



## **2016 Council of Club Leaders Resolutions Package**

### **Table of Contents**

**Eleven resolutions forwarded with a favorable recommendation from the Resolutions Committee for consideration:**

- 1. Improved Science in Fundraising (Rocky Mountain Chapter)**
- 2. Legal Strategy (Iowa Chapter)**
- 3. National Respect for Chapters and Groups (Lone Star Chapter)**
- 4. New Employees (New Jersey Chapter)**
- 5. Clean Energy Vision (Maryland Chapter)**
- 6. Natural Gas (Massachusetts Chapter)**
- 7. REC Affirmation (Loma Prieta and LA Chapters)**
- 8. Local Outings (John Muir Chapter)**
- 9. Injection-Well Activity (Oklahoma Chapter)**
- 10. Sport Hunting (New Jersey Chapter)**
- 11. Act Effectively on Global Warming (Montana Chapter, et al)**

**Four Resolutions forwarded with a less than favorable recommendation from the Resolutions Committee:**

- 12. Meat-Free Mondays (Ohio Chapter)**
- 13. Gift Memberships (New Jersey)**
- 14. Climate Change Lawsuit (Tehipite Chapter)**
- 15. Sugar Sweetened Beverage (SF Bay Chapter)**

## **RESOLUTION NO. 1: Improved Science in Sierra Club National Fundraising**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests that Sierra Club's Board of Directors set up a committee that reviews fundraising solicitations for distribution by national fundraising staff. This committee would be made up of individuals across the country holding a variety of expertise in science, public policy, and campaigns relevant to specific regions and Chapters. This is a necessary check to make sure our outreach efforts for fundraising are aligned with our campaign messaging, and reinforce an image and brand of honesty and integrity for the Sierra Club.**

Passed unanimously by the Rocky Mountain Chapter ExCom on July 9, 2016 (12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions).

### **Explanation/Description of issue**

#### **PROS:**

1. Avoid misleading and counterproductive ads like "Save the Wolf From Extinction"

#### **CONS:**

2. May increase time to get ads out.

Submitted by: Kent Abernethy, RMC Headwaters Group ExCom delegate. Becky English 303 728-4131 cell/text is RMC CCL representative.

Date Submitted: July 19, 2016.

Rocky Mountain Chapter

Phone: \_\_Kent Abernethy: 970 485 2081 Becky English CCL 303 728-4131 cell / text

E-Mail: kabern.22@gmail.com, [beckyrep@gmail.com](mailto:beckyrep@gmail.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

We must be cognizant of the fact that no marketing effort and solicitation for funds, no matter how polished, can be effective in the long term if it lacks the backing of a well-respected and trusted organization.

Underestimating the damage that a misleading add, with incorrect and false statements can have on the Sierra Club's image and integrity is a grave mistake. Adds like "Save the Wolf from Extinction" can tarnish that image and degrade the public's opinion of the Sierra Club.

National would set the example for the Chapters' fundraising efforts by putting the Committee in place as a check point. Not only acting to prevent disingenuous ads but also

making an observation or suggestion that improves an advertisement. Moreover, it conveys how seriously we guard our hard fought reputation, one that invokes confidence and trust.

Recently, our Rocky Mountain Chapter mistakenly sent out a solicitation featuring the wolf, without consulting Delia Malone our campaign leader for the wolf effort. The ad contained outdated information and did little to support and develop the Wolf Campaign.

If National had a policy and a committee in place to vet these ads, Chapter Staff may have been more aware of the protocol and considerations before hitting the “send” button.

Mega fauna, especially wolves, are exceptionally effective in fundraising. We understand that a very small percentage goes directly to wolf preservation when a wolf is used in the solicitation. In our Chapter’s case, we need those donations to help fund staff to work actively on the Wolf Campaign - building public support, education, and our volunteer and supporter base. A successful campaign, will ultimately be of great benefit to wolves. I would suggest the same holds true for the National Sierra Club on a grander scale.

Recognizing these fundraising necessities and dynamics, we must all take responsibility to maintain, protect, and preserve the Sierra Club’s image and legacy. This Committee helps to ensure that result.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 2: Legal Strategy**

**The Sierra Club Board of Directors is requested to adopt a policy that entities, organizations and individuals outside of the Sierra Club shall not be allowed to dictate or influence Sierra Club legal strategy. The Board will ensure that Sierra Club staff and programs comply with this policy.**

### **Explanation/Description of Issue**

Legal action by the Sierra Club must have as its primary goal the protection of the environment. Our legal action and the lawyers representing the Club must be free to use the best legal strategy to accomplish this goal. Although the Sierra Club makes an effort to work with other organizations, such as labor unions, civil rights groups, the Democracy Initiative allies, etc., there are times when our goals and strategies may conflict with those of the other groups. Those groups should not be able to dictate our legal strategy, e.g., restricting evidence and witnesses that can be presented, restricting questions that can be asked of witnesses, and restricting issues that can be raised.

### **Pros**

- Allows Sierra Club to pursue our goals, objectives and policies to protect the environment
- Prevents outside influence on Sierra Club legal strategy

### **Cons**

- May alienate groups Sierra Club is trying to work with

Submitted by the Iowa Chapter  
[Jonas.Magram@gmail.com](mailto:Jonas.Magram@gmail.com)

### **RESOLUTION NO. 3:**

#### **Encouraging National Campaign Staff to Respect Work of Chapters and Groups**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to encourage the National campaign staff to become familiar with and respect the work of, and community relationships developed by, chapter and group staff and volunteers, and to reflect that knowledge and respect when dealing with the press and the public.**

Passed - Lone Star TX Chapter Excom 7/23/16 - 12 “yes” and 0 “no,” and 5 not present.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

In recent years, there has been a tendency on occasion for National Sierra Club campaign staff to promote different agendas and priorities than those of many chapters and groups. In some cases, this is necessary given restrictive funding and staffing realities. In the past, much has been said -- and the Council has offered resolutions --about the need for better communication of various plans and intentions between the levels of the Club, especially when national campaigns impact the work of local chapters and groups and their relationships with their communities.

