



Supervisor Sean Elsbernd debates our own Charles Marsteller on Proposition C at the Coalition's Endorsement Night; Candidates Next Week

10 REASONS TO OPPOSE "BETTER NEIGHBORHOODS +"

- 1. Amend the Planning Code** Any change by the City to Land Use Controls, Planning Code, and Planning & Implementation Process should be accomplished by amending Planning Code, *not* Administrative Code. And a process that fundamentally defines Planning should be in the Planning Code not the Administrative Code.
- 2. Begin with Planning** This definition of Planning needs hands-on management by the Planning Commission and the public from the beginning of the process; not at the end.
- 3. It's Unnecessary** After adequate Outreach and Notice, there are other existing means within the Planning Code to retrieve public benefits:
 - Public benefits can be extracted by legislation developed specific to the Plan such as imposition of Development Impact Fees for the provision of necessary community infrastructure.
 - PUDs
 - Special Use Districts
 - Reclassification (rezoning)
- 4. No Plan Implementation Committee**
 - There should be no PIC
 - The Planning Commission should not abrogate their power.
 - There should not be a "buffer" group between citizens and the Planning Commission.
 - Is Cost, Quality Control implicit in monitoring such a body?
 - There is an inherent Conflict of Interest in the PIC and also in consultants and contractors mentioned throughout legislation.
 - PIC is not subject to Sunshine.
 - PIC is only there to "rubber stamp" an Area Plan.

CSFN ENDORSEMENTS 2005

- Prop B** *Bonds for Potholes, Bike Lanes, Etc?*.....NO
- Prop C** *Ethics Commission funding*.....No Endorsement
- Prop D** *MUNI Commission Supervisors' Appointments*..NO
- Prop F** *Neighborhood Firehouses (Early Endorsement)* YES
- Prop H** *Handgun Prohibition*NO
- Next Meeting:**
- Prop A** *City College Bonds....(G & E Recommendation)* NO
- Prop G** *GG Park Entrance...(G & E Recommendation)* YES

The endorsement vote is recorded in the minutes on page 4. The Government and Elections Committee report is found on page 7.

- PIC members *should* be limited to those who live or own property within the Plan Area.
- As it is written now the Planning Commission chooses members based on Planning Dept's recommendations.
- As it is written now developers, both nonprofit and for profit, are on PIC.
- 5. Protect Discretionary Review.** Do not modify DR.
 - Negates purpose of DR to relegate it to the Area Plan.
 - Rezoning will take place under the Plans. That is a Plan's purpose.
 - As it is written, DRs can reduce building envelope only by 5%. This is inadequate.
 - CU for 1:1 parking should be included in the Plans.

(Cont'd on p 2)

IT AIN'T BROKE — SO BACK OFF!

The existing Planning Code, without amendment, has enabled the production of three Better Neighborhood plans for which the Department has been praised. The planning process is not broken. The Planning Department's staff report of July 21, 2005 lauds the "already successful planning process", employed and demonstrated by the creation of these three Better Neighborhoods. So why do we need the "Better Neighborhoods" special legislation?

Interestingly, the City's latest Housing Inventory reports that from 2001 to 2004, 9,399 dwelling units have been constructed, another 6,129 dwelling units have been permitted and 17,244 are in active planning review. This is the Planning Code that we are being told is totally inadequate and should be set aside in favor of radical amendment in another code, the Administrative Code! Curiously, the proponents of this legislation do not propose amending the Planning Code, even though they label it ineffectual.

The Housing Inventory thus reports that the total number of units constructed, permitted or under review during the period 2001-2004 is approximately 28,000. This is a very considerable number. Is there any doubt that this is a success story? The current planning process is not broken when it produces so many housing units.

It is important to point out that the large numbers cited in the Housing Inventory include only developments of ten units or more. Yet, fully two-thirds of the housing produced in this City is in buildings of ten units or less. The Housing Inventory, by the City's own reporting, reveals that "production rates for all four years exceeded annual production rates of the past twenty years."

This is not to say that improvements to the Code should not be made, improvements which would create Code passages ensuring affordability, for example. But the Planning Code already permits doubling the density, through the Conditional Use (for Planned Unit Development or P.U.D.) provisions of Section 304. In addition, the Planning Code already permits a lower than 1:1 ratio of off-street parking to dwelling units, again through Section 304. Other changes, such as aggregating the required open space or lowering the exposure requirement of units, are allowable through the PUD process.

