. The Committee may wish to delete this requirement.
- b) **Reporting Requirement on Fire Departments, Districts, or Authorities.** This bill requires a city, county, or fire department, district or authority to report to the Energy Commission when in compliance with the bill's requirement to implement an online

permitting platform. However, the requirement to implement an online permitting platform falls only on cities and counties. The Committee may wish to remove the requirement that a fire department, district or authority report to the Energy Commission.

- c) **Energy Storage System Paired with a Solar Energy System.** This bill generally requires an online permitting platform for solar energy systems and energy storage systems *paired with a solar energy system*. However, in some cases, the bill language refers only to an energy storage system (without specifying that the energy storage system must be *paired with* a solar energy system). The Committee may wish to amend the bill to maintain consistency in these terms.

11) **Committee Amendments.** The Committee may wish to amend this bill as follows:

- a) Delete the requirement that cities and counties update their AB 2188 ordinances to allow a residential solar energy system and a residential energy storage system to use the online, automated permitting platform required by the bill.
- b) Delete the requirement that a fire department, district or authority report to the Energy Commission.
- c) Ensure that references to an energy storage system include language requiring it to be *paired with* a solar energy system.
- d) For clarity, amend Section 65850.52 (f) as follows:

(f) A city, county, or city and county shall self-certify its compliance with this section when applying for funds from the Energy Commission after the applicable date in the compliance schedule in ~~subdivision (e), other than subdivision (c).~~ **This subdivision shall not apply to** the twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) in funds available, pursuant to Section 76 of Chapter 69 of the Statutes of 2021, from the Energy Commission for automated solar permitting.

12) **Previous Legislation.** AB 1124 (Friedman), Chapter 235, Statutes of 2021, revised the definition of “solar energy system” to additionally include any structural design feature by eliminating the provision that it be a feature of a building.

SB 129 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 69, Statutes of 2021, authorized \$20 million from the General Fund to the CEC to support a grant program for cities, counties, or cities and counties to establish online solar permitting.

SB 617 (Wiener) of 2021 was similar to this bill. SB 617 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2700 (Friedman) of 2020 was substantially similar to AB 1124. AB 2700 was held in this Committee.

AB 546 (Chiu), Chapter 380, Statutes of 2017, required cities and counties to accept electronic submissions of permit applications for advanced energy storage installations, and required the creation of a California Energy Storage Permitting Guidebook.

AB 1414 (Friedman), Chapter 849, Statutes of 2017, reduced the maximum permit fee a city or a county may charge for residential rooftop solar energy systems, applied these caps and commercial permit fee caps to a broader range of solar energy systems, and made additional changes to existing law governing permit fees for rooftop solar energy systems.

AB 2188 (Muratsuchi), Chapter 521, Statutes of 2014, required every city and county to adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems.

SB 1222 (Leno), Chapter 614, Statutes of 2012, limited the fees that cities and counties charge for permits related to the installation of rooftop solar energy systems.

AB 2473 (Wolk), Chapter 789, Statutes of 2004, required cities and counties to permit the installation of solar energy systems by right if the system meets specified requirements, and redefined the term “significantly” in regard to restrictions on solar systems that raise costs or decrease efficiency.

- 13) **Arguments in Support.** A large coalition of supporters, including the sponsors of this bill, Environment California & SPUR, write, “California could meet its energy needs by capturing just a sliver of the virtually limitless and pollution free energy that strikes the state every day in the form of sunlight. Currently, most permitting processes are onerous and costly. We can do more to reduce barriers to residential rooftop solar and storage adoption for more communities. By making it easier for more Californians to go solar and add energy storage, we can reduce carbon emissions, increase resilience to wildfires and public safety power shutoffs, and increase job opportunities in our communities.

“The Solar Access Act, SB 379, would require cities and counties to adopt an online and instant permitting system, such as SolarAPP+ so that customers can get a permit for simple residential solar and solar-plus-storage systems without delay. SolarAPP+ is an automated permitting software developed by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and funded by the US Department of Energy and is a great solution to the problem of expensive and time intensive solar and energy storage permitting processes for single family homes and duplexes. This tool is free for jurisdictions to use and can be integrated with existing software.

