



DATE: January 24, 2024

TO: Waste Management Authority and Energy Council

FROM: Jennifer West, Program Manager

SUBJECT: 2024 Legislative Session Priority Setting

SUMMARY

At the January 24 WMA meeting, staff will provide an overview of the 2023 legislative session and ask Board members to confirm the Agency’s legislative priorities for 2024. Staff will also provide an update on the legislation the Agency is pursuing in 2024 that would make changes to the SB 1383 procurement requirements. The new legislative session began on January 3, 2024.

At the end of the 2023 legislative session, several bills were signed into law that were consistent with the Board’s adopted legislative priorities. The 2024 legislative session will be the second year of a two-year session, and many of the bills the Board took a position on are being continued through next year. They are described below. The biggest success of 2023 in terms of the bills the Agency supported was the signing of the Right to Repair Act, requiring tools and documentation allowing the repair of small electronics by third parties, which will help devices last longer, and will keep many out of the landfill.

DISCUSSION

StopWaste’s Board adopted five priorities for the 2023 Legislative Session:

1. Common sense adjustments to SB 1383 requirements
2. Decarbonization/electrification in the built environment to reduce reliance on carbon-intensive energy and materials in our communities
3. Circular economy solutions and plastic pollution prevention
4. Clear product information for consumers
5. Building healthy food systems

For 2024, staff recommends the Board adopt similar priorities to 2023 (above) to create a diverse range of categories under which we track bills and take a position. Some examples of specific bills that fall into these categories include:

1. SB 1383 requirements: The Agency is sponsoring a bill designed to adjust the procurement requirement for jurisdictions for compost/mulch (recycled organic waste products). The intention is to increase local government flexibility in meeting the requirements, reduce local government costs, and continue advancing the methane-reduction goals in SB 1383.

2. Decarbonization: Policy that supports low-carbon concrete and cement in procurement practices and in construction falls in this category. In December, staff shared [a board memo](#) and the Board recommended that staff work to examine how electricity rates impact electrification and what role the Energy Council can play in 2024 in this area. That effort has been incorporated into the proposed priorities for 2024.
3. Circular economy solutions: Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) may have a big year in 2024. Several bills relating to EPR became two-year bills (carpet, textiles, EV batteries, and solar panels) and we are watching to see how far they get in 2024. We will continue to prioritize and support effective legislation that advances a reusables infrastructure and eliminates reliance on single-use foodware and bags, for example.
4. Clear product information for consumers: SB 660 (Irwin) is a two-year bill that would help with “best by” date confusion on food labels and prevent edible food from being thrown out unnecessarily.
5. Building healthy food systems: We are tracking possible bond measures that fund healthy food systems including building sustainable agriculture and food access. Given our goal to help address food insecurity, we will continue to evaluate opportunities to increase funding support for food recovery organizations.

At StopWaste we advance our legislative priorities by working with other partner agencies to find common ground and building coalitions to engage with state agencies and legislators, as we have a stronger voice together. We contract with a lobbyist team in Sacramento (Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer and Lange) who works with bill authors, represents StopWaste at committee hearings, helps with letters of support, and engages directly with state agencies and coalition partners. StopWaste staff consult with the Board, the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Committee (TAC), other member agency staff and our staff, and update partners on our legislative positions periodically.

On January 10, Governor Newsom released the 2024-25 state budget, where he projected the state deficit to be \$37.9 billion (a significant difference from the \$68 billion projected by the Legislative Analyst’s Office last month). The Governor attributes the budget deficit to a substantial decline in the stock market which drove down revenues and unprecedented delays in income tax collections, which make up a significant share of the “Big Three” General Fund Revenue sources (personal income, sales, and corporation taxes). The Governor proposes to withdraw \$13 million from the state’s reserve accounts. He’s also proposing \$8.5 billion in cuts, including \$3 billion from climate programs, \$1.2 billion in housing programs, \$760 million from currently vacant state jobs, and about a half billion each in funding for school facilities and student housing. His plan would also delay some previously proposed spending, including \$1 billion for transit and intercity rail, roughly half a billion dollars in early education facilities, and \$400 million in clean energy spending.