Changing zoning classifications, changing height limits, adding special use districts which are specific to geographical areas of the City, all these have been accomplished through the years by processes that are enabled in Planning Code Sections 302 through 306. If the Planning Commission finds that these code sections are flawed and require amendment, then the Planning Commission should consider changes to the Planning Code. But the neighborhoods are not being asked to support changes in the Planning Code. We're being asked to support changes in the Administrative Code, which would allow a whole level of review outside the normal planning process, and subtle changes to the notification process which would bring in more neighborhood notification at the beginning, but actually reduce the

amount of public input as the process continues over time.

Furthermore, it is our analysis that the Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) set up in this BN+ legislation is merely project-by-project "comment" on the implementation of a given Better Neighborhoods Plan, gives the public input no power, and does not permit changes over time.

Certainly, the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods are only too happy to endorse greater "up front" community outreach and notification; we could also consider amendments to the Planning Code. But we do not understand why the Planning Code is not seen as the right code to amend. Making changes in the Administrative Code instead constitutes an end run around the Planning Commission. Furthermore, a close reading of the legislation reveals that less, not more, public scrutiny would be involved, since after the early outreach stage, public notification is assured only to those who specifically request it in writing. This would be less notification, not more, than is required in the CU and Map and Zoning reclassification processes that are written in the Planning Code as it stands today.

Code amendments that require the timely participation of other City Departments could be made in both the Planning Code and the Administrative Code, if, as the proponents say, it is necessary. A case can be made that funding of public improvements necessitated by changes in density and height should be codified and added to the Administrative Code, in order to include the participation of other City departments. But that is not what the Planning Commission is being told; they are being persuaded that all the changes regarding density, height and land use need to be made in the Administrative Code. This makes no sense to us at all.

We believe that this legislation reduces the ultimate voice of the neighborhoods and reduces the participation of the Planning Commission in crafting massive changes in the blueprint for the City's future growth.

But then, what is the real scenario? The proponents of the BN+ legislation blame the Planning Code and the Planning Department for its case-by-case deal-making, but it is the former mayoral administration and its sway over the Planning Department that is really to blame.

...*Judy Berkowitz, Marilyn Amini, Ellen Kernaghan, Mary Anne Miller*

10 Reasons (Con't from p. 1)

- Design Guidelines are only for up to 40 feet, these Plans are for much higher.
- 6. In concert with the public, the Planning Commission shall conduct Needs Assessment and Impact Analysis.
- 7. Notice is already required in PUD and has to be done with no restraints.
- 8. Planning may take longer than two years; there should be no arbitrary cap imposed.
- 9. Mello-Roos financing unfairly shifts the cost burden of Impact Fee from the developer to neighborhood property owners in the Plan area and possibly even Citywide.
- 10. Developers should incur all costs. These should be based on revenues derived from values created by the process. ...*CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In September, we always look forward to spirited presentations from the candidates who are running for office. We also continue to hear discussion from the various camps who come to the CSFN General Assembly meetings to convince us of the strength of their positions on those ballot measures we didn't hear in August. This month we consider Props A and G.

Again this month, as last, we have been kept very busy by the Better Neighborhoods Planning & Implementation Process legislation introduced by Supervisor McGoldrick and currently before the Planning Commission. It will be heard for the last time at the Planning Commission on September 15. We understand that it has been scheduled for the BOS Land Use Committee for Wednesday September 21. The CSFN LU&H Committee has prepared suggestions for the Commissioners to amend the ordinance (see the Problem Items and Concerns in Better Neighborhoods Planning & Implementation Process Legislation elsewhere in this Newsletter).

