



## Judicial Council of California

520 Capitol Mall, Suite 600 · Sacramento, California 95814-4717

Telephone 916-323-3121 · Fax 916-323-4347

PATRICIA GUERRERO

*Chief Justice of California  
Chair of the Judicial Council*

MICHELLE CURRAN

*Administrative Director*

May 21, 2026

Hon. Mark González  
Member of the Assembly, 54th District  
1021 O Street, Suite 6150  
Sacramento, California 95814

**Subject: Assembly Bill 2152 (M. González), as amended May 18, 2026—Oppose**

Dear Assembly Member González,

The Judicial Council regrettably must oppose Assembly Bill 2125 because it authorizes specified fire station projects for judicial streamlining, requiring any action or proceeding brought to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the certification of an environmental impact report, mitigated negative declaration, or negative declaration for an essential local fire station project, including any potential appeals to the court of appeal or the Supreme Court, to be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 365 calendar days of the filing of the certified record of proceedings with the court.

**CEQA actions are already entitled to calendaring preference.** The Council has previously and consistently opposed these and other unreasonable limitations on the fair administration of justice in courts. CEQA actions are already entitled to calendaring preference “over all other civil actions” in both the superior courts and the Courts of Appeal pursuant to section [21167.1\(a\)](#) of the Public Resources Code. Imposing the 270-day expedited judicial review timeline on top of existing calendar preferences is arbitrary and likely to be unworkable in practice. This limited timeframe is especially restrictive if the court of appeal or the California Supreme Court must also decide some portion of a CEQA case. Even assuming that no extensions of time are granted for any aspect of the proceedings, it takes an estimated six months to get a case to hearing in the superior court, plus the additional time for the judge to decide and issue a decision.

Hon. Mark González

May 21, 2026

Page 2

**When everything is a priority, nothing is a priority.** The courts are overwhelmed with the task of managing complicated calendars with myriad cases— each of which often comes with delays due to extension requests by counsel— but with finite resources and finite hours in the day. As with other legislation creating or prioritizing calendaring preferences, the expedited judicial review requirements proposed by AB 2125 for an unknown number of fire station projects will likely have an adverse impact on other cases in the courts, so setting a timeline for deciding CEQA cases has the practical effect of pushing other cases on a court’s docket to the back of the line. This means that those other cases—including statutorily mandated calendar preferences, such as juvenile cases, criminal cases, civil cases in which a party is at risk of dying, wage theft cases, election issues—will likely take longer to be calendared and adjudicated.

The Judicial Council appreciates the most recent amendments taken to ensure that an applicant challenging an eligible fire station project pays the appropriate filing fees, but must remain opposed due to the bill’s judicial fast-tracking and preferential treatment of these causes of action. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Heather Resetarits at 916-323-3121 or at [heather.resetarits@jud.ca.gov](mailto:heather.resetarits@jud.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



Cory T. Jaspersen

Director

Judicial Council Governmental Affairs

CTJ/HR/ad

cc: Kyle Johnson, Legislative Assistant, Office of Assemblymember Mark González  
Brynn Cook, Principal Consultant, Senate Environmental Quality Committee  
Matthew Fleming, Deputy Legislative Secretary, Office of the Governor  
Michelle Curran, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California