The Governor’s budget proposal kicks off the start of budget negotiations with the Legislature. The Governor will update his January proposal in May, and the Legislature must pass a budget by June 15, ahead of the July 1 start of the next fiscal year. Negotiations about which bonds to place on the ballot in Fall 2024 will be key this year to help with limited funding.

NEXT STEPS / KEY DATES

The legislature returned to Sacramento in January. Agency staff and our lobbying team continue to engage in discussions about two-year bills and proposals for the coming year. An outline of key dates in the 2024 legislative calendar is below:

- **January 3:** Legislature returns to complete second year of the 2023-2024 session
- **January 10:** Governor submits proposed state budget to the legislature
- **January 31:** All two-year bills must pass out of the house of origin
- **February 16:** Last day for new bills to be introduced
- **May 24:** Last day for each house to pass bills introduced in their house
- **July 3:** Last day for policy committees to meet and pass bills
- **July 5 - Aug 5:** Summer recess
- **August 31:** Last day for each house to pass bills
- **September 30:** Last day for the Governor to sign/veto bills

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that the Board adopts priorities for the 2024 Legislative Session.

1. Common sense adjustments to SB 1383 requirements
2. Decarbonization/electrification in the built environment to reduce reliance on carbon-intensive energy and materials in our communities, including pursuing supply-side policies that would support electrification
3. Circular economy solutions and plastic pollution prevention
4. Clear product information for consumers
5. Building healthy food systems

Staff recommends that the Board change its position on two bills: SB 552 (No Position) and SB 560 (Support).

BILLS WITH STOPWASTE POSITIONS

StopWaste took positions on 30 bills in 2023, and a brief description and status of each is below along with its supporters and opponents. There will be newly introduced bills this session for the Board to review for positions, typically in March and again in May. Of the 30 bills the board considered in 2023, six became law, 13 are now two-year bills and three were vetoed after passing the legislature. The remaining eight did not make it through the session. One bill SB 552 requires board action to change our position at the January meeting.

Plastic Pollution Prevention, Circular Economy Solutions and Upstream Waste Prevention, including Extended Producer Responsibility

[AB 2 \(Ward\) Solar Photovoltaic Module Recycling](#)

This bill implements a multi-pronged strategy for establishing a solar panel collection and recycling program. As currently drafted, the bill would create separate programs for panels that are consumer-owned and panels that are not consumer-owned. Panels that are owned by consumers of all varieties would be managed by California's Covered Electronic Waste

Recycling Program. Panels that are not consumer-owned would be managed by their owners. These panels typically fall into two categories: 1) panels that are owned by manufacturers and leased to a consumer, business, public agency, or utility, and 2) panels that are owned by a utility or related entity. Owners of these panels would be required to develop a plan, somewhat like that typical of an EPR program, that would outline how they would meet their obligation to properly manage and recycle their panels. The bill is still in development and the panel manufacturers and owners have substantial political leverage over the direction of the bill.

The bill is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee where it was made a **two-year bill**. It will be eligible for consideration in 2024.

Agency Position: Watch

Support: California Product Stewardship Council (sponsor), Californians Against Waste, California Solar & Storage Association.

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

[AB 1238 \(Ward\) Hazardous waste: solar panels](#)

This bill requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to develop alternative management standards (AMS) for the management of photovoltaic (PV) modules. The bill specifies that the AMS should 1) Promote the safe collection, reuse, and recycling of PV modules; 2) Ensure that the AMS do not pose a significant potential hazard to human health and safety or the environment; 3) Provide flexibility and administrative convenience for persons collecting and recycling PV modules; 4) Seek to streamline the process for persons collecting and recycling PV modules; 5) Allow for the safe landfilling of PV modules, if there are no recycling or reuse option; 6) Allow a person, when following the AMS, to collect, reuse, or recycle PV modules without a hazardous waste permit. This bill is connected to AB 2 by the same bill author.