The meeting with Mayor Newsom on August 24 was, according to everyone who has weighed in, very successful. There was what may be a record number of CSFN folks there; quite a few for whom this was their first such meeting. **Kathy Devincenzi (LHIA)** briefly and succinctly presented concerns with BNP&IP legislation, and requested that the Mayor to veto the legislation if amendments had not been made to it when it comes before him. **Mary Helen Briscoe** and **Martin MacIntyre and (PRO-SF)** spoke about the excessive noise from events in Golden Gate Park, and the money that the City is supposed to levy as facility use fees which is often not collected. **Eileen Boken (SPEAK)** addressed the Mayor on 19th Avenue median landscaping and solar panels on Sunset Reservoir. **Francisco Da Costa (BV/HPCC)** spoke on crime and environmental issues in the Southeast Sector. **Danita Kulp** told of the citywide problem of people doing end-runs around notice and permit violations. **Al & Mary Harris** and **Dan Weaver (OMI-NIA)** are concerned about the loss of funding for Neighborhood Safety Partnership (NSP). They are the only organization in the OMI working on Public Safety and keeping crime down. **Babette Drefke (EMIA)** is ever-vigilant about rebuilding the 19th Street steps. **Nancy Wuerful (SPEAK)** updated the mayor on the Natural Areas Program proposed tree removals in city parks. **Ramona Albright (TPC&OSC)** could not be at the meeting to speak to the issue with Nancy. **Lee Ann Prifti (DHIA)** closed the meeting with a compliment to the Mayor about the "excellent handling of a Diamond Heights issue by the SFPD." Unfortunately Kathy Howard and Gerry Crowley didn't get a chance to speak because of time constraints, but will at the next meeting. Others at the meeting were: George & Katherine Zaback and Dona Crowder (TPIA), Cheryl Brodie and Richard Shadoian (SFNA), Steven Currier (OMRA), Hiroshi Fukuda (RCA), and John Munz (ETNA).

As to the CSFN Annual Dinner: we are combining the Annual Dinner with the Christmas Party and holding it on the December regular meeting date. We think it will be a wonderful party and that everyone will have a great time!

(And you won't have to bring potluck!)

It's a busy time with the election... and of course the BNP&IP saga continues...

I'm looking forward to seeing you all September 20 at the Coalition General Assembly meeting!

...Judith Berkowitz (EMIA) President

PROP G MAKES GOOD SENSE

CSFN has hosted much discussion about the Golden Gate Park Music Concourse projects – the museums, the underground garage, the adjacent park roads. With the new deYoung opening shortly, the garage nearly complete, and the Academy of Sciences rebuilding, many of these discussions have matured or been put to rest.

As mandated by litigation associated with these projects, the city must install two additional car lanes on Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in the Park. Without intervention, free parking in front of the Strybing Arboretum (now called the SF Botanical Garden) and the Big Rec playing fields is to be replaced with car lanes to and from the Concourse underground garage.

The idea of a four-lane road in the Park has raised the concern of Irving Street merchants, and Richmond and Sunset neighbors, including our members, creating a division within CSFN.

Proposition G addresses this contentious issue by removing the requirement for the additional car lanes on MLK Jr. Dr., ensuring that the road will remain as it is today with just one car lane in each direction between 9th Ave. and Concourse Dr. This simple, direct solution provides access to the Park without the mandated changes that could adversely affect the surrounding neighborhoods.

This plan is so smart and simple that Prop. G has near unanimous support from both sides of the disagreement: Mayor Newsom, Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi, the entire Board of Supervisors, the Inner Sunset Merchants Association, North Park Neighbors Association, the Sierra Club, the Academy of Sciences, the deYoung Museum, and the SF Parks Trust (formerly Friends of Recreation and Parks).

The CSFN Government & Elections Committee unanimously recommends an endorsement of Prop G.

Finally – something sent to the ballot by our Supervisors that solves a problem instead of creating one.

...Submitted by Barbara Meskunas, President, BANG

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Neighborhood Views is published monthly, the official voice of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, Inc., a 501(c)4 Organization.

To Submit Articles: email articles by the fifth of the month to: dougcoms@aol.com. Articles reflect the opinions of the submitter, not necessarily the opinion of the CSFN. We invite material from member organizations as well as rebuttal to articles already printed. Articles are written by the editor unless otherwise designated. We reserve the right to edit where necessary. Member organizations receive the newsletter without charge. Copies: Members/\$10, Non-members/\$15.

CSFN MINUTES: GENERAL MEETING 16 AUGUST 2005

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by President Judy Berkowitz at 7:02 pm at Northern Police Station on Tuesday, 16 August 2005.

QUORUM ascertained: 22 organizations and 7 guests attending.

INTRODUCTION of Delegates and Guests.

