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It's not surprising that Patagonia, known for its long-term deep commitment to sustainable business practices, rushed to register as a California "Benefit Corporation," a new class of corporation for businesses whose mission is to operate in an environmentally and socially responsible manner.

Last year, California created this new corporate charter, which went into effect January 1. The Benefit Corporation class legally requires a corporation to pursue a positive impact on society and the environment, broadening its duty to go beyond maximizing shareholder value - profits.

As opposed to traditional corporations which, under current law are required to prioritize shareholder financial interests above those of workers, communities, and the environment, Benefit corporations are legally required to:

1) have a corporate mission to create a material positive impact on society and the environment;

2) redefine fiduciary duty to require consideration of the interests of workers, community and the environment;

3) publicly report annually on its overall social and environmental performance using a comprehensive, credible, independent, and transparent third party standard.

**Why is a Benefit Corp Needed?** Because current law demands that corporations prioritize profits over social and environmental concerns, shareholders can sue a corporation for spending money to address climate change, for example, if that cuts into...
a company's profits. But if a corporation legally pursues Benefit Corp status, it is required to pursue those missions.

"Patagonia is trying to build a company that could last 100 years," says founder Yvon Chouinard. "Benefit corporation legislation creates the legal framework to enable mission-driven companies like Patagonia to stay mission-driven through succession, capital raises, and even changes in ownership, by institutionalizing the values, culture, processes, and high standards put in place by founding entrepreneurs."


"This is California at its best, showing there is a way to create jobs and grow the economy while raising the bar for social and environmental responsibility," says Assemblymember Jared Huffman (D-San Rafael), who sponsored the law. "With this new law, we are attracting new socially-conscious companies, investors and consumers - we're sending a strong message that California is open for this emerging form of business."

Well known green groups supported the California's legislation (AB 361), such as the US Green Building Council and GreenSeal, and the bill was sponsored by the American Sustainable Business Council, New Voice of Business, and B Lab. A citizen advocacy campaign was led by Care2.com.

**First Day Registered Companies:**
Other companies that registered on the first day: DopeHut, Dharma Merchant Services, Give Something Back Office Supplies, Green Retirement Plans, Opticos Designs, Patagonia, Rimon Law, Scientific Certification Systems, Solar Works, Sun Light & Power, Terrassure Sustainable Land & Resource Development, Thinkshift Communications
Website: [www.benefitcorp.net](http://www.benefitcorp.net)

Patagonia Pioneers Sustainability Legal Status
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Outdoor clothing company Patagonia has become the first company in California to elect to be a "benefit corporation." The legal...
The Farm Bill is a Climate Bill
by Don Carr

As a possible 2012 farm bill looms, the agriculture committee leaders and their industrial agriculture lobby remoras are sorting through the smoking ruins of the 2011 secret farm bill process. They hope to come up with a unified position from which to begin deliberations on a new farm bill. Sadly, one thing they’ve all agreed to cut is 7 million acres from the Conservation Reserve Program. The CRP is administered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture and pays farmers to keep highly erodible land out of production.

While many recognize that putting land into conservation programs leads to cleaner water, healthier soil and robust wildlife habitat, few realize that CRP land also plays a major role in fighting climate change. According to the USDA, one acre of protected land sequesters 1.66 metric tons of carbon every year, carbon that would otherwise end up in the atmosphere. The 7 million acres about to be cut from the Conservation Reserve Program have been putting 11.6 million metric tons of carbon into the soil every year. The Environmental Protection Agency says that this amount of carbon is equivalent to the annual emissions of 2 million passenger vehicles. All that stored carbon will be sent back into the atmosphere if those 7 million acres are plowed under to plant more industrial-scale corn for ethanol and livestock feed.

A recent poll conducted by Iowa State University Extension and Outreach found that 68 percent of Iowa farmers surveyed say climate change is occurring; many of those same farmers likely experienced the devastating weather events of the past few years. So you’d think that there would be a clarion call from agriculture to have the federal government do whatever it takes to protect farmers against the ravages of climate change. Instead, taxpayers have to pick up the rapidly increasing insurance tab after climate-related disaster strikes.

And had industrial agriculture lobbyists not help scuttle climate change legislation, farmers would be collecting payments today via carbon credits for their conservation practices.
The main impetus for cutting conservation acres is the mad rush to plant every available inch of ground—whether it’s highly erodible land or a golf course—to capture high prices for corn propped up by Washington’s misguided corn ethanol mandate. Speaking of corn ethanol, the industry and its lobbyists should be gravely concerned about the carbon emissions released by plowing under Conservation Reserve Program land. Political support for corn ethanol—which has been slipping—depends in part on whether it is better for the environment than gasoline. Most believe that corn ethanol currently is no better, emissions-wise, than gasoline.

America’s water, soil and wildlife habitat have never been under greater assault from the ravages of modern industrial agriculture. And since industrial crop production is exempt from most federal regulations, farm bill conservation programs like the Conservation Reserve Program are often our only line of defense against erosion and water contamination by toxic agrichemicals. Conservation is the rare investment in agriculture that pays every taxpayer a positive return.

Meanwhile lavish government payments to highly profitable mega-farms continue. Astonishingly in this tea-flavored budget environment, farm state lawmakers and agribiz lobbyists are working toward newer programs that could increase taxpayers’ burden. Farm income has been white-hot for a decade and shows no sign of diminishing. But if you quiz industrial ag lobbyists about why agribusiness subsidies should be spared the budget axe while conservation gets whacked, they’ll tell you farm bills are written for the bad times, not for the good times.

Well, it’s pretty obvious these are the bad times for conservation.

The conservation community needs to fight back hard against these proposed cuts. EWG president Ken Cook said it best:

No conservationist worthy of the name should accept legislation that cuts another $6-plus billion from the farm bill’s programs to protect land, water and wildlife. Nor should conservationists accept subsidy programs that give incentives to farmers who drain wetlands, plow up prairies or recklessly increase already severe runoff pollution from farm fields.

And if the climate change community can engage the debate on the farm bill with the same intensity it used to postpone the Keystone Pipeline, we may just have a conservation battle we can win this time around.
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