AB 1238 is currently in the Senate Environmental Quality Committee and is a **two-year bill**. It is eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Product Stewardship Council, Californians Against Waste, RethinkWaste

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

[AB 863 \(Aguilar-Curry\) Carpet Extended Producer Responsibility](#)

This bill would increase accountability in California's existing carpet EPR program. Specifically, it would increase penalties for non-compliance on the low end from \$5,000 to \$10,000, and on the high end from \$10,000 to \$50,000. The bill will also make a stewardship organization ineligible to serve as an agent on behalf of manufacturers if they violate California's carpet stewardship law three times. The sponsor of this bill is working with the author and stakeholders on a proposal that would expand the scope of this bill to include a

more substantial restructuring of the existing law governing California's carpet EPR program.

The bill is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee where it was voluntarily made a **two-year bill** by the author. The bill is being negotiated by stakeholders at this time and will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: National Stewardship Action Council (sponsor), California Product Stewardship Council, RethinkWaste, Californians Against Waste

Opposition: The Carpet and Rug Institute

Cost to local governments: None

AB 1290 (Rivas, L.) Product safety: plastic packaging

This bill would, beginning Jan. 1, 2026, prohibit the manufacture or sale of PET bottles, rigid plastic packaging containers containing PVCD, and plastic packaging that contains a variety of problematic substances. The bill would authorize a city, county, or the state to impose civil liability in the amount of \$500 for the first violation, \$1,000 for the second violation, and \$2,000 for any subsequent violations.

This bill is currently on the Assembly inactive file and as a **two-year bill**, could be eligible for consideration again in 2024. However, the bill would need to pass off the Assembly Floor by 1/31/2024 if it is to stay alive.

Agency position: Support

Supporters: California Product Stewardship Council, Californians Against Waste, CALPIRG, NRDC, Heal the Bay, National Stewardship Action Council.

Opposition: American Chemistry Council, California Chamber of Commerce, Dart Container Corporation

Cost to local governments: None

AB 1347 (Ting) Solid waste: paper waste: proofs of purchase.

This bill bans the use of the chemicals bisphenol A (BPA) and bisphenol S (BPS) in printed receipts. In addition, it prohibits businesses from printing any information on a receipt, other than information strictly related to the transaction. In addition, it requires businesses to offer all customers a choice between an email, text, or paper receipt, or no receipt at all.

AB 1347 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee and is **dead**. There is a chance it will be reintroduced in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: Californians Against Waste, California Product Stewardship Council, RethinkWaste

Opposition: California Chamber of Commerce, California Retailers Association, Costco Wholesale, California Restaurant Association

Cost to local governments: None

AB 1659 (Gabriel) Sale of small electronic devices: charging devices.

This bill creates a single charging hardware standard for small electronic devices, such as cell phones. The bill requires small electronic devices, such as smartphones, tablets, and laptops, manufactured after 2025 to be universally chargeable with a USB Type-C cable.

AB 1659 is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee where it was held as a **two-year bill** and will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Product Stewardship Council, Californians Against Waste, Climate Equity Policy Center, Natural Resources Defense Council

Opposition: Consumer Technology Association

Cost to local governments: None

SB 271 (Dodd) Powered wheelchairs: repair

This bill requires an original manufacturer of a powered wheelchair to provide a wheelchair owner or independent repair provider with the necessary parts and equipment used to inspect, diagnose, maintain, and repair the wheelchair. The bill also prohibits the Department of Health Care Services from requiring prior authorization for the repair of a powered wheelchair under Medi-Cal or a treatment authorization request.

This bill was passed by the legislature and sent to Governor Newsom. Unfortunately, the governor **vetoed** the bill because of related fraud issues in the Medi-Cal program.

Agency position: Support

Support: Californians Against Waste, Consumer Reports, iFixit, California Foundation for Independent Living Centers

Opposition: California Association of Medical Product Suppliers, National Coalition for Assistive & Rehab Technology

Cost to local governments: None

SB 244 (Eggman) Right to Repair Act

Requires manufacturers of consumer electronics to provide replacement parts, diagnostic information, and service literature to consumers and third-party repair businesses. These requirements would apply for three years after the date a product model or type was manufactured for products that have a wholesale price of \$50 to \$99.99 and seven years for products of \$100 or more, regardless of whether the specified time exceeds the warranty period for the product.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: Californians Against Waste, CalPIRG, iFixit, Natural Resources Defense Council

Opposition: California Chamber of Commerce, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, Internet Coalition, TechNet

Cost to local governments: None

[SB 353 \(Dodd\) Beverage containers: recycling.](#)