PRESENTATION by HOST ORGANIZATIONS: NOPNA, North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association and OMI-NIA, Oceanview, Merced Heights, Ingleside Neighbors in Action.

MINUTES of 19 July '05 MEETING approved as published in August '05 newsletter, page 4.

OFFICERS' REPORTS: See page 5 of August '05 Newsletter

PRESIDENT Judith Berkowitz REPORT: page 3 of August news letter.
*Setting the date for the Annual Dinner and getting commitment from the MAYOR to attend and speak has been most difficult. Not Set Yet! *MEETING with the MAYOR has been postponed to AUGUST 24th, unless otherwise noted.

1st VICE PREZ, Steve Gruel: see July 27th X-COM report on page 5 of newsletter. Dinner: 2 locations considered, no selection yet. Next X-com meeting is 6:00pm Wednesday, August 31st at the Northern Police Station. Bring, make program suggestions by e-mail/phone, OK.

2nd VICE PREZ, Richard Shadoian: NONE

RECORDING SEC'Y, Dick Millet : 19 July '05 Minutes approved.

TREASURER, B. Meskunas, 16 Aug: Cash Activity Report. attached.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, Lionel Brazil: NONE

ANNOUNCEMENT: *Doug Comstock is updating the the CSFN Web site. Please forward changes in officers, contacts, etc to him at dougcoms@aol.com.
*BN+ Workshop: 5:30 pm (T) 30 Aug 05 at Main Library, Hispanic Rm.

SPEAKER: FRANK KELLY, Sec'y of Fire Fighters Local 798 spoke on Proposition "F": This proposition is now an "Ordinance", not a "Charter Amendment" as originally proposed. The intent is to maintain the level of services that will prevent "brown-outs". The CSFN has previously voted to SUPPORT this proposition. Frank says

"thanks for your support".

COMMITTEE REPORTS, see page 5 & 6 of August Newsletter.

COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS, written reports are in August '05 Newsletter.

NEW BUSINESS: Emergency Resolution: the CSFN requests an adequate, appropriate, and ample extension of Planning Commission's review period, re subject legislation at least until October 21 2005. Emergency declared. Resolution passed unanimously. (BV/HPCC)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: SPEAK Resolution to "Preserve the Tuolumne River" is WITHDRAWN.

PROGRAM: by GOVERNMENT & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

PROP 'B': \$208M Street Resurfacing Bond, incl. handicap access, pedestrian safety, sidewalk repair/replacement.

Robert Beck, DPW, spoke in support of this proposition stating that streets have been neglected for too many administrations so need repairs.

Supervisor Sean Elsbernd spoke against; this it is a maintenance issue, not capital improvement, therefore not a Bond item.

PROP 'C': Ethics Commission Charter Amendment
Chas. Marsteller, VNN (CSFN), spoke in support. Supervisor Sean Elsbernd spoke against.

PROP 'D': Dividing Metro Transit Authority,

MTA, Board Appointments

Bob Planthold, Sr. Action Network spoke in support. Andrew Sullivan, Rescue MUNI, spoke against.

PROP 'H': Prohibiting Handguns

Bill Barnes, supporter; no show
Edward Ohaga, spoke against.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

SHOULD THE "CSFN" take a POSITION and/or WRITE ballot arguments per G&E Committee for NOVEMBER BALLOT HANDBOOK?

MOVED (E. Wilson), 2nd: CSFN 'Position' and 'Writing' of Ballot Argument be VOTED separately. PASSED (hand vote)

PROPOSITION 'B', COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Unanimous):

"Oppose" Proposition and "Pay" for Ballot argument. Membership VOTE:

"Oppose PROP 'B'": Moved (Meskunas), 2nd, PASSED: 20 yes 1 no

"Write 'B' Argument": Moved (Meskunas), 2nd, PASSED:



Supervisor Sean Elsbernd argues against Prop B Bonds: We agreed

(Cont'd p.5)

18 yes 3 no

Moved (Currier), 2nd, FAILED: "Limit number of words in Argument." 4/13

PROPOSITION 'C', COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (5 yes, 1 no)

"Endorse" Proposition and "Pay" for Ballot argument.

Membership VOTE:

"Endorse PROP 'C': Moved (Meskunas), 2nd, FAILED:

12 yes 7 no

"Write 'C' Argument: "not considered"

PROPOSITION 'D', COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (3 yes, 1 no)

"Oppose" Proposition and "Pay" for Ballot Argument.