It should go without saying that when Sierra Club staff communicates with media, care should be taken not to discredit or misrepresent the work of local Sierra Club volunteers or malign the relationships that volunteers have built over the years with the press, the public and other environmental organizations.

This resolution is offered as a means of reinforcing the need for all of us to work together on the “respect” aspect of the “communication and mutual respect” goals for staff and volunteers set forth in the Board’s policy adopted from report of the Chapter National Relations Task Force in 2013.

#### **ARGUMENTS FOR:**

1. Encouraging campaign staff to better familiarize themselves with the work of local volunteers in the communities where they work can only benefit the relationship between the staff and the volunteers and assure that the Club speaks with a unified voice to the press and the public.
2. Encouraging staff to use discretion in what they say and to leave out personal agendas when they speak to the press and the public will prevent misinformation from being disseminated which could be detrimental to relationships with the press, the community and other environmental organizations.

#### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST:**

1. Some may believe that such a policy is not needed, that common sense will prevail, and that the solution to the problems that led to the need for this resolution is already Sierra Club policy.

Submitted by: Lone Star Chp, 7/31/16 by David Griggs, CCL Delegate, 214-244-6979

## **RESOLUTION NO. 4:**

### **Encouraging New Employees to Attend a Chapter or Group Event or Activity**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to adopt a policy encouraging those newly hired Sierra Club employees whose duties include regularly engaging with volunteers to attend at least one chapter or group executive committee meeting, conservation meeting, or other comparable event or activity within the first six months of employment to help staff and volunteer leaders become better acquainted with each other's roles.**

Passed by the New Jersey Chapter ExCom on May 14, 2016 with 12 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No”, and 1 abstaining.

### **Background Information:**

Sierra Club is the only national, volunteer-driven environmental organization in the country, and a crucial component of the Club are its volunteers in its chapters and local groups that make it unique within this nation’s major environmental organizations.

Yet many of the Club’s new employees have no prior experience with Sierra Club and/or this aspect of the Club may not fully appreciate the strengths that chapters and groups add to the organization.

Encouraging, where appropriate, new Club employees attend at least one chapter or group executive committee meeting, conservation meeting, or other comparable event of activity would help those employees that do so fully appreciate those strengths, which in turn would make the Club even more effective by strengthening the working relationships between staff and chapter and group volunteers.

### **Arguments For:**

- Where appropriate, encouraging new staff members to have direct experience with chapter and group volunteers will strengthen the Club’s relationships between them and its staff.

### **Arguments Against:**

- Many of the new employees attending a volunteer meeting might do so in either the San Francisco Bay or Washington, DC areas, so their perspective on volunteers would be mostly shaped by a relatively small percentage of chapters and groups.

Submitted by: New Jersey Chapter, Joe Testa, delegate, 6-24-16; [testa-j@live.com](mailto:testa-j@live.com)

## **RESOLUTION NO. 5:**

### **Broader Transportation Goals within Club's Energy Vision Statement**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests that the Board of Directors broaden the goals in the Club's proposed 100% Clean Energy Vision Statement in the Transportation section to encompass better transit and measures that would make walking and bicycling more attractive.**

The Maryland chapter took up this issue at our May 25, 2016 executive committee meeting. We voted by unanimous consent.

We resolve that the Sierra Club's vision for a 100% clean energy future for the transportation topic should specifically include transit and better infrastructure for walking and bicycling, in addition to encouraging the transition of automobiles from fossil fuels to electricity.

The draft 100% Clean Energy Vision draft document only mentions increasing the number of electric vehicles (EVs) to 1,000,000 by 2018 and to 10,000,000 by 2030. In contrast, the Club's transportation policy (<http://www.sierraclub.org/policy/transportation>) also supports transit, reduced subsidies for parking, and better facilities for walking and bicycling.

Note: The Club's Clean Energy Vision Statement should refrain from endorsing particular technological innovations in Transportation, but could mention ridesourcing, new forms of transit such as use of previously under deployed low-sky space (e.g. elevated fixed guideway systems) for mobility, and transportation within the context of "Smart Cities." The common themes are access for all, decarbonization, and connectivity.

#### **PROS:**

1. Reliable, safe transportation should be available for all, not just those who can afford or want to buy cars. Those who most rely on transit, bicycles and walking are the very people we are hoping to attract to the Sierra Club with our DEI initiatives.
2. An electric vehicular fleet will demand more electricity. More transit, walking, and bicycling would moderate the need to expand the use of clean renewable energy for the electric vehicles.
3. More active transportation means a healthier society.
4. Electric cars take up the same room as fossil-fuel powered cars. By itself, electrification of the vehicular fleet does not address the need to reduce vehicular miles traveled, which creates road congestion leading to demands for more pavement.
5. The most resource intensive form of transportation, the single occupant vehicle (SOV), dominates our roads. The clean energy vision should encourage all alternatives to the SOV since they use less energy and other resources.
6. Transit systems around the country are hurting - we notice this every day for the Washington (DC) Metro system as we read in the Washington Post. We need to move the focus and funding from roads to transit.
7. Often people choose to drive because alternatives, such as walking and bicycling are perceived as (and may actually be) less safe. Government at all levels can address this need

by providing safe sidewalks, trails, and bicycle lanes by engaging in “Complete Streets” urban design and planning.

