

It's undoubtedly dangerous to try to read too much into short media quotes. But Mary Nichols, the chair of the California Air Resources Board, is in a better position than most to judge (and to influence) the political winds on the future of the State's cap-and-trade program. Here's her latest public statement on the issue, made during an appearance last week at a climate conference in LA (and reported by KPCC [here](#), with audio, and also by the LA Times [here](#)):

"We have to be open to the possibility that there could be other ways to get reductions," she said. "Certainly the current governor deserves a chance to put his mark on the program and decide if he wants it to change in some ways."

To me, this seems a bit more tepid than her usual full-steam-ahead stance on cap and trade. Sean [has speculated](#) (without particular grounds, he admits) that Governor Brown may reopen the question of whether to rely on a cap-and-trade program to help achieve the greenhouse gas reductions required by California's Global Warming Solutions Act, AB 32. Already, ARB's plan for achieving those cuts does about 80% of the job through measures other than cap and trade, so the change would be very significant but would not set the State back to square one. We've covered [elsewhere on this blog](#) the debate about why EJ advocates are pushing for an authentic reconsideration of the cap-and-trade question. Sounds like they may actually be getting one?