This bill would expand the Beverage Container Recycling Program (BCRP) to include all sizes of containers of 100% juice. It would also authorize CalRecycle to adjust certain recycling payments based on either the applicable preceding 12-month or 3-month average scrap value, whichever is lower.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: Californians Against Waste, Berkeley Recycling/Community Conservation Centers INC, Republic Services

Opposition: None listed

Cost to local governments: None

[SB 552 \(Newman\) No longer addresses Solid waste: single-use foodware and single-use food packaging.](#)

This bill was completely changed to address public safety for pools and spas, and so we would like to remove our WATCH position on it.

Agency position: Recommend changing to No Position

Remove from our list

[SB 560 \(Laird\) Solid Waste: Gas Cylinders: stewardship program](#)

This bill would establish an extended producer responsibility (EPR) program for various types of compressed gas cylinders. The bill will require manufacturers to develop, fund, and implement a program to collect and properly recycle these cylinders. The bill will be amended with language from CalRecycle to better describe the EPR program, to be consistent with other EPR efforts as well.

SB 560 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee and is **dead**. There is a chance it will be reintroduced in 2024.

Agency position: Support if Amended

Support: California Product Stewardship Council (sponsor), Californians Against Waste

Opposition: Worthington (gas cylinder company)

Cost to local governments: None

[SB 615 \(Allen\) Vehicle traction batteries](#)

This bill would require vehicle traction batteries (for EVs) to be recovered and reused, repurposed, or remanufactured and recycled at the end of their useful life in an EPR program. This bill would also require vehicle manufacturers, dealers, dismantlers, repair dealers, or other secondary users to be responsible for ensuring responsible end-of-life management of vehicle traction batteries. This bill continues to be negotiated by stakeholders that include recyclers, manufacturers, local governments, and environmental

organizations. Discussions are being guided by a report that was issued on the subject by a legislatively mandated working group at CalEPA.

SB 615 is a **two-year bill** and is currently in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee. This bill will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support if amended for more robust end-of-life management

Support: California Product Stewardship Council, Union of Concerned Scientists, Californians Against Waste, National Stewardship Action Council

Opposition: None at this time but some manufacturers may oppose as details get finalized

Cost to local governments: None

SB 665 (Allen) Plastic waste: single use plastics alternatives: working group

This bill required the California Environmental Protection Agency to establish a working group to establish a policy framework for evaluating novel materials that are alternatives to plastics for single-use products. The working group would be tasked with developing a set of recommendations, including standards for certifying novel materials.

SB 665 was passed by the legislature but **vetoed** by Governor Newsom. In his veto message the governor pointed to implementation of SB 54 as an alternative to this bill.

Agency position: Support

Support: National Stewardship Action Council, Republic Services, California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, Rural County Representatives of California, RethinkWaste

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

SB 676 (Allen) Local ordinances and regulations: drought-tolerant landscaping

Specifies that cities or counties may not prohibit the installation of drought-tolerant landscaping using living plant material on residential property, and repeals existing provisions regarding the ability of cities or counties to prohibit or restrict the installation of synthetic grass or artificial turf on residential property.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Produce Stewardship Council, National Stewardship Action Council, NRDC, San Francisco Baykeeper, Environmental Working Group

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

SB 707 (Newman) Textile Recovery Act of 2023

This bill establishes an extended producer responsibility program for apparel and a limited scope of household textile articles such as bedding, curtains, and towels. Under the bill producers will be required to design, fund, and implement a takeback and recycling program that also contains strong repair and reuse elements. The bill also requires internalized funding that includes modulation of fees based on recyclability of products. Stakeholders are working to achieve consensus to the maximum extent possible, and there are likely to be significant amendments in 2024.