CONS:

Robin Mann, in a message to Richard Reis, dated June 30, stated that a more final version of the vision statement will embrace transit and transit equity. (This resolution will encourage this as well as the need for walkable and bikable communities.)

While we feel the vision statement must embrace the need for better transit and better infrastructure for walking and bicycling, we express and emphasize our appreciation of the Vision and the people who helped create it.

Submitted by: Richard Reis

Date Submitted: July \_\_, 2016

Maryland Chapter

Phone: 301-325-8001

E-Mail: [rich.reis1@gmail.com](mailto:rich.reis1@gmail.com)



## RESOLUTION NO. 6: Natural Gas

**That the Sierra Club allow chapters to explicitly acknowledge that, due to high leakage rates, “natural” or “fracked” gas can be worse than coal as a climate pollutant.**

### *Explanatory notes:*

Natural gas is over 90 percent methane. Methane, over a 20-year timeframe, is 86 times more powerful than carbon dioxide as a climate pollutant.

Given the high levels of methane leakage, from the wellheads in the fracking fields, all the way to our local streets, natural gas is not a viable bridge fuel to a renewable energy future. If more than 4.8 percent of the methane leaks, then the climate effect over twenty years is worse than that of coal.<sup>1</sup>

Estimates of methane leakage vary, ranging from one to nine percent. Natural gas does not have the particulate emissions of coal, nor the levels of mercury, sulphur dioxide and nitrous gases emitted by the burning of coal. But, at present leakage rates, natural gas is usually a worse climate pollutant than coal. If leaks could be eliminated, natural gas would be only half as bad as coal as a climate pollutant.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, natural gas can increase the production of ozone. If obtained from fracking, the gas may contain the following toxic materials, as well as others: benzene, formaldehyde, acrolein, and naturally occurring radioactive materials and their decay products such as, but not limited to, polonium, lead, radium and radon.

Pros: There is a great deal of propaganda from the fossil-fuel industry touting natural gas as clean. Even many environmental organizations, including the Sierra Club at one time, touted natural gas as a bridge to the future. We must replace that picture to inform decision makers and the public that the then-unknown high levels of leakage and the dangers and chemical impacts of fracking eliminate possible climate and environmental benefits of natural gas. Present leakage rates make natural gas worse for the climate than coal.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://static.berkeleyearth.org/pdf/climate-impacts-of-coal-and-natural-gas.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL). Cost and performance baseline for fossil energy plants, Volume 1: Bituminous coal and natural gas to electricity. Revision 2. November 2010. DOE/NETL-2010/1397. United States Department of Energy.

The once lauded characterization of natural gas as a 'bridge fuel' needs to be refuted forcefully with scientific evidence and credible proposed alternatives to its continued use. The lack of a future for natural gas could also be a catalyst for faster development of alternatives.

The failure to propose a viable path to a timely alternative will undermine our credibility.

Cons: Acknowledging that natural gas is worse than coal, in any respect, could encourage the 'clean coal' brigade.

Acknowledging that the Sierra Club was wrong about natural gas, in the minds of some, may undermine our credibility.

Submitted on July 30, 2016. Amended August 23, 2016

Endorsed by the Massachusetts Executive Committee, July 30, 2016

Submitted by:

Cathy Ann Buckley

Council of Club Leaders Delegate

Chapter Chair

**Massachusetts Sierra Club**

## RESOLUTION NO. 7: Revise Arcadia Contract

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to revise the agreement with Arcadia Power so that Club members and supporters are not asked to purchase unbundled renewable energy certificates (RECs), because such RECs do not conform to Club policy, which requires carbon offset products to be certified as additional. Preferable alternatives for fostering renewable energy are available.**

Passed unanimously by the Loma Prieta Chapter ExCom on May 3, 2016 with 10 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No,” 0 “Abstaining,” and 1 absent.

Passed unanimously by the Angeles Chapter ExCom on June 26, 2016 with 18 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No,” 0 Abstaining,” and 4 absent.

### **Explanation/Description of issue**

1. On October 29, 2015, the Club sent out an email signed by Michael Brune (see full email and other attachments below), claiming, “Arcadia Power gives you the ability to reduce your impact, help move toward a 100% clean-energy future through the support of community wind farms, and uphold your values, no matter where you live or whether you rent or own.”  
However, these claims are not valid, because Arcadia Power is selling only unbundled RECs to Club members. The purchase of these RECs does not meet the condition of additionality—it does not result in the production of renewable energy that otherwise would not have been produced. In particular, regarding Arcadia’s unbundled RECs: a) the specific wind farm was built many years ago so purchase of its unbundled RECs will not be additional, b) the physical electricity delivered to customers remains the same as before, and c) unbundled RECs leave behind a trail of energy stripped of its renewable attributes—equal in magnitude to the volume of unbundled RECs sold— which by definition means the purchase of these RECs does not actually move toward “100% clean energy. (See a more complete definition of additionality below the resolution.)
2. Buying an unbundled REC means you are purchasing the renewable attributes of wind energy, while you are using the same electricity you used before. The mere exchange of certificates from one party to another does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
3. There is such a huge number of unbundled RECs available on the voluntary market (not used for RPS compliance) that the average market price is only 0.05¢ per kWh (less than 1% of the value of the electricity itself, insufficient to support decisions to construct new wind facilities). Since the Club has not required certification that the RECs will be **additional**, the sale of unbundled RECs provided by Arcadia from the voluntary market does not meet the National Sierra Club Policy on Carbon Market Programs requirements for a) additionality, b) limited quantity, and c) verifiability.
4. The national email undermined Sierra Club California, which has aggressively applied national Club Policy in defeating utility attempts to sell the same kind of unbundled RECs to customers, Sierra Club California has also successfully advocated to reduce the use of such RECs in meeting the state’s renewable portfolio standards.

