



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. Patrick J. Ahrens
Member of the Assembly, 26th District
1021 O Street, Suite 6110
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Assembly Bill 2231 (Ahrens), as amended April 22, 2026—Oppose

Dear Assembly Member Ahrens:

The Judicial Council regrettably must oppose Assembly Bill 2231, which requires the Judicial Council, on or before July 1, 2027, to adopt rules of court establishing procedures requiring actions or proceedings seeking judicial review of the certification of an environmental impact report for an environmental leadership hospital campus project in the cities of Emeryville and Santa Clara, including any appeals to the court of appeal or the Supreme Court, to be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 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 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. Patrick J. Ahrens

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 2231 for two hospital campus projects will likely have an adverse impact on other cases in the courts of those two counties, so setting a timeline for deciding these 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.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Heather Resetarits at 916-323-3121.

Sincerely,



Cory T. Jasperson

Director

Judicial Council Governmental Affairs

CTJ/HR/ad

cc: Martin Bui, Legislative Director, Office of Assembly Member Ahrens
Matthew Fleming, Deputy Legislative Secretary, Office of the Governor
Michelle Curran, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California