

Daybreak West, Feb.11: Legislature eyes another attempt at sequestration targets 02/11/25 8:30 AM By <u>Brad Hooker</u>, <u>Chloe Lovejoy</u>, <u>Rebekah Alvey</u>, <u>Philip</u> Brasher, Oliver Ward, and Noah Wicks



California may soon be the first state to codify into state law carbon sequestration targets for natural and working lands.

Asm. Damon Connolly of San Rafael reasons that "climate change cannot wait" and the state must act to "harness the power of our forests, wetlands and farmlands to combat this crisis." Laurie Wayburn, president of the Pacific Forest Trust, sponsor of Connolly's new bill, argues California must set goals in this sector like it has with energy and transportation.

AB 491 builds on the Newsom administration's strategic plan for <u>nature-based</u> <u>solutions</u> released last year. It proposes to boost CDFA's healthy soils program to cover 140,000 acres in the next four years and 190,000 by 2045. Since its inception in 2016, the incentive program has reached <u>about 130,000 acres</u>, with the governor pushing for <u>up to \$85 million a year</u> for the grants. The plan also seeks to set aside nearly 20,000 additional acres for conservation easements by 2045.

Remember: The Legislature has made similar attempts over the years. Asm. Robert Rivas of Hollister, before taking over as Assembly speaker, hit a roadblock for two years in a row. Fellow Democrats were <u>skeptical over expanding the authority</u> of the Air Resources Board, and the bill quietly <u>died in an appropriations</u> committee.

Former Asm. Cristina Garcia of Bell Gardens took up the mantle the following year. When her bill stalled in the same committee, she <u>cannibalized another one</u> and revived the legislation just three days before the end of the 2022 session, circumventing the committee. The bill, AB 1757, established an advisory committee that crafted the administration's nature-based solutions.

But: A farm coalition had opposed each of the attempts, arguing the sector <u>already</u> <u>plays a critical climate role</u>. They worried about setting specific targets when the industry is at the mercy of drought, markets and pests and said the measure would undermine existing efforts while adding costs onto farmers.