5. After complaints about the Club's marketing of unbundled RECs on behalf of Arcadia Power, Chief Advancement Officer Mary Nemerov sent an email to Chapter directors in four states indicating that the Arcadia Power partnership undermines Sierra Club renewable energy advocacy, saying,

“Sierra Club national staff . . . understand the concerns regarding the conflict in promoting wind RECs where local advocates and chapters have worked to create community choice aggregation programs or are advocating against utilities purchasing unbundled RECs to meet mandatory renewable requirements.

For that reason, we will be limiting direct marketing of the Arcadia Power partnership and *excluding* California, Washington, Oregon, and Michigan going forward.” (See full email in attachments.)

#### **PROS:**

1. Because voluntary RECs from Arcadia Power are not additional, limited, and enforceable, they are inconsistent with national Club Policy.
2. Purchases of Arcadia Power RECs undermine legitimate efforts to reduce carbon emissions because purchasing such RECs may discourage legitimate action to directly reduce emissions (as outlined in an attachment).
3. Potential injuries from the partnership with Arcadia Power to the Club's work toward 100% clean energy include:
  - Members may think that sending money to Arcadia every month means *their* electricity is clean, which is not the case, as documented above.
  - Members will not be able to use that money to invest in much more effective ways to reduce one's carbon footprint.
  - Members may reduce their advocacy work for 100% clean energy, thinking their electricity is clean.
  - The entire Club is branded as hypocritical when it pushes for 100% clean energy, while it is marketing a product that does not meet the Club's own policy standards, and especially when there are alternatives that do provide clean energy.
4. Excluding Arcadia Power direct emails from four states is helpful for those states but continues the problems caused by the Club's promotion of this product in the other states.
5. Revision of the Club's contract may also help dissuade other organizations from marketing similar unbundled RECs to their members.

#### **CONS:**

1. National Sierra Club officials might be constrained by legal contract considerations.
2. National Sierra Club officials might consider the revenue to the Club to be more important than the issues with marketing unbundled RECs.
3. National Sierra Club officials have already considered this problem and taken action on it in four states.
4. National Sierra Club officials may have other reasons to not revise terms of the Arcadia contract at this time.

Submitted by: Mike Ferreira, Chair, Loma Prieta Chapter  
Date Submitted: July 25, 2016  
Phone: 650-563-4030, E-Mail: michaeljferreira@gmail.com  
Submitted by: Sharon Koch, Chair, Angeles Chapter  
Date Submitted: July 25, 2016  
Phone: 949-717-7745, E-Mail: slkoch@ix.netcom.com

For more information, contact Jim Stewart, PhD, Co-chair  
Sierra Club California Energy-Climate Committee  
DrJimStewart@gmail.com Cell: 213-820-4345

## **RESOLUTION NO. 8: Local Outings**

**The Board of Directors needs to resolve, both permanently and in a timely manner, the dilemma created by the limits on staff support given to Local Outings programs.**

**Sierra Club's board can institute one or more of the following options, or create a suitable solution of their own, to expedite hiring one full-time equivalent in new staff:**

- 1. Fund a full time position supporting local outings and other associated needs through Sierra Club's annual unrestricted budget;**
- 2. Allow fundraising for unrestricted funds by Sierra Club Outdoors staff to secure the necessary funding to properly staff and promote Local Outings programs; and/or**
- 3. Shift the current designations for solely unrestricted funds to meet compliance for local outings to allow for a better reflection of restricted/unrestricted funds used in supporting Local Outings programs.**

*Background:* Roughly 5,000 energetic, trained and committed Sierra Club members annually volunteer to lead over 235,000 participants into the outdoors and then return them home safely. This activity brings new energy to help motivate, educate and train members and supporters to become outdoor enthusiasts and better environmental stewards - furthering Sierra Club Outdoors' mission of bringing people outdoors for the benefit of both. This activity helps identify and cultivate new members and new leaders, increases outreach and helps build the social and environmental movement. In fact, surveys of current members and leaders indicated outings was their main route to membership.

### *Arguments for:*

Local Outings Programs have been and will remain a critical component for attracting, motivating and onboarding members.

Lack of support has allowed for chapter and group outings programs to drift apart and become stagnant. While some drift is inevitable, the lack of group management for outings programs has led extended drift and led to diminished outcomes.

### *Arguments against:*

Unrestricted funds are in very short supply.

The Local Outings program has made it this far without collapse.

New funding for communications have been made available to Local Outings to help promote their offerings.