Membership VOTE:

"Oppose PROP 'D'": Moved (Currier), 2nd, PASSED: 15 yes, 2 no

"Write 'D' Argument": Moved (Currier), 2nd PASSED: 13 yes, 3 no

PROPOSITION 'H', COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (4 yes, 2 no)

"Oppose" Proposition; writing of argument "not considered".

Membership VOTE:

"Oppose PROP 'H'": Moved (Meskunas), 2nd, PASSED: 16 yes, 2 no

"Write 'H' Argument": Moved (Meskunas), 2nd, FAILED: 5 yes, 8 no

ADJOURNMENT: 10:04 pm.

...submitted by Dick Millet (PBNA) Recording Secretary

LAND USE & HOUSING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Special Meeting of August 29, 2005.

A Special Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened on August 29, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station.

The Committee heard progress reports on and/or considered the following matters:

- Proposed Better Neighborhoods Planning & Implementation Process legislation:
- Discussion of PIC in BNP&IP legislation: : What is the precedence for it? How much will it increase workload? Staffing. Selection of PIC members. Conflict of interest. Sunshine.
- Bernie Chodin had a one-page summary of financing points.
- The Acting Chair has prepared a list of "Problem Items and Concerns with BNP&IP" which will be turned in to the Commission.

The committee agreed to convene a special meeting on September 6, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

...Submitted by Judith Berkowitz (EMIA) Acting Chair
(More LU & H Committee Reports are on page 6.)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT FOR AUGUST 31, 2005

The CSFN ExComm was called to order at 6:10 p.m. at its regularly scheduled meeting on August 31, 2005 at Northern Police Station by Chair Steven Gruel. Present were: Judith Berkowitz, Doug Comstock, Eileen Boken, Dick Millet, Bud Wilson, and Richard Shadoian. Excused were: Evelyn Wilson, Lionel Brazil and Barbara Meskunas. Guests: Ramona Albright, Babette Drefke and Marilyn Amini.

President's Report: President Judith Berkowitz reported on the CSFN meeting with the Mayor. The meeting went very well with 25 people attending. Numerous issues were presented and discussed with the Mayor. The next meeting with the Mayor will be in either December 2005 or January 2006. The President next reported that she and several other CSFN delegates attended a workshop on the proposed "Better Neighborhood Planning" legislation. Approximately 75 people were there. She noted that there was widespread opposition against the proposed legislation. She added that there will be three Planning Commission hearings on this legislation set for September 1, 8, and 15th in Room 400, City Hall.

1st Vice President's Report: No report.

2nd Vice President's Report: No report

Corresponding Secretary: Excused.

Recording Secretary: No report but acknowledged for having his draft minutes rapidly prepared.

Treasurer: Excused.

Program: The September 20, 2005 program will consist of the presentations by the candidates for treasurer, assessor-recorder, city attorney.

Unfinished Business: President Berkowitz gave a further report on the CSFN Annual dinner which is scheduled for October 18, 2005. About 100 guests are expected with tickets priced at \$50. There will be 3 entrees. The Patio Español will be the location and the keynote speaker will be Carole Migden.

It was moved and duly seconded, that there be no awards presented by the CSFN this year. After discussion, the motion carried 6-1.

New Business: Richard Shadoian raised the possibility of limiting host organization's presentations to 3 minutes. After discussion, it was agreed that host organizations were encouraged to submit articles to the newsletter on their month of "hosting" and that 3 minutes was sufficient time to talk about an organization to the general assembly.

Shadoian also brought up whether the language of CSFN-endorsed ballot arguments should be presented to and ratified by the CSFN Gov't & Elections Committee or by the ExComm prior to submission to the voter handbook. After much discussion, the matter was referred to the Government & Elections Committee.

Announcements: The next ExComm meeting will be October 26, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment at 7:18 p.m.

...Submitted by Steven F. Gruel (GGHNA) Chair, and
Richard Shadoian, (CVIA) 2nd VP

ON TREES, DOGS & MYOPIA

Imagine if trees covered all the areas in every park in the City. No flowery meadows, no mixed shrub and flower borders, no grassy lawns. We would find that our neighborhood parks and recreation areas would not be usable, if trees grew so numerous that by their size, root intrusion and shade creation they crowded out every other type of planted landscape. Everyone loves trees, but trees do not belong everywhere. As it is with neighborhood parks, so it is with the City's thirty-three Natural Areas: there are spots where the trees have crowded out everything else.

