



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-096

For business meeting on April 25, 2025

Title

CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 1, 2025

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705

Date of Report

April 9, 2025

Recommended by

Appellate Advisory Committee
Hon. Allison M. Danner, Chair

Contact

Jeremy Varon, 415-865-7424

jeremy.varon@jud.ca.gov

James Barolo, 415-865-8928

james.barolo@jud.ca.gov

Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
Hon. Donald J. Proietti, Chair

Executive Summary

The Appellate Advisory Committee and the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend amending eight rules of the California Rules of Court governing the expedited resolution of actions and proceedings brought under the California Environmental Quality Act. These amendments would implement recent legislation requiring inclusion of “environmental leadership media campus project” for streamlined review, and specify the fees that applicants of this project type must pay to cover the costs of the trial and appellate courts in adjudicating challenges to those projects.

Recommendation

The Appellate Advisory Committee and the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2025, amend rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705 to add “environmental leadership media campus” as a “streamlined CEQA project” and to set the fees to cover trial court and appellate court costs for review of challenges to those projects, as applicable.

The text of the amended rules is attached at pages 6–13.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Since 2011, the Legislature has enacted numerous bills providing expedited judicial review for legal challenges brought under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for specified projects. Initially, the Legislature enacted legislation providing that CEQA challenges to so-called environmental leadership projects would be brought directly to the Court of Appeal and that project applicants would pay the costs of adjudicating the case. (See Assem. Bill 900; Stats. 2011, ch. 354.) To implement the required appellate court fees in AB 900, the council adopted the predecessor to rule 8.705.

In 2013, the Legislature required the Judicial Council to adopt rules requiring that specified CEQA actions or proceedings, including any appeals, be resolved within a specified period of time. (See Sen. Bill 743; Stats. 2013, ch. 386.) SB 743 added section 21168.6 to the Public Resources Code, which provided that CEQA challenges to Sacramento basketball arena projects would receive expedited judicial review. To implement SB 743, the council adopted, among others, rules 3.2220 and 8.700, which provided expedited review for the specified projects and set out certain requirements and incentives to help streamline judicial review.

From 2018 to 2020, the Legislature enacted several laws expanding the projects for which streamlined CEQA review is available. Two such laws included requirements that applicants pay the “additional costs” incurred by trial and appellate courts associated with expedited adjudication of CEQA challenges for Oakland ballpark and Inglewood arena projects. (See Assem. Bill 734 (Stats. 2018, ch. 959) and Assem. Bill 987 (Stats. 2018, ch. 961).) In addition to adding the specified projects to rules 3.2220 and 8.700, the council implemented AB 734 by adopting rule 3.2240, which established a fee for streamlined CEQA review to be paid by applicants to the trial court. The council also amended rule 8.705 to include a corresponding fee for the Court of Appeal.¹

In 2021, the Legislature enacted further legislation expanding the projects for which streamlined CEQA review is available and requiring project applicants to pay the trial court and Court of Appeal “costs” (as opposed to “additional costs”) for streamlined adjudication of CEQA challenges. (See Sen. Bill 7 (Stats. 2021, ch. 19) and Sen. Bill 44 (Stats. 2021, ch. 633).) The council amended rules 3.2220 and 8.700 to add the new projects and amended rules 3.2240 and 8.705 to set trial and appellate court fees for streamlined adjudication for such projects.²

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review* (Mar. 2, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10565631&GUID=6D8B30CC-D416-44C2-A4F0-D857024D2730>.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review* (June 16, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11204347&GUID=0B8ED5A2-2001-41B5-B8A8-3797FEF852B9>.