### *Submitted by:*

Eric Uram for the John Muir Chapter

## **RESOLUTION NO. 9: Calling for a Ban on Injection-Well Activity in Seismic-Prone Areas**

**Induced seismicity (man-made earthquakes) caused by injection well disposal of waste fluids from oil and gas drilling, fracking and production activities poses a significant threat to life, health and property. The Council of Club Leaders and the Sierra Club Board of Directors should call for a ban on injection well activity for any seismic-prone area at risk for damaging induced earthquakes. Scientists have studied the occurrence of induced seismicity for many years and have published numerous scientific papers on the subject. Calls for further study must not be used as an excuse to delay action.**

Passed by the Oklahoma Chapter Executive Committee on July 20, 2016, 7-0 with 2 members absent

### **Explanation/Description of Issue**

The Sierra Club does not appear to have a stated policy on induced seismicity. Through fracking and other operations, the oil and gas industry produces billions of gallons of wastewater that is disposed of in injection wells. Last year Oklahomans experienced more than 900 earthquakes of magnitude 3.0 or greater capable of causing property damage, all linked to areas of injection well operation. Other states have seen the same problem, to a lesser degree. Now the U.S. Geological Survey has produced an earthquakes hazard map that shows areas of a dozen states where damage from induced seismicity could occur in 2016. The number of induced earthquakes has dropped because of the recent decline in oil and gas industry activity, but is likely to increase as industry activity picks up again.

### **PROS:**

Publicizing and opposing induced seismicity that is directly tied to oil and gas operations forces oil and gas companies to acknowledge the effects of their injection well operations.

This resolution does not conflict with existing Sierra Club policy and in fact complements efforts taken through the Keep Dirty Fuels in the Ground, Beyond Oil and Beyond Gas campaigns.

Accepted, peer-reviewed scientific research has established a clear cause-and-effect relationship between injection well operations and induced earthquakes, so the Sierra Club would be acting in line with known science as well as prudence and environmental protection.

### **CONS:**

This could be seen as an outlier issue, since man-made earthquakes generally have occurred in geographically small areas in oil and gas producing states (except in Oklahoma, where they have affected a substantial part of the state).

The resolution could be seen as taking the most extreme position possible, calling for an outright ban on all injection well activity in earthquake-prone areas instead of a moratorium or a mandated reduction in injection well volumes.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 10: Sport Hunting On Public Lands in Chapters**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Sierra Club Board of Directors permit chapters to oppose (or endorse restrictions on) sport hunting on those public lands within their boundaries that are set aside for the preservation of natural landscapes and wildlife.**

Passed by the New Jersey Chapter ExCom on July 9, 2016 with 12 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No”, and 0 abstaining.

### **Background Information:**

Currently, as stated in the Sierra Club Conservation Policy on Wildlife and Native Plants, the Club is opposed to sport hunting in national parks because national parks are set aside for the preservation of natural landscapes and wildlife. For all other public lands, regulated periodic hunting and fishing are included within acceptable management approaches when they are based on sufficient scientifically valid biological data and when consistent with all other management purposes and when necessary for total protection of particular species or populations.

If chapters were permitted to oppose (or endorse restrictions on) sport hunting on those public lands within their boundaries that are set aside for the preservation of natural landscapes and wildlife, it would make it easier for them to preserve the wildlife within those areas when sport hunting is not based on sufficient scientifically valid biological data and/or is necessary for total protection of particular species or populations.

### **Arguments For:**

- Chapters would be enabled to provide more protection to those hunted species in public lands set aside for the preservation of wildlife which are currently being managed without sufficient scientifically valid biological data.

### **Arguments Against:**

- If Sierra Club permits chapters to oppose (or endorse restrictions on) sport hunting on specific public lands within their boundaries, it may also decide to establish a procedure involving Club entities such as the Our Wild America Campaign, the Wildlife & Endangered Species Team and/or other entities to first review chapter requests for doing so before allowing chapters to proceed. If this occurs, this could take time away from those entities' current efforts.

Submitted by: Joe Testa

Date Submitted: 07-15-2016

New Jersey Chapter

Phone: day 973-890-7300 x124; home 908-665-1067 (\*)

E-Mail: testa-j@live.com



## **RESOLUTION NO. 11: Act Effectively Against Global Warming**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to make it the official Sierra Club policy position that the United States, in concert with the family of nations, must commit to actions that will limit long-term global warming to no more than 1 degree Celsius above preindustrial levels, for the reasons, and by the means, described in this resolution.**

Passed by the Montana Chapter Executive Committee on 4/20/2016, with 8 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No” and 0 abstaining, by Cumberland Chapter Executive Committee on 4/26/2016 with 9 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No” and 1 abstaining, by the Iowa Chapter Executive Committee on 4/28/2016, with 8 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No” and 0 abstaining, by the New Hampshire Chapter Executive Committee on 7/30/2016, with 7 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No,” and 1 not responding in time, by the South Carolina Chapter Executive Committee, and by the Alabama Chapter Executive Committee on 7/30/2016, 10 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No,” and 3 not responding in time.

Global warming is the greatest threat humanity has faced, yet we have failed to respond with the urgency required to address it. The scientific community has warned us for many years but, rather than respond with a requisite level of policy ambition, we have allowed fossil fuel emissions and global temperature to rise dramatically.

Global temperature has increased about 1 degree Celsius since preindustrial times, and that warming is already wreaking havoc on the planet. The recent international agreement to limit warming to under 2 C, and to strive for 1.5 C, is inadequate and frightening. Some of the world’s best climate scientists have explained why we must limit long-term global warming to no more than 1 degree C (and even bring the temperature increase below 1 C in time, while bringing CO2 concentrations below 350 ppm by 2100), and how that can be accomplished. There is no excuse for failing to heed their warning and their prescription. We are now ominously close to triggering the collapse of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet, which would flood coastal cities worldwide. We are in a climate emergency that requires policies and actions commensurate with the danger.

