

Sierra Club Santa Cruz Group Executive Committee

Meeting Minutes, October 10, 2018

6:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Branciforte Small Schools

840 North Branciforte Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Called to Order 6:35

Attending: Steve Bakaley, Keresha Durham, Gillian Greensite, Mark Mesti-Miller, Jane Mio, Rachel O'Malley, Ron Pomerantz, Erica Stanojevic
Jack Nelson, David Bezanson

Online Votes

Vote to send letter to Regional Transportation Commission passed on September 23 regarding the North Coast segment of the Rail Trail Draft EIR

Welcome & Introductions...5 mins

Approval of minutes

Rachel moves to approve minutes with changes suggested by email; Steve seconds, unanimous

Treasurer's Report (Gillian)

Solid checking and savings

Cost for fundraising \$254; received \$2,516; 44 donors; 10 gave more than \$100

Steve volunteers to get info from Trician for the next few months while Mary is unable

Executive Committee

Nominations - Gillian passes it over to a group discussion

Rick extended deadline for stating intent

A need to convene a meeting for the nominations committee and take care of deadlines

A comment that excom members should be talking to others who may potentially interested

A comment that info is needed - some people are known who may get involved once info is known

A comment that an email blast needs to go out to all members inviting them to state intention to run

A comment that an email blast needs to go through compliance, etc., and may take several days, and may not even go out before the deadline is met

A comment five candidates for four slots is ok

An idea to get something out onto Facebook and website

An option to extend the deadline even a little longer than the 17th so that an email blast can go out

Chapter has a quorum on how many emails go out each month; at least one is going out for Ventana; a concern that we may also want an email blast regarding our endorsements and so we need to consider this

A concern that if there are too many candidates then it is a heavy burden on nomination committee

A thought that the people who are the strongest candidates may already be known to us; on committees already

Steve will work on getting this going

Loma Prieta Visit - November 12th

A few of us are ready to attend the meeting

Donation to Branciforte Small Schools

Keresha motions to give \$20 to general fund of the school per month; Mark seconds; unanimous

Discussion about location itself - more convenient for those in southern parts of the county

Events and Outreach Committee

Note about an upcoming hike

Resolution re no red meat at SC Group events - David Bezanson

Introducing the statement because he believes it fits with our statement of "Explore, Enjoy and Protect" our planet

Article states that plant based diet is more environmentally friendly than other diets

A statement that red meat has the highest environmental impact than any food group

Resolution states that at Sierra Club events that no red meat will be served

Would encourage people to switch to a more plant based diet

Support for the plant based foods at events; a comment that the resolution as written should specify that factory meats are very different from biodynamic farms and so resolution should be reworded

Comments about supporting a plant based foods at events

Comment that it may not actually be very different from current practice

A comment that supports encouraging not having red meat however not prohibiting it

A comment that cheese and crackers are something that many of our members enjoy at events and that it is cheap and easy

A comment that this would be different at the chapter level than at our group level

A difference if meal is ordered by group; if individuals order it then should have an option

A comment that our only fundraiser a few years ago had no meat option

A negotiation that it specifies "the vast majority of meat production" rather than all meat production

Keresha moves to approve with suggested changes; Rachel seconds; motion passes with 8 in favor and Steve objecting

Political Committee

Threshold vote for measures

Candidates need $\frac{2}{3}$; for ballot measures is unstated

Ron proposes that perhaps we need to align it with the candidates $\frac{2}{3}$ threshold; or perhaps a 60%

A simple majority may not be as strong

Do we want this to apply to Measure M/L votes?

Not proposing a full bylaws change as that is a whole process; this would be for internal policy

A comment that having a $\frac{2}{3}$ support is a good idea as a simple majority may not cut it; some issues are very contentious

A comment that it would be a good idea to have it in the bylaws so it can be referred to in the future; however not for tonight

If we align ballot measures with the candidates then the political committee would also need to recommend it

More support for $\frac{2}{3}$; a comment that consensus is even better

A comment that it would be odd to change policy and then go back to stuff we've already voted on

A question about why this hasn't come up before

Steve motions that support for measures will align with candidates rules; Mark seconds; unanimous

So measures will need to align with candidate rules - will need political committee endorsement and excom endorsement

Measure M - a simple majority so we will remain neutral

Measure L - have been no votes by political committee or excom - hasn't yet been discussed by political committee

•

Steve moves to retroactively apply the policy above to the 2018 election; Jane seconds

- A discussion about why Measure L wasn't considered in political committee - there was some internal discussion about it and it wasn't fully discussed; it later turned out to be a bigger issue
- A comment that a person will vote no because a need for it isn't seen; that Measure L hasn't been considered by our political committee
- A comment that this second motion would cover L and M - M was voted on by a simple majority not $\frac{2}{3}$

Motion passes with most in favor and Keresha voting no

A discussion about having a discussion about Measure L at our next meeting - an extra meeting regarding discussing the rail trail

- A comment that it may take too much time at our meeting and would need publicizing to our meeting

- A comment that if the political committee convenes and makes a recommendation then we should consider it at our next meeting
- An observation that the $\frac{2}{3}$ rule means that it would be $\frac{2}{3}$ of the whole committee body, not just $\frac{2}{3}$ of those present at a meeting. With 7 members of the political committee it would mean 5 votes
- A straw poll about voting no or not
- A comment that it may be a lot of work and maybe not a huge impact
- A comment that it can be impactful - some people do look us up before voting so what we recommend is important

Promoting endorsed candidates and issues

- In addition to web presence and email blast, a PDF that is printable that people can take to polls
- A comment that a seal can be used when sent to our members - not sure that it can be used at public events
- If has to go through compliance, they can say take off a seal or not
- A comment that the flyer would be more effective if shorter
- Some people may want more info - can have a “see background below” or something
- The layout may be more effective in another format
- Gets very sticky if we spend money to support candidates
- Steve will get copy of flyer up on website

Will postpone vehicle idling - maybe can bring to conservation committee

Conservation committee

Pogonip Creek Recreational Trail - 8:30 Friday to walk through trail; meeting on site - Gillian will send map to conservation committee

Upcoming developments - no deadlines mentioned; still will be upcoming

Affordable housing - one piece of property to city; city will then build 60 - 100 affordable housing units

- A note that ceilings on affordable housing need only be 8 feet; for regular units it is 10 feet

UCSC expansion - deadline for comments is Nov. 1st

Green City commission - may work towards creating one within city

County Drown policy - Ron will share ACLU's response when he gets it

Tar plant - Would be good to get in contact with these groups

Valley Women's Club/PG&E tree removal - the environmental impact of their cutting is incredible and there is no EIR out because is a voluntary program; PG&E has internally conducted an environmental review and is refusing to release it

Are both releasing carbon and also reducing the further sequestering of carbon

No discussion about replacing the trees

Impacts community as well

VWC has contacted state assembly member Mark Stone and supervisor Bruce McPherson regarding these issues

- Asking that the following actions take place:
 - A public meeting with PG&E
 - A request to stop intimidating people saying they have to cut trees
 - That PG&E has insulated wires or grounded - outdated wires
 - Southern California Edison Company has changed their policies and are having successful results; we would like similar policies
 - PG&E proposes cutting a million trees

Rachel moves that we support the VWC in this campaign; Gillian seconds; unanimous

This would be to give our time - write letters, inform our members;

Transportation Committee

Committee roster update - one person to drop who isn't able to be involved, and one person who wants to be involved. Dropping Jim Danaher and adding Nina Donna

Mark makes a motion to change membership; Steve seconded; unanimous

Unified Corridor Study Workshop - Thursday morning 8:30 - public meeting - where commissioners will likely discuss

Monday night at Live Oak Elementary - public input meeting - potentially going to be with stations and such rather than a sitting audience thing

Tuesday meeting as well in Watsonville council chambers (?) someone please confirm that

Rail trail letters follow up - mention that Transportation committee wants to be involved in issue and in any correspondence; a note that there hasn't been a response from the city regarding our letters

An idea to have a letter written by us that perhaps encompasses different points of view

Current plan is for RTC staff to bring forth a recommendation at Nov. 15th meeting; all is coming up quickly

A concern is that the documents basically say that environmental concerns will be addressed later

A hope that the Sierra Club could produce a letter that would have some positive impacts and potentially presents multiple views

A mention about the document that discusses impacts of rail on the environment - will be forwarded

Environmentally sensitive areas - like a black box - how did they come up with numbers?
Economic development - a concern about how much development could be spurred

Keresha will post Monday event on meetup

Misc. transportation updates - a lot coming up

Adjourned at 8:44

Next Meeting: November 14th