Most recently, in 2023, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 149 (Stats. 2023, ch. 60) to add “infrastructure projects” to the list of projects to receive expedited CEQA review. The council amended the rules governing expedited CEQA review, effective December 31, 2023, to include this new project type and apply the required court fees in rules 3.2240 and 8.705 to these new projects.³ In addition, effective January 1, 2025, the council amended rule 3.2226 to implement a requirement in the new law that courts must hold an initial case management conference within 30 days of the filing of the complaint in actions brought under CEQA that receive expedited court review.⁴

Analysis/Rationale

In 2024, the Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 3265 (Stats. 2024, ch. 255) (Link A), which added “environmental leadership media campus” to the list of projects to receive expedited CEQA review.⁵ Notably, the Legislature added this type of project to section 21168.6.6 of the Public Resources Code, in place of the previously repealed section on Sacramento “entertainment and sports center project.”⁶ The new law explicitly mandates that the council expedite review for “actions or proceedings seeking judicial review of the certification of an environmental impact report for an environmental leadership media campus project or the granting of any project approval.”⁷ It also states that the council must adopt rules to put this mandate into effect by July 1, 2025.

To implement the statute, the committees recommend rule amendments that add “environmental leadership media campus project” to the list of projects that receive expedited CEQA review and make other conforming changes.⁸

Amendments to add environmental leadership media campus projects

Several of the recommended rule amendments simply add statutory citations or “environmental leadership media campus project” to an existing rule to implement AB 3265’s provision that such projects receive expedited CEQA review. Other proposed amendments remove references to “entertainment and sports center project” from an existing rule to implement AB 2965’s

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review* (Oct. 26, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12398997&GUID=7F912B56-E0AF-4D15-B801-87FE8D7EF0C2>.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *CEQA Actions: Initial Case Management Conferences* (Aug. 21, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13259734&GUID=68C78DF7-103E-4ACB-B4AB-816CE2B321E5>.

⁵ Pub. Resources Code, § 21168.6.6.

⁶ Section 21168.6.6 was repealed effective January 1, 2023. (See Assem. Bill 2965; Stats. 2022, ch. 38.)

⁷ Assem. Bill 3265; Stats. 2024, ch. 255.

⁸ Other conforming changes include removing reference to Public Resources Code sections 21189.50–21189.57, which were repealed effective July 2, 2024. (See Sen. Bill 174; Stats. 2024, ch. 74.)

removal of expedited CEQA review for such projects. (See, for example, proposed amendments to rules 3.2220 and 8.700.)

Fees for expedited review

In addition to adding a category to the list of projects that receive expedited CEQA review, AB 3265 also requires that the project applicant agree “to pay any additional costs incurred by the courts in hearing and deciding any case subject to this section ..., as provided in the California Rules of Court adopted by the Judicial Council.”⁹ Because this language mirrors the language used in the Oakland ballpark and Inglewood arena statutes (see Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21168.6.7(d)(6) and 21168.6.8(b)(6), respectively), the committees recommend that the fee requirements in the rules of court that apply to Oakland ballpark and Inglewood arena projects also apply to new environmental leadership media campus projects.

In March 2022, the council amended the rules of court to set court fees for expedited CEQA review for Oakland ballpark and Inglewood arena projects as required by statute.¹⁰ Specifically, Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.7(d)(6) (Oakland ballpark) and 21168.6.8(b)(6) (Inglewood arena) require the project applicants to pay a fee for the “additional costs” to the courts for expedited review. As described in the March 2022 report to the council, those fees were derived from an estimate that the amount of time to adjudicate expedited CEQA cases is 91 full-time working days of a judicial officer and a research attorney in each of the courts. As such, the committees recommend amending California Rules of Court, rules 3.2240 and 8.705 to adopt the same fee amounts for project applicants in an environmental leadership media campus project.

Policy implications

The committees recommend amending the rules to implement legislation and to ensure that the rules conform to law. The policy choices have been made by the Legislature.

Comments

The committees solicited public comments on this proposal from December 6, 2024, to January 6, 2025, as part of the council’s regular winter 2025 invitation-to-comment cycle. Of the five relevant comments received, three were from courts, one was from a county bar association, and one was from the Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee (TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee). All the commenters agreed with the proposal or agreed if it were modified. The substantive comments and the committees’ responses are summarized below.