SB 707 is currently a **two-year bill** because the author and sponsor held the bill to allow for additional collaboration. The bill is currently in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Produce Stewardship Council (sponsor), Rethink Waste, Rural County Representatives of California, National Stewardship Action Council, Zero Waste Sonoma
Opposition: California Chamber of Commerce, California Retailers Association, American Apparel and Footwear Association, California Manufacturers & Technology Association
Cost to local governments: None

Brown Act

[AB 557 \(Hart\) Open meetings: local agencies: teleconferences](#)

This bill eliminates the sunset date on provisions of law allowing local agencies to use teleconferencing without complying with specified Ralph. M Brown Act (Brown Act) requirements during a proclaimed state of emergency.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Special Districts Association, League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, California School Boards Association
Opposition: None listed
Cost to local governments: None

Decarbonization and Electrification, Low-Carbon Buildings

[AB 43 \(Holden\) GHG emissions: building materials: embodied carbon trading system](#)

This bill authorizes the Air Resources Board (ARB) to create an Embodied Carbon Trading System (Trading System) to implement provisions of AB 2446 (Holden), Chapter 352, Statutes of 2022, and makes various revisions to the framework for measuring and reducing the carbon intensity of building materials used in the construction of new buildings created by AB 2446.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: US Green Building Council, Sierra Club

Opposition: American Council of Engineering Companies of California, California Cement Manufacturers Environmental Coalition

Cost to local governments: None

AB 57 (Kalra) California Pocket Forest Initiative

This bill would establish the California Pocket Forest Initiative in CalFire until January 1, 2031. Specifically, the bill would authorize CalFire to offer grants to cities, counties, districts, nonprofit organizations, the California Conservation Corps or certified community corps, public universities, public community colleges, and public schools to establish pocket forests on public lands to test and demonstrate the applicability and effectiveness of the Miyawaki method in California.

The legislature passed AB 57, but Governor Newsom **vetoed** the measure because of concerns about the state's fiscal condition.

Agency position: Support

Support: Sierra Club California, California Urban Forests Council, Climate Action California.

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

AB 529 (Gabriel) Adaptive Reuse Projects

Requires the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to convene a working group regarding adaptive reuse residential projects, including identifying and recommending amendments to state building standards and makes other changes to state law related to adaptive reuse projects.

This bill was passed by the legislature and **signed** by Governor Newsom.

Agency position: Support

Support: California YIMBY, California Apartment Association, Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California (sponsor)

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

AB 593 (Haney) Carbon emission reduction strategy: building sector

This bill requires the California Energy Commission to identify an emission reduction strategy for the building sector to support the achievement of the state's 2045 greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals.

The Department of Finance tagged this bill with a \$5.8 million one-time cost in 2023-2024, but also noted ongoing costs to the PUC of approximately \$800,000. The bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee as a **two-year bill**, likely because of the cost.

Agency position: Support

Support: Building Decarbonization Coalition, Climate Action California, SPUR
Opposition: California Association of Realtors
Cost to local governments: None

SB 511 (Blakespear) Greenhouse gas emissions inventories

This bill requires ARB, before January 1, 2028, to develop, and publish on its internet website, a report on GHG emissions inventories for the calendar year 2025 for each city, county, or city and county that requests inclusion in the report. The bill requires the report to include electricity and natural gas usage data disaggregated by the residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural sectors for each emissions inventory.

This bill was held in Assembly Appropriations Committee and is **dead for the remainder of the two-year legislative session.**

Agency position: Support

Support: California State Association of Counties, City of Alameda, City of Berkeley, City of Dublin, City of Fremont, City of Hayward, City of Oakland, League of California Cities
Opposition: None
Cost to local governments: None

SB 527 (Min) Neighborhood Decarbonization Program

This bill would, until January 1, 2030, require the California Public Utilities Commission, in consultation with gas corporations, to develop and supervise the administration of the Neighborhood Decarbonization Program to cease providing gas utility service in an area within its service territory if the CPUC determines that adequate substitute energy service is reasonably available to support the energy end use of affected gas customers.

SB 527 was held in Senate Appropriations Committee and is **dead for the remainder of the two-year legislative session.**

Agency position: Support

Support: City of Berkeley Office of Energy and Sustainable Development, Climate Action Campaign, SPUR, Efficiency First CA, Emerald Cities Bay Area, NRDC, Rising Sun, Sierra Club
Opposition: Rural County Representatives of California
Cost to local governments: According to the opposition, "this may shift costs from gas utilities to customers, and do not believe it is sufficient that this bill requires the CPUC to ensure that rates for substitution of service for low-income customers are just, adequate, and reasonable."