This is why biologists and botanists who helped formulate a draft Management Plan for the Natural Areas in the City have prescribed removal of 3,400 trees over twenty years. Mary McAllister's article in the August CSFN newsletter makes this sound like a drastic measure, but it is not too large a number when you consider the trade-off. The trees removed will permit new shrub, flower and grassy areas to be created. It will permit the establishment of suitable habitat for insects, birds and ground creatures that have been evicted over the years as our human settlement has taken shape. We have bulldozed, filled and tamed all but these rare remnants of native open space. In our more enlightened times, we use the term "stewardship" to express our obligation to the rare and special place where we live. But it is time to make amends. Stewardship instructs us in these small acts of restoration.

Has Mary McAllister forgotten that she took part in three months of deliberations with five other members of a special ad hoc advisory committee, who succeeded in making many changes to the draft Natural Areas Management Plan? Most people agree that the Plan is much better for it. Upon receiving the suggestions that she and others on the committee made, staff modified the Plan for presentation at a series of workshops during late Spring of this year, after which more than 500 comments forms were received by Recreation and Parks staff from the public. Why does McAllister persist in her negative comments about this Plan which she has had such a central role in formulating? Even the basic goals of the Plan were modified, resulting in the creation of three categories of Natural Areas: those areas that are in more or less ecologically intact and as close to pristine native habitats as we have in the City (18% of the acreage); those that are somewhat compromised and can be restored over time by the removal of non-native species that crowd out native species (38% of the acreage); and, urban forest areas that will remain almost entirely unchanged, including retention of the non-native eucalyptus trees (49% of the acreage).

The public has been assured that access to the Natural Areas will not be changed when Natural Areas are restored, as the off-leash dog organizations had feared. It remains for the off-leash dog advocates to be up front about their goals. Are dogs and their unleashed access to every area in our Park system what concern McAllister, an avid dog advocate, most?

...Submitted by Pinky Kushner, SPEAK

REPORTS OF MEETINGS HELD BY LAND USE & HOUSING COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting of September 6, 2005. The Regular Rescheduled Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened on Tuesday, September 6, 2005 at 6:15 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station.

The committee reviewed the comments made during the first public hearing on the proposed Better Neighborhoods Planning legislation that was held by the Planning Commission on the 1st of September.

After evaluating these comments, the committee discussed preparations for public comment at the next public hearing on this legislation scheduled for the 8th of September. The committee voted to write a letter urging the Planning Commission to:

- 1) return the proposed Better Neighborhoods Planning legislation to the Board of Supervisors and request the proposed legislation be redrafted as an amendment to the Planning Code instead of being proposed as an amendment to the Administrative Code;
- 2) address the numerous flaws in the procedure by which the proposed legislation was introduced for consideration by the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission; and
- 3) consider ten amendments to the proposed legislation.

The committee voted to convene a special meeting on Monday, the 12th of September.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Special Meeting of September 12, 2005. The Special Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened on September 12, 2005 at 6:12 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station.

The committee reviewed the results of the second public hearing held on September 8, 2005 by the Planning Commission on the proposed Better Neighborhoods Planning legislation and delegated to a subcommittee the preparation of a position paper to be presented at the third public hearing scheduled for September 15, 2005 by the Planning Commission on the proposed Better Neighborhoods Planning legislation.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

...John Bardis (ISAC) Chairman

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

**CSFN'S ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER
2005**

**THIS YEAR OUR ANNUAL HOLIDAY PARTY
WILL SERVE AS AN AWARDS DINNER AS WELL**

CSFN GOVERNMENT & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF AUGUST 30, 2005 MEETING

The G & E Committee met as scheduled on 8/30/05 at 7PM at the Lucky Penny Restaurant at Masonic and Geary. Members present were Cheryl Brodie, Doug Comstock, Sharon Eberhardt, Mary Harris, Tony Sacco and Barbara Meskunas.

G & E considered the two late November ballot measures, A and G.

Prop A, the City College Bonds, was placed on the ballot at the last minute and did not garner unanimous support from its own Board. The Committee reviewed the newspaper reports of nonpublic meetings, read the proposal disclosure that state law would permit these monies to be redirected once approved by the voters, and decided that the timing was not right for this \$246 million (not counting interest) bond. Vote was 4 to recommend opposition, 2 against.

Prop G, the concourse garage proposal, is a legally required adjustment that will eliminate the need to widen the southern entrance to Golden Gate Park to create dedicated garage entrance lanes. Prop G is a sound compromise to the garage entrance debate-the committee voted unanimously to recommend support.

Proponents and opponents for each measure have been invited to the 9/20 meeting.

...Submitted by Barbara Meskunas (BANG) Chair

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS COUNCIL & THE MAYOR'S OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES WOULD LIKE TO INVITE YOU TO OUR JIM DIERS PRESENTATION

WEDNESDAY, SEPT 14 - 6PM TO 8PM
Wednesday, Sept. 14th • 6PM to 8PM
Reception at 5:30pm
Milton Marks Auditorium
California State Building
455 Golden Gate Ave.

Jim Diers, community innovator and former head of Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods will share his book, *Neighborhood Power*, and his experience in this evening presentation.

Jim Diers has developed highly acclaimed strategies for community development and citizen empowerment. He offers real-life examples of how to build active, creative neighborhoods; his proven programs help government officials embrace citizen activists as true partners.

How To Reach Us

President: Judith Berkowitz • sfjberk@mac.com • 824-0617
1st Vice President: Steve Gruel • attystevengruel@sbcglobal.net
2nd Vice President: Richard Shadoian • sfrichard@earthlink.net
Treasurer: Barbara Meskunas • sfmeskunas@aol.com
Recording Secretary: Dick Millet • milletdick@yahoo.com
Corresp. Secretary: Lionel Brazil • lbrazil@excelsiordistrict.org
Member at Large: Eileen Boken • aeboken@msn.com
Member at Large: Doug Comstock • dougcoms@aol.com
Member at Large: Bud Wilson • ewilson981@msn.com

Parliamentarian: Evelyn Wilson,
evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net

262-0440



Thanks to Our Sponsors 2005

BENEFACTORS

*San Francisco Apartment Assn.
Residential Builders Assn.
Spotlight Printing*

PATRONS

*Rebecca Silverberg
Retired Firemen & Widows Assn. of SFFD
Law Offices of Angela Alioto*

SPONSORS

<i>Katherine Howard, ASLA</i>	<i>Ramona Albright</i>
<i>Sharon M. Eberhardt</i>	<i>Robert L. Speer</i>
<i>Lee Ann Prifti</i>	<i>David & Karen Crommie</i>
<i>Mary McAllister</i>	<i>Cheryl C. Brodie</i>
<i>Dick Millet</i>	<i>Kelly & David Pascal</i>
<i>OMI Neighbors in Action</i>	<i>Al & Mary Harris</i>
<i>Joan Girardot</i>	<i>Suzanne D. Cauthen</i>
<i>Judith Berkowitz</i>	<i>Doug Comstock</i>
<i>Barbara Meskunas</i>	<i>John Bardis</i>
<i>Ed Jew/SWEAP</i>	<i>Charles B. Dicke</i>
<i>Cow Hollow Assn.</i>	<i>Anita Grier</i>
<i>Greg Corrales</i>	<i>Jim Siegel</i>
<i>Francis Somsel</i>	<i>Patricia Vaughney</i>
<i>New Mission Terrace Improvement Assn.</i>	
<i>Leland Yee, Speaker Pro Tem, Assembly, 12th District</i>	
<i>Hon. Quentin Kopp</i>	

Committee Meetings

Land Use & Housing • Monday Aug 15th 6PM;
Mon. Aug 29, 6PM at Northern Police Stn.
Chair: John Bardis • jbardis@xdm.com 776-2014
Bylaws Chair: Evelyn Wilson: evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net 566-7826
Government and Elections • Tuesday, Aug 30th 6PM
Inquire for location. Chair: Barbara Meskunas
sfmeskunas@aol.com
Newsletter Chair: Mary Helen Briscoe 346-1448
Open Space Chair: Ramona Albright 621-9621
Transportation Chair: George Zaback 564