The Orange County Bar Association recommended inserting the term “environmental leadership media campus project” into rule 3.2223(3), which addresses payment of the fees set by

⁹ Assem. Bill 3265; Stats. 2024, ch. 255, § 2.

¹⁰ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review* (Mar. 2, 2022), p. 10, <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10565631&GUID=6D8B30CC-D416-44C2-A4F0-D857024D2730>.

rule 3.2240. The committees agree that such projects should be included in rule 3.2223(3) and accordingly have included this in their recommended amendments to the rules.

The Superior Court of San Bernardino County noted that “[t]raining may be needed for judges as to the updated rules,” and “3 months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date should be enough time for implementation.” The committees acknowledge that additional time may be helpful to courts. However, the statutory changes these amended rules implement take effect on July 1, 2025. The committees therefore recommend a July 1, 2025, effective date for the amended rules, even though that effective date provides only two months implementation time following Judicial Council approval.

A chart of comments and the committees’ responses is attached at pages 14–16.

Alternatives considered

Because the new CEQA requirements are mandated by the Legislature, the committees did not consider the alternative of no rule amendments.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The committees anticipate that this proposal would require courts to train court staff and judicial officers on the amended rules, but any such training would be required to implement the statutory changes in any event.

Attachments and Links

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705, at pages 6–13
2. Chart of comments, at pages 14–16
3. Link A: Assem. Bill 3265 (Stats. 2024, ch. 255),
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB3265

Rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705 of the California Rules of Court are amended, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

Rule 3.2200. Application

Except as otherwise provided in chapter 2 of the rules in this division, which govern actions under Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6–21168.6.9, 21178–21189.3, ~~21189.50–21189.57~~, 21189.70–21189.70.10, and 21189.80–21189.91, the rules in this chapter apply to all actions brought under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as stated in division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

Rule 3.2220. Definitions and application

(a) Definitions

As used in this chapter:

- (1) A “streamlined CEQA project” means any project within the definitions stated in (2) through ~~(9)~~ (8).
- (2) An “environmental leadership development project” or “leadership project” means a project certified by the Governor under Public Resources Code sections 21182–21184.
- (3) ~~The “Sacramento entertainment and sports center project” or “Sacramento arena project” means an entertainment and sports center project as defined by Public Resources Code section 21168.6.6, for which the proponent provided notice of election to proceed under that statute described in section 21168.6.6(j)(1).~~ An “environmental leadership media campus project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.6.
- (4) An “Oakland sports and mixed-use project” or “Oakland ballpark project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.7 and certified by the Governor under that section.
- (5) An “Inglewood arena project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.8 and certified by the Governor under that section.
- (6) ~~An “expanded capitol building annex project” means a state capitol building annex project, annex project-related work, or state office building project as defined by Public Resources Code section 21189.50.~~
- ~~(7)~~ (6) An “Old Town Center transit and transportation facilities project” or “Old Town Center project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21189.70.

(8) (7) An “environmental leadership transit project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.9.

(9) (8) An “infrastructure project” means an “energy infrastructure project,” a “semiconductor or microelectronic project,” a “transportation-related project,” or a “water-related project” as defined in Public Resources Code section 21189.81 and certified by the Governor under Public Resources Code sections 21189.82 and 21189.83.

(b) Proceedings governed

The rules in this chapter govern actions or proceedings brought to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the certification of the environmental impact report or the grant of any project approvals for a streamlined CEQA project. Except as otherwise provided in Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6–21168.6.9, 21178–21189.3, ~~21189.50–21189.57~~, 21189.70–21189.70.10, and 21189.80–21189.91 and these rules, the provisions of the Public Resources Code and the CEQA Guidelines adopted by the Natural Resources Agency (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.) governing judicial actions or proceedings to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul acts or decisions of a public agency on the grounds of noncompliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the rules of court generally apply in proceedings governed by this rule.