“With \$20 million of funding secured in the Governor’s 2021 budget, jurisdictions can apply for grants to support the staff time needed to implement SolarAPP+ or another automated permitting system. This bill will support the adoption of tools like SolarAPP+, drive down the cost of solar and solar-plus-storage systems and make it more accessible to Californians. The rapid growth of solar resulting from SB 379 would benefit our communities. Solar installation provides local, accessible and good-paying jobs in communities across California. Solar energy also generates more carbon-free energy which lowers residents’ energy bills, readies the grid for electric vehicles, and keeps the lights on and medical devices running during blackouts and public safety power shutoffs, especially when the solar system includes a battery.” (*citations omitted*)

14) **Arguments in Opposition.** The California Contract Cities Association, in opposition, states, “Our organization’s stance derives from our belief that the bill would directly limit many cities’ local policing powers over their own administrative processes of permitting solar panels in their jurisdictions. Administrative practices are of very local concern – not often overseen by the State – and we believe cities are best suited to manage these activities. And while CCCA generally supports efforts to meet California’s clean energy goals, including streamlining the development of rooftop solar, we are worried SB 379 in its current form puts too heavy a mandate on local cities without offering adequate resources – such as technical administrative support – to assist with implementation. Cities with strong permitting processes in place today could be left worse off tomorrow, should they be forced to use a new system they are unfamiliar with, which causes unnecessary confusion and delays.”

15) **Double-Referral.** This bill is double-referred to the Utilities and Energy Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Environment California [CO-SPONSOR]

SPUR [CO-SPONSOR]

350 Bay Area Action

350 Humboldt

350 Sacramento

ADT

ADT Solar

Advanced Energy Economy

Alameda County Democratic Party

Bay Area Council

Brightline Defense

California Association of Realtors

California Environmental Voters

California Solar & Storage Association

Center for Sustainable Energy

City and County of San Francisco

City of Berkeley

Climate Reality Project, San Fernando Valley Chapter

Coachella Valley Association of Governments

Commissioner Leah Simon- Weisberg, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board

Commissioner Paola Laverde, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board

Commissioner Soli Alpert, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board

Councilmember Adele Andrade Stadler, City of Alhambra

Councilmember Alison Hicks, City of Mountain View

Councilmember Ben Bartlett, City of Berkeley

Councilmember Carroll Fife, City of Oakland

Councilmember Chris Ricci, City of Modesto

Councilmember Dan Kalb, City of Oakland

Councilmember Dennis Pocekay, City of Petaluma

Councilmember Eduardo Martinez, City of Richmond

Councilmember Erin Minett, City of Nevada City
Councilmember Glenn Grandis, City of Fountain Valley
Councilmember Hung Wei, City of Cupertino
Councilmember James Coleman, City of South San Francisco
Councilmember Jenny Kassan, City of Fremont
Councilmember Kate Harrison, City of Berkeley
Councilmember Katherine Lee, City of Alhambra
Councilmember Kathy Watanabe, City of Santa Clara
Councilmember Kristin McCowan, City of Santa Monica
Councilmember Loren Taylor, City of Oakland
Councilmember Mikke Pierson, City of Malibu
Councilmember Rebecca Garcia, City of Watsonville
Councilmember Ronaldo Fierro, City of Riverside
Councilmember Ruth Luevanos, City of Simi Valley
Councilmember Salvador Solorio-Ruiz, City of Delano
Councilmember Sara Lamnin, City of Hayward
Councilmember Sophie Hahn, City of Berkeley
Councilmember Terry Taplin, City of Berkeley
Councilmember Tony Madrigal, City of Modesto
Councilmember Valerie Arkin, City of Pleasanton
Councilmember Victor Aguilar, City of San Leandro
Desert Valleys Builders Association
E2 (Environmental Entrepreneurs)
Electric Ratepayers Alliance
Environmental Defense Fund
Greenwork
GRID Alternatives
Habitat for Humanity California
Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
Local Solar for All
Los Angeles Business Council
Mayor Alma Beltran, City of Parlier
Mayor Ariston Julian, City of Guadalupe
Mayor David Potter, City of Carmel By-the-Sea
Mayor Dianne Martinez, City of Emeryville
Mayor Kevin Wilk, City of Walnut Creek
Mayor Michael Vargas, City of Perris
Mayor Pauline Cutter, City of San Leandro
Mayor Pro Tem Gabriel Quinto, City of El Cerrito
Mayor Rick DeGolia, Town of Atherton
Mayor Sue Himmelrich, City of Santa Monica
Mayor Teresa Barrett, City of Petaluma
Mayor Tom Butt, City of Richmond
Natural Resources Defense Council
San Diego Housing Federation
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
Sierra Club California
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action

Solar and Fire Education
Solar Rights Alliance
Southern California Association of Non-profit Housing
Steve Palmisano, Director of Public Works & Utilities, City of Watsonville
Sunpower Corporation
Supervisor Ahsha Safai, City and County of San Francisco
Supervisor Carmen Ramirez, Ventura County
Supervisor Das Williams, Santa Barbara County
Supervisor Jaron Brandon, Tuolumne County
Supervisor Miguel Villapudua, San Joaquin County
The Climate Center
Vote Solar

Opposition

California Contract Cities Association

Analysis Prepared by: Angela Mapp / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958