As James Hansen and his 17 co-authors explained in their 2013 report, “Assessing ‘Dangerous Climate Change:’ Required Reduction of Carbon Emissions to Protect Young People, Future Generations and Nature,” if we make emissions reductions and carbon storage changes, global warming would peak at about 1.1 C and drop to slightly below 1 C by 2050. We strongly disagree with Hansen’s belief that nuclear power is integral to this effort, because the work of Jacobson and Delucchi demonstrate the technological and economic feasibility of producing 100% of global energy for all purposes from wind, water, and solar power (Mark Z. Jacobson and Mark A. Delucchi. “A Path to Sustainable Energy by 2030,” *Scientific American*, Nov. 2009). As the club has already recognized, we must work for a 100% clean-energy future, but we must work for a goal that will actually arrest and reverse our current climate emergency, and our current club commitment to a 1.5 C limit is inadequate to the task. Though we disagree with Hansen on nuclear power, we cite his work because it provides strong scientific evidence for the necessity of a long-term

temperature target of no more than 1 degree Celsius, and it provides a prescription for achieving the four points outlined below, when augmented by the work of Jacobson and Delucchi.

- 1- Long-term global warming of no more than 1-degree Celsius;
- 2- U.S. and global fossil-fuel emissions reductions of at least 6% a year, beginning immediately, in conjunction with 100 gigatons of carbon storage, to be secured through improved forestry and agricultural practices;
- 3- U.S. and global carbon pricing that accurately reflects the damages caused by carbon; and
- 4- A U.S. and global energy system for all purposes promoting greater efficiency and run on wind, water, and solar power, with appropriate governmental support to establish this power infrastructure with wartime speed.

**PROS:**

- Would put the Sierra Club in a position of courageous moral leadership on the greatest threat humanity has ever faced.
- Would provide a highly visible and specific policy vehicle to vanquish the climate crisis and help to preserve the marvelous and ancient tapestry of life that has been humanity's timeless companion.
- Because the advocated policy is based on science and morality, it is eminently defensible. Adopting it would demonstrate unimpeachable integrity, as the full implementation of the policy would actually solve the problem.
- The truth is more inspiring than offering false hope, and the central climate-change truth is that by refusing to advocate a science-based climate policy we have brought humanity to the brink of catastrophe. Only a wartime-speed global energy transformation that limits global warming to 1-degree Celsius is sufficient to extricate us from our peril.

**CONS:**

- Would be seen as highly ambitious and would cause some sectors to respond with intensified obstruction (e.g. fossil fuel industries).
- Would be challenging to accomplish, and would require reworking Sierra Club climate campaigns and work plans in line with the 1 C / 6% cuts goal.

Submitted by: Jonathan Matthews, Summer Nelson, Judy Lyons, Patrick Bosold, Jerry Curran, Susan Corbett, and David Underhill; Date Submitted: 7/31/2016

Montana Chapter, Cumberland Chapter, Iowa Chapter, New Hampshire Chapter, South Carolina Chapter, and Alabama Chapter

Phone: 406 447 4351; E-Mail: [j.c.matthews@alumni.stanford.edu](mailto:j.c.matthews@alumni.stanford.edu)

## **RESOLUTION NO. 12: Meat-Free Mondays**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to adopt a campaign that encourages staff, members, and supporters to adopt a meat-free diet every Monday of every week.**

Passed by the Ohio Chapter (or Sierra Student Coalition) ExCom on July 17, 2016 with 12 voting “Yes,” 0 voting “No” and 0 abstaining.

Explanation/Description of issue:

1. Current policy: Agriculture/Climate Change and Agriculture

<http://www.sierraclub.org/policy/agriculture/food>

Livestock are the major source of greenhouse gases from agriculture, so minimizing the production and consumption of domestic animals that produce the most methane is one critical way to reduce greenhouse gas production. Ruminants such as cows, sheep and goats produce the most methane (an extremely potent greenhouse gas), and most GHG emissions from livestock come from cattle. The diet of livestock can and should be managed in ways that dramatically reduce their methane production. Livestock housing and waste handling at Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) should be managed to minimize greenhouse gas releases, to capture methane for energy production and to maximize soil carbon sequestration.

2. Purpose of the resolution:

1. The current policy cited above notes that “livestock are the major source of greenhouse gases from agriculture” but does not couple this statement with even minimal concrete recommendations.
2. This resolution enables the Sierra Club to move from a passive acknowledgment of a problem to an active recommendation.
3. This resolution would fit into the “Enjoy” portion of the Sierra Club’s Mission of “Explore, Enjoy, and Protect the Planet” as a lifestyle recommendation.
4. The intent of the Meat-Free Monday campaign is not to create a seismic shift in reducing the environmental footprint of Sierrans as it pertains to the consumption of meat but to provide a fun introduction into a meat-free diet.

PROS:

- The campaign facilitates a transition of the Sierra Club’s conservation policy on agriculture from a passive acknowledgment to an active recommendation.
- While a one-day per week dietary change will seem to have a minor environmental impact at first, it will cause the environmental movement to confront their dietary routines and become more self-conscious of their choices that involve meat.
- Although the scope of adopting a meat-free diet one day per week is modest, it may provide a catalyst for stakeholders to adopt a more ambitious reduction in the consumption of meat by increasing familiarity with meat-free dietary options.

- Meat-based diets are by far the largest contributor of our environmental footprint and the methane that originates from such diets have a significant contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. A partial adoption of this campaign by our stakeholders will have a direct and positive impact in the reduction of our environmental footprint.
- According to the UNFAO report “Tackling climate change through livestock: A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities” (<http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/197608/icode/>)  
 “...Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with livestock supply chains add up to 7.1 gigatonnes (GT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2-eq) per year – or 14.5 percent of all human-caused GHG releases.”
- This campaign lets the Sierra Club demonstrate leadership within the environmental movement as it relates to the reduction of our environmental footprint.