(c) * * *

Rule 3.2221. Time

(a) * * *

(b) Extensions of time by parties

If the parties stipulate to extend the time for performing any acts in actions governed by these rules, they are deemed to have agreed that the statutorily prescribed time for resolving the action may be extended by the stipulated number of days of the extension, and to that extent to have waived any objection to noncompliance with the deadlines for completing review stated in Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6–21168.6.9, 21185, ~~21189.51~~, 21189.70.3, and 21189.85. Any such stipulation must be approved by the court.

(c) Sanctions for failure to comply with rules

1 If a party fails to comply with any time requirements provided in these rules or
2 ordered by the court, the court may issue an order to show cause as to why one of
3 the following sanctions should not be imposed:
4

- 5 (1) Reduction of time otherwise permitted under these rules for the performance
6 of other acts by that party;
7
- 8 (2) If the failure to comply is by petitioner or plaintiff, dismissal of the petition;
9
- 10 (3) If the failure to comply is by respondent or a real party in interest, removal of
11 the action from the expedited procedures provided under Public Resources
12 Code sections 21168.6.6–21168.6.9, 21185, ~~21189.51~~, 21189.70.3, and
13 21189.85, and these rules; or
14
- 15 (4) Any other sanction that the court finds appropriate.
16

17
18 **Rule 3.2223. Petition**
19

20 In addition to any other applicable requirements, the petition must:
21

- 22 (1) On the first page, directly below the case number, indicate that the matter is a
23 “Streamlined CEQA Project”;
24
- 25 (2) State one of the following:
26
 - 27 (A) The proponent of the project at issue provided notice to the lead agency
28 that it was proceeding under Public Resources Code section 21168.6.6,
29 21168.6.7, 21168.6.8, or 21168.6.9 (whichever is applicable) and is
30 subject to this rule; or
31
 - 32 (B) The proponent of the project at issue provided notice to the lead agency
33 that it was proceeding under Public Resources Code sections
34 21189.80–21189.91 and is subject to this rule; or
35
 - 36 (C) The project at issue was certified by the Governor as an environmental
37 leadership development project under Public Resources Code sections
38 21182–21184 and is subject to this rule; or
39
 - 40 ~~(D) The project at issue is an expanded capitol building annex project as~~
41 ~~defined by Public Resources Code section 21189.50 and is subject to~~
42 ~~this rule; or~~
43

1 ~~(E)~~ (D) The project at issue is an Old Town Center project as defined by
2 Public Resources Code section 21189.70 and is subject to this rule;

3
4 (3) If an environmental leadership media campus project, environmental
5 leadership development project, Oakland ballpark project, Inglewood arena
6 project, energy infrastructure project, semiconductor or microelectronic
7 project, or water-related project, provide notice that the person or entity that
8 applied for certification of the project as such a project must make the
9 payments required by rule 3.2240 and, if the matter goes to the Court of
10 Appeal, the payments required by rule 8.705;

11
12 (4) If an environmental leadership transit project, provide notice that the project
13 applicant must make the payments required by rule 3.2240 and, if the matter
14 goes to the Court of Appeal, the payments required by rule 8.705; and

15
16 (5) Be verified.

17
18
19 **Rule 3.2240. Trial court costs in certain streamlined CEQA projects**

20
21 In fulfillment of the provisions in Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6, 21168.6.7,
22 21168.6.8, 21168.6.9, 21183, and 21189.82 regarding payment of trial court costs with
23 respect to cases concerning environmental leadership media campus, environmental
24 leadership development, environmental leadership transit, Oakland ballpark, Inglewood
25 arena, energy infrastructure, semiconductor or microelectronic, or water-related projects:

26
27 (1) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an
28 environmental leadership development project, the person or entity that applied for
29 certification of the project as an environmental leadership development project
30 must pay a fee of \$180,000 to the court.