SB 682 (Skinner) Low-carbon cement and low-carbon concrete.

This bill would make it the policy of the state to purchase or specify at least 10 percent of cement and concrete meet or exceeds a specified benchmark for low-carbon cement by 2030 and to exclude from that 10 percent the purchase of all fossil-based supplementary cementitious materials by 2035. The bill would allow, for purposes of meeting the state policy described above, the volume of low-carbon cement or low-carbon concrete products agreed to be supplied under a model advance procurement agreement, but that was not

actually supplied, to be counted for up to 5 years or until the state agency is able to obtain the missing materials, as specified.

This bill passed through both policy committees but was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee and is **dead for the remainder of the two-year legislative session**.

Agency position: Support

Support: Decarbonized Cement & Concrete Working Group, Institute for Carbon Management

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

Organics/Composting

[AB 660 \(Irwin\) Food and beverage products: labeling and sell by dates](#)

This bill would require on and after January 1, 2025, a food manufacturer, processor, or retailer responsible for the labeling of food items for human consumption to use “Best if Used by” to indicate quality, and “Use by” to indicate safety of a product, and prohibits the use of “Sell by” in order to prevent food that is still good from being unnecessarily thrown away.

AB 660 is currently a **two-year bill** and is in the Senate Agriculture Committee. The bill will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: Californians Against Waste (Co-sponsor), California Product Stewardship Council, National Stewardship Action Council, RethinkWaste, NRDC (Co-sponsor)

Opposition: California Farm Bureau Federation, Association of California Egg Farmers, California Grocers Association, Pacific Egg and Poultry Association

Cost to local governments: None

[AB 1567 \(Garcia\) Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparation, Flood Protection, Extreme Heat Mitigation, and Workforce Development Bond Act of 2024](#)

This bill enacts the Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparation, Flood Protection, Extreme Heat Mitigation, and Workforce Development Bond Act of 2024. Specifically, this bill, upon approval by the voters in the March 5, 2024, statewide primary election, enacts the bond to authorize the issuance of \$15 billion in general obligation (GO) bonds to finance projects including: (1) \$1.6 billion for the protection of California’s wildlife, biodiversity, and fisheries from climate risks. (2) \$820 million for protecting farms, ranches, and working lands from the impacts of climate change. (3) \$1.8 billion for regional climate resilience projects that address multiple risks.

This bond measure did not pass in 2023 and will be eligible for consideration again in 2024. The bill is currently in the Senate Natural Resources Committee as a **two-year bill**.

Agency position: Support if amended to include \$200 million towards organic waste infrastructure

Support: The Nature Conservancy, California Urban Forests Council, Placer Land Trust

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: None

Building a Healthy Food System

AB 406 (Connolly) Agriculture: Healthy Soils Program: Organic Production

This bill expands the Healthy Soils Program (HSP) to include the funding of organic farming projects and provide grant to incentivize organic production, including transition to organic projects as specified. Specifically, this bill allows CDFA to expand demonstration projects and provide grants to incentivize organic production.

AB 406 is a **two-year bill** because it was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee. It will be eligible for consideration again in 2024 but will need to pass out of the Assembly by January 31.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Certified Organic Farmers, Center for Food Safety

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: No

AB 408 (Wilson) Climate-resilient Farms, Sustainable Healthy Food Access, and Farmworker Protection Bond Act of 2024

This bill enacts the \$3.65 billion Climate-Resilient Farms, Sustainable Healthy Food Access, and Farmworker Protection Bond Act of 2024. Specifically, this bill, upon approval by the voters in the November 5, 2024 statewide general election, enacts the bond to authorize the issuance of \$3.65 billion in general obligation (GO) bonds to finance projects in the following categories: (1) \$1.25 billion for improving agricultural resilience and advancing sustainable agriculture; (2) \$750 million for protecting the health and well-being of California's farmworkers; (3) \$750 million for sustainable healthy food access and nutrition security; (4) \$915 million for strengthening regional food economies.

AB 408 is a **two-year bill** and is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee. It will be eligible for consideration again in 2024.

Agency position: Support

Support: California Compost Coalition, Californians Against Waste, Ecology Center

Opposition: None

Cost to local governments: No