#### CONS:

- Meat-Free Mondays would be a Sierra Club branded campaign which would be distinct from an existing outside nonprofit organization called “Meatless Mondays”. While this resolution is designed to gain momentum by adopting a course action that starts sooner rather than later, the board of directors may want to explore a more formal partnership.
- Challenging norms even at a token level tends to invite knee-jerk emotional responses from existing stakeholders who are responding to change itself.
- Meat = protein (disregards all plant-based sources and is primarily an argument based from ignorance)
- Meat is associated with cultural tradition (argument from habit)
- Vegetarianism = [enter demonic term]-worship
- Eating meat (both domesticated and game) is associated with masculinity and going meat-free will be seen by some as an emasculation (this mainly exists because of a lack of equivalent vegetarian cultural narratives).
- Animal grazing may be beneficial to soil (but so too is returning farmland back to wilderness).

Submitted by:	Philip Crume, Chapter Chair and CCL Delegate Ohio Chapter
Date Submitted:	July 31, 2016
Phone:	440-925-0714
E-Mail:	chair@ohio.sierraclub.org

## **RESOLUTION NO. 13: Gift Memberships for young leaders**

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Sierra Club Board of Directors encourage young leaders to join the Sierra Club by building on the Gift Membership Pilot Program by expanding the program in the future to provide free memberships to Boy Scout Eagle Scouts, Girl Scout Gold Award recipients, and other comparable youth group leaders.**

Passed by the New Jersey Chapter ExCom on July 9, 2016 with 8 voting “Yes,” 2 voting “No”, and 1 abstaining.

### **Background Information:**

This year, the Sierra Club has a pilot program where it is giving away 1,500 free Sierra Club memberships to community leaders across the country. If this program is deemed a success and the Club decides to expand it in the future, Scouts provide a natural pool of compatible candidates for membership.

There are approximately 900,000 Boy Scouts active in their troops around the country. Over 50,000 a year become an Eagle Scout. Girl Scouts’ highest rank is the Gold Award. The average age to attain Eagle Scout recognition is 17 years of age.

Now that the Boy Scouts are becoming more inclusive and given Scouting encourages girls and boys to enjoy the outdoors, engage in community/environmental service projects, and often assume leadership positions in the community later in life, it would be a good investment to offer them free membership for a period of time -- perhaps enough time to carry the membership for those who become active with us through the college and graduate years of school -- if they can earn Eagle Scout or the Gold Award.

### **Arguments For:**

- The Sierra Club is devoted to increasing and diversifying its membership. This could be an effective way to inspire the next generation to become involved in our organization.
- By engaging with these leaders at a relatively early age, we have a good opportunity to gain a significant number of long-term members. As prominent marketers know, providing free memberships to youth pays off handsomely in the long run with paid memberships as adults.
- This could also encourage their parents – often active leaders in their own right – to become familiar and engaged with the Club, another potential source of new members.
- High-achieving Scouts could be expected to have an above-average likelihood of taking on leadership roles as they gain experience in the Club.
- This program would give Chapters an incentive to reach out to Scouting organizations in their communities.

### **Arguments Against:**

- There would be an expense incurred by providing these memberships. Each membership costs the club approximately \$20. This expense could be mitigated in part by offering these members electronic-only subscriptions to *Sierra* magazine and other publications.
- A mechanism would need to be devised to identify eligible Scouts. The Club might work out an arrangement with the Scouting national organizations; Chapters could be responsible

for contacting their local Scouting organizations; or it might be up to Scouts themselves to contact the Sierra Club to take advantage of this opportunity.

- There would be a need to determine what similar youth organizations should be included in the program; this would further affect the cost.

Submitted by: Joe Testa

Date Submitted: 07-15-2016

New Jersey Chapter

Phone: day 973-890-7300 x124; home 908-665-1067 (\*)

E-Mail: [testa-j@live.com](mailto:testa-j@live.com)

## **RESOLUTION NO. 14: Climate Change Lawsuit**

**To require the Sierra Club's legal office review, analyze, and make recommendations for a climate change lawsuit challenging government's destructive four-decade inaction on climate change issues and compel the government to take positive climate change action.**

Tehipite Chapter is sponsoring this resolution. Date of vote: July 13, 2016; Vote count: Yes: 6 No: 0

**Pro: A list of reasons or bullet points on why this Resolution would be beneficial.**

- American citizens have the right to sue for climate change action and compel our government to act; this proposed new policy would require the Sierra Club's legal office to review, analyze and make recommendations for a climate change lawsuit challenging government's destructive four-decade inaction on climate change issues and would compel the government to take positive climate change action.
- The Federal government (and fossil fuel corporations) has known for more than four decades that fossil fuels are destroying the climate system and yet continues to promote, under regulate to stop their use.
- The Federal government holds natural resources in public trust, and against that public trust, the Federal government and EPA have not taken adequate steps to deal with climate change; a Sierra Club climate change lawsuit would force our government to do their duty in order to protect that public trust.
- A positive legal challenge to our government's destructive four-decade inaction on climate change could seek to hold the President and federal agencies responsible for continued fossil fuel exploitation, and instead, move our country towards renewable energy and environmental protection. (President Obama recently allowed hundreds of new gas, oil and mineral permits on public government lands.)
- A positive legal challenge could build upon previous suits as the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Massachusetts and other states could sue the EPA to force them to adopt rules with regard to climate change; possible recommendations could compel the Federal government to impose the regulations on fossil fuel companies and others contributing to climate change, supporting current Sierra Club goals.
- A positive climate change lawsuit recommendation could seek a court order requiring the President to immediately implement a national plan to decrease atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) to a safe level: 350 ppm by the year 2100, supporting several Sierra Club goals.
- The Federal government has a systemic responsibility to make a positive difference against climate change; a positive legal challenge could compel the Federal government to comply with this responsibility.