31
32 (2) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an
33 energy infrastructure project, a semiconductor or microelectronic project, or a
34 water-related project, the project applicant, if the applicant is not the lead agency,
35 must pay a fee of \$180,000 to the court.

36
37 (3) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an
38 environmental leadership transit project, the project applicant must pay a fee of
39 \$180,000 to the court.

40
41 (4) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an
42 Oakland ballpark project or an Inglewood arena project, the person or entity that

1 applied for certification of the project as a streamlined CEQA project must pay a
2 fee of \$120,000 to the court.

3
4 (5) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an
5 environmental leadership media campus project, the project applicant must pay a
6 fee of \$120,000 to the court.

7
8 ~~(5)~~ (6) If the court incurs the costs of any special master appointed by the court in
9 the case or of any contract personnel retained by the court to work on the case, the
10 person or entity that applied for certification of the project or the project applicant
11 must also pay, within 10 days of being ordered by the court, those incurred or
12 estimated costs.

13
14 ~~(6)~~ (7) If the party fails to timely pay the fee or costs specified in this rule, the court
15 may impose sanctions that the court finds appropriate after notifying the party and
16 providing the party with an opportunity to pay the required fee or costs.

17
18 ~~(7)~~ (8) Any fee or cost paid under this rule is not recoverable.
19
20

21 **Rule 8.700. Definitions and application**

22 **(a) Definitions**

23
24 As used in this chapter:

- 25
26
27 (1) A “streamlined CEQA project” means any project within the definitions
28 stated in (2) through ~~(9)~~ (8).
29
30 (2) An “environmental leadership development project” or “leadership project”
31 means a project certified by the Governor under Public Resources Code
32 sections 21182–21184.
33
34 (3) ~~The “Sacramento entertainment and sports center project” or “Sacramento~~
35 ~~arena project” means an entertainment and sports center project as defined by~~
36 ~~Public Resources Code section 21168.6.6, for which the proponent provided~~
37 ~~notice of election to proceed under that statute described in section~~
38 ~~21168.6.6(j)(1).~~ An “environmental leadership media campus project” means
39 a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.6.
40
41 (4) An “Oakland sports and mixed-use project” or “Oakland ballpark project”
42 means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.7 and
43 certified by the Governor under that section.

(5) An “Inglewood arena project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.8 and certified by the Governor under that section.

~~(6) An “expanded capitol building annex project” means a state capitol building annex project, annex project-related work, or state office building project as defined by Public Resources Code section 21189.50.~~

~~(7)~~ (6) An “Old Town Center transit and transportation facilities project” or “Old Town Center project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21189.70.

~~(8)~~ (7) An “environmental leadership transit project” means a project as defined in Public Resources Code section 21168.6.9.

~~(9)~~ (8) An “infrastructure project” means an “energy infrastructure project,” a “semiconductor or microelectronic project,” a “transportation-related project,” or a “water-related project” as defined in Public Resources Code section 21189.81 and certified by the Governor under Public Resources Code sections 21189.82 and 21189.83.

(b) * * *

Rule 8.702. Appeals

(a)–(e) * * *

(f) Briefing

(1)–(3) * * *

(4) *Extensions of time to file briefs*

If the parties stipulate to extend the time to file a brief under rule 8.212(b), they are deemed to have agreed that the statutorily prescribed time for resolving the action may be extended by the stipulated number of days of the extension for filing the brief and, to that extent, to have waived any objection to noncompliance with the deadlines for completing review stated in Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6–21168.6.9, 21185, ~~21189.51~~, 21189.70.3, and 21189.85 for the duration of the stipulated extension.

(5) * * *

(g) * * *

Rule 8.705. Court of Appeal costs in certain streamlined CEQA projects

In fulfillment of the provisions in Public Resources Code sections 21168.6.6, 21168.6.7, 21168.6.8, 21168.6.9, 21183, and 21189.82 regarding payment of the Court of Appeal's costs with respect to cases concerning environmental leadership media campus, environmental leadership development, environmental leadership transit, Oakland ballpark, Inglewood arena, energy infrastructure, semiconductor or microelectronic, or water-related projects:

(1) Within 10 days after service of the notice of appeal or petition in a case concerning an environmental leadership development project, the person or entity that applied for certification of the project as an environmental leadership development project must pay a fee of \$215,000 to the Court of Appeal.

(2) Within 10 days after service of the petition or complaint in a case concerning an energy infrastructure project, a semiconductor or microelectronic project, or a water-related project, the project applicant, if the applicant is not the lead agency, must pay a fee of \$215,000 to the ~~court~~ Court of Appeal.

(3) Within 10 days after service of the notice of appeal or petition in a case concerning an environmental leadership transit project, the project applicant must pay a fee of \$215,000 to the Court of Appeal.

(4) Within 10 days after service of the notice of appeal or petition in a case concerning an Oakland ballpark project or Inglewood arena project, the person or entity that applied for certification of the project as an Oakland ballpark project or Inglewood arena project must pay a fee of \$140,000 to the Court of Appeal.

(5) Within 10 days after service of the notice of appeal or petition in a case concerning an environmental leadership media campus project, the project applicant must pay a fee of \$140,000 to the Court of Appeal.

~~(5)~~ (6) If the Court of Appeal incurs the costs of any special master appointed by the Court of Appeal in the case or of any contract personnel retained by the Court of Appeal to work on the case, the person or entity that applied for certification of the project or the project applicant must also pay, within 10 days of being ordered by the court, those incurred or estimated costs.

- 1 ~~(6)~~ (7) If the party fails to timely pay the fee or costs specified in this rule, the court
2 may impose sanctions that the court finds appropriate after notifying the party and
3 providing the party with an opportunity to pay the required fee or costs.
4
5 ~~(7)~~ (8) Any fee or cost paid under this rule is not a recoverable cost.

W25-02

CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review (Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee (TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee)	A	The JRS notes that the proposal is required to conform to a change of law. This proposal would require courts to train staff and judicial officers on the amended rules and any such training would already be required to implement the statutory changes.	The committees appreciate the information provided.
2.	Orange County Bar Association by Mei Tsang, President Newport Beach, CA	AM	Please insert the term “environmental leadership media campus project” into Revised Rule 3.2223(3), so that the subsection reads: “If an environmental leadership media campus project, an environmental leadership development,”	The committees will recommend this change.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

W25-02

CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review (Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
3.	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles by Robert Oftring, Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs	A	<p>The following comments are representative of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, and do not represent or promote the viewpoint of any particular officer or employee.</p> <p>In response to the Judicial Council of California’s “ITC W25-02 CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review,” the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Court), agrees with the proposal.</p> <p>The Court supports the proposed modification of court rules to specify an additional \$120,000 fee to be paid to the trial court for a qualifying expedited review.</p>	The committees appreciate the information provided.
4.	Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino by Brenda Martin Del Campo, Management Analyst II	A	Training may be needed for judges as to the updated rules. 3 months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date should be enough time for implementation.	The committees appreciate the information provided and note that the Legislature mandated a July 1, 2025 effective date and that the added project type is limited to the County of Los Angeles.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

W25-02

CEQA Actions: New Projects and Fees for Expedited Review (Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.2200, 3.2220, 3.2221, 3.2223, 3.2240, 8.700, 8.702, and 8.705)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
5.	Superior Court of California, County of San Diego by Mike Roddy, Executive Officer	A	Q: Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose? A: Yes.	The committees appreciate the information provided.
			Q: Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify. A: No.	The committees appreciate the information provided.
			Q: What would the implementation requirements be for courts for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems? A: None. The proposal appears to be limited to the County of Los Angeles.	The committees appreciate the information provided.
			Q: Would two months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation? A: Yes.	The committees appreciate the information provided.
			Q: How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes? A: Proposal appears to be limited to Los Angeles Superior Court.	The committees appreciate the information provided.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.