1) Welcome
2) Announcements
   ○ Gavin Newsom event upcoming May 29
   ○ PG&E failed to adhere to a request from the city regarding asking about how much money it would cost to reroute pipes
     ■ A concern that there was some people within the city who want a sidewalk - on Washington Street - instead of the trees
     ■ Each tree is supposed to be evaluated and that hasn’t happened
     ■ Gillian plans to appeal
3) Additions/Deletions to agenda
4) Bird Safety Design update (Jane)
   ○ Got response from Clara Stanger - time to set up a meeting
5) Streambed Alteration Agreement (Jane)
   ○ Got response from Mark Dettle - they are working on some changes in the agreement and will consider integrating some of the information and would like to set up a meeting.
     ■ The changes the city is proposing would reduce their costs and their goals are different than ours
   ○ A suggestion to ask Fish and Wildlife, or a more local fishery person, for a meeting as well
   ○ They do have some new regulations from Fish and Wildlife and they are working to integrate those
     ■ They may have to chip and remove the cuttings - which may not actually help with biological stability
6) Rail Contract - Gillian
   ○ Due to be signed on 14th; no executive committee meeting this month
   ○ Freight would not have a limit; would be a “common carrier” line
   ○ Uses would be for Big Creek Lumber, soybean oil, glycerin, some propane, etc.
   ○ A concern about the rail car storage piece - it appears to be left over from a previous contract and perhaps should be deleted
   ○ “Common Carrier” - that anyone can run a train on the line and deliver it to any place; there aren’t restrictions of movement of who can use the line; kinda like cars on a freeway
   ○ Is a typical language for short line contracts
   ○ 10 year contract; with a hinge point regarding the unified corridor
   ○ “Rail Banking” - presumably allows easements to stay in place - however Supreme Court has since said that property rights supercede this
     ■ Cannot rail bank a corridor that hasn’t been abandoned
○ A note that there is not a lot of freight expected to be on the rail line
○ A concern about toxic materials may be transported
   ■ A note that there would have to be a functioning plant locally that would process whatever materials would be coming in - since we don’t have such facilities then it is unlikely toxic materials would be transported
   ■ Agriculture chemicals would have a market and may be transported
      ● A note that if those chemicals are transported by truck accidents are more likely
○ A right to build facilities for storage - maybe at the old Wrigley plant
○ A question about why passenger rail isn’t discussed when the current debate is really about passenger rail
○ A note that the market would control the amount of freight intrinsically rather than limits on the contract
○ A thought that perhaps the storage facilities piece regarding the Wrigley plant may also be a leftover from a previous contract
   ■ Maybe can have this piece (which may involve an inspection area) deleted
○ Phase 2 - have to present a plan for passengers - for excursion trains like the Christmas trains; sunset dinner trains
○ CTC has accepted that excursion trains will hold as a placeholder for real passenger transit to be developed
○ Tressels - have speed requirements like no more than 10 - 15 miles an hour for certain ones as they are not currently built for more than that
   ■ They will be rebuilt if there is real passenger rail service
○ A concern that this could spur development near the rail line for materials transit and passenger rail would be less important
○ A question about a proposal to exempt lands adjacent to rail lines to be exempt from CEQA
○ No real information about how the environment - namely vegetation - will be treated
○ A comment that it would be good to see a business plan
○ Some property is already bought or in the process of purchasing property, so it seems as though the company is counting on this contract
   ■ A belief that the business plan was shared with the RTC in closed session
○ A transloading facility is planned for Watsonville - to put freight from trucks onto the trains
○ No signage or fencing required by rail company
○ The easement is tied to rail - the easement will go away if the rail goes away
   ■ If abandon the rail line, then land may go back to previous property owners
○ 69% of rail line is easement; 31% is fee-simple (RTC owns the land)
○ In San Jose - light rail with no fence; it works well. Is there a way to do the rail/trail without fence?
   ■ A concern that the freight would require fencing
Fencing proposed may be different along different lengths of the track as rail is developed; wildlife corridors in some areas and not others? A concern

- Prop 116 funds require that the line remain active
- Potential letter issues:
  - Vegetation on contract - treated well, no herbicides
  - Wildlife under crossings or other crossings should be developed
    - When used they need to be developed; if it is unused wildlife deaths don’t occur
  - No storage of cars on rail line
  - Delete inspection pit/ construction of buildings on Wrigley
  - If there would be fencing, then wildlife fragmentation would be an issue - a question about the trail/rail issue......
  - Materials transported may not be environmentally responsible - biofuels and ag chemicals
- We would like a draft letter written with transportation committee - Erica will forward notes to Rick and Jack as well
  - A time limit - write draft by 31st
  - Aim for a goal of the 5th to have the letter fully written and a vote ready on so it can be included in packet; 7th delivered to RTC

7) Group direction: including, not limited to, below potential ideas
   - Dark Skies
     - May be good to communicate with Take Back Santa Cruz - educate them about safety
     - Sports fields/ parks seem to be biggest lights; they may be in opposition
     - And car dealerships/driving range/ UCSC lights that shine onto Pogonip
     - Gillian will ask - what role could Sierra Club play
     - Have events group put on something
     - Gillian and Erica will
   - Limiting vineyard expansion (Patricia)
     - People in valley are concerned - vegetation is disappearing because water is being used; and pesticides
     - Valley women’s club may be working on this as well
     - Patricia will contact VWC and ask how we can support
   - Balloon ban (Patricia)
   - Preventing waste - a how to about using reusable containers at bulk sections in grocery stores (Erica)
   - A thought that we would maybe it would be good to work on large scale plastic use issues - how to re-educate people to not use plastic in general
   - Urban greenspaces
     - Urban tree canopy
     - Parks
     - Vegetation throughout town
- A thought that observing plans may be higher level
- A need to be aware of who the staff is and how to work with them
- Are there policy level issues we should be involved in
  - No heritage tree ordinance in the county coastal zone

Leslie O’Malley - works at a recycling facility - has some resources regarding and may be a good person to contact regarding this
  - She emphasized clam shells
  - Patricia will contact her and will ask about networking with her

Because China will no longer take plastics, may be a good time to take on the plastics

Some criteria
  - what other organizations are doing work we can’t emulate - they have resources
  - Which would encourage us to work with other organizations
  - What excites us
  - Deliverable

8) Next meeting date June 27