- A possible recommendation could enhance/join the current climate change lawsuit by 21 young people from across the United States engaging in a landmark constitutional climate change lawsuit against the Federal government (in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon) along with climate scientist Dr. James E. Hansen, serving as guardian for future generations and his granddaughter. The Complaint asserts that, in causing climate change, the Federal government has violated the youngest generation's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, as well as failed to protect essential public trust resources. April 8, 2016 the Federal court affirmed the constitutional rights of kids and denied motions of government and fossil fuel industry in this youth's landmark climate change case. For more information on this legal action: <http://ourchildrenstrust.org/us/Federal-Lawsuit>.

Con: A list of reasons or bullet points on why this Resolution might not be beneficial. It would take time and funds.



## RESOLUTION NO. 15: Sugar Sweetened Beverage (SSB) Regulations

**The Council of Club Leaders requests the Board of Directors to develop and take a position in support of regulatory measures aimed to reduce production, distribution and consumption of Sugar Sweetened Beverage (SSB) products, including, but not limited, to general or special taxation of production and distribution companies.**

Local chapter leaders have been approached by activists and residents, asking Sierra Club to support these measures.

**Passed by the San Francisco Bay Chapter ExCom on July 11, 2016 with 11 voting “Yes,” 1 voting “No” and 1 abstaining.**

Explanation/Description of issue (500 word limit)

Several Bay Area cities are putting Sugar Sweetened Beverages Tax Initiatives on the ballot this year to help address health, environmental and social justice crisis associated with sugary beverages consumption. This is a beginning of a growing movement. Berkeley was the first to implement such a tax, and now Philadelphia has joined in as well. Internationally, a number of cities and countries have such measures in the works. This year, San Francisco, Oakland, and Albany have placed such a measure on the November 2016 ballot.

A Sugar Sweetened Beverage (SSB) is any non-alcoholic beverage with an added sugar-based, caloric sweetener, including sucrose, fructose, glucose, and other sugars (including high fructose corn syrup). This includes, but is not limited to: soda, non-100%-fruit drinks, sports drinks, flavored water, energy drinks, and pre-sweetened tea.

These taxes work in three ways:

- 1) Raise awareness. The public deserves the right to know about the link between sugary drinks, diabetes and other diseases, the environment, and how *the beverage industry targets its marketing toward youth and communities of color.*
- 2) Raise revenue for community programs that combat the impact of sugary drink marketing. *Revenue from the tax could fund community and school-based programs, which may include environmental programs.*
- 3) Reduce consumption. *Studies coming out of Mexico and Berkeley are showing the tax has led to reduced sales and consumption of SSBs.* These reductions could prevent deadly diseases and save billions in health care costs and positively slow the negative environmental impacts associated with sugar and soda production.

While health concerns have been cited as the main rationale for creating SSB taxes, the immense environmental impacts of SSB overproduction cannot be overlooked. Those impacts include:

- On production side: some of the most atrocious environmental effects take place during growing and processing sugar producing crops, one-time-use container manufacturing and disposal, colossal water use, emissions from transport.

- On the consumption side: consumption of sugar leads to many chronic diseases. More sick people there are – more resources are spent to produce, deliver and dispose of pharmaceuticals, syringes, hospital supplies and equipment, etc.

There has been a large growth of sugar-producing crops, often at the expense of natural habitat. This includes corn, beets, sugar cane and other sugary crops cultivation not only in the U.S., but in developing countries. Reducing consumption of drinks containing sugars has a real potential to result in reduction of planting of sugar producing crops and corresponding habitat destruction, fertilizer and pesticide use.

#### PROS: (250 word limit)

- **Sugary Drinks Are Not Healthy for the Environment**  
Sugarcane is a water-intensive crop, and its production in many countries has moved to marginal areas removing natural rainforests, mangroves, and other sensitive environments. Sugarcane has been responsible for reduced wildlife biodiversity, polluted rivers and seas, eroded fertile soils, careless use of pesticides and fertilizers, poor management of irrigation, air pollution from burning cane fields, and damage to coral reefs such as the Great Barrier Reef. Sugar is produced in former wetlands and other fragile ecosystems, because, unlike many crops, it will grow there.

The water footprint of a typical soda, taking into account the direct and indirect water to produce the drink, ranges between 150 and 300 liters of freshwater per 0.5 Liter bottle. Beverage companies divert 1M gallons of water annually and deny local communities their fundamental right to water. This is especially felt in India, where local farmers have accused the beverage industry of depleting the water table and not leaving enough for their crops.

GHGs produced for the production of one-time use containers and during the bottling and distribution of SSBs are also excessive.

- **This is a Social Justice Issue**  
Diabetes does not touch everyone equally. A recent study at Yale Rudd Center found that African American children and teens viewed 80-90% more sugary drink TV advertising than their white peers. Beverage companies continue to advertise to children and teens and target low-income and minority communities. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is a Sierra Club priority.

#### CONS: (250 word limit)

- Some argue that this is not an environmental issue.
- Some argue that some proposed taxes are not specific taxes.
- Some argue that these taxes might be regressive.

Submitted by: Olga Bolotina and Becky Evans, San Francisco Bay Area Chapter  
Date Submitted: 8/4/2016; Phone: 510-910-4733E-Mail: Olga.bolotina.ab@gmail.com or rebecae@earthlink.net