

VOTE **NO** ON **AB 1881** (Ramos)

UPDATED FLOOR ALERT — OPPOSE

AB 1881 (Ramos) — As Amended August XX, 2026

AUG. XX AMENDMENTS *FAIL* TO RESOLVE ANY OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS WITH THIS BILL.

*The opposition was **NOT** consulted on these amendments*

WHAT AB 1881 STILL DOES

AB 1881 is not just about land access. It does not improve tribal consultation. It hands any tribe an effective **VETO** over state land use and water management decisions throughout California. Our coalition remains **OPPOSED** because the bill still:

- **Creates a sweeping private right of action** — including injunctive relief and attorney's fees—allowing any tribe to challenge state agency actions involving state lands and waterways in any judicial or administrative proceeding.
- **Requires written tribal CONSENT** — before state agencies may advance projects on state lands or waters that may affect sacred sites, with no defined timeline, no process for breaking a deadlock, and no mechanism for the state to proceed if consent is withheld.

The private right of action and **consent requirements** would still give *any* tribe—not the state—the **FINAL WORD** over water and land management decisions.

AB 1881 IS SO UNWORKABLE THAT THE STATE WATER BOARD NEEDED A COMPLETE CARVE-OUT

This carve-out is not a technical fix — it's an admission that **this bill is broken**. The bill still applies to **every other state agency** that manages state lands and water (i.e., Dept. of Water Resources, CalFire, CalTrans, etc.). If the bill's requirements are so **fundamentally flawed** that the State Water Board needed a full exemption, the Legislature should ask why those same requirements are acceptable for every other agency.

WE SUPPORT MEANINGFUL TRIBAL CONSULTATION — AB 1881 GOES TOO FAR

CEQA's tribal consultation mandates are essential and meaningful — if an agency fails to consult adequately, the entire environmental review can be invalidated. That is a powerful, enforceable remedy. Our coalition agrees that tribes deserve a meaningful voice when the state undertakes actions that may affect sacred sites and culturally significant lands — and we remain committed to working with the author and tribal stakeholders to strengthen tribal consultation in a way that is workable and enforceable. **But AB 1881, as written, does not strengthen that process; it bypasses it entirely.**

AB 1881 WOULD *STILL* UNDERMINE CALIFORNIA'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO CLIMATE CHANGE

California is in a race against climate change—building water storage, modernizing conveyance infrastructure, reducing fuel loads to prevent catastrophic wildfires, and restoring watersheds. **AB 1881 inserts a tribal veto into every one of those efforts.** While the state invests billions in its climate agenda, this bill would hand any tribe the power to bring that work to a halt.

VOTE NO ON AB 1881 (Ramos)



Agricultural Council of California

American Pistachio Growers

Association of California Water Agencies

California Association of Winegrape Growers

California Chamber of Commerce

California Citrus Mutual

California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association

California Municipal Utilities Association

California Special Districts Association

State Water Contractors

Water Blueprint for the San Joaquin Valley

Advocacy Fund

Western Growers

California State Association of Counties

California Walnut Commission

El Dorado Irrigation District

Grower-Shipper Association of Central California

League of California Cities

Northern California Water Association

Regional Water Authority

Solano County Water Agency

Southern California Water Coalition

Western Municipal Water District

Western Plant Health Association

Western Tree Nut Association

Valley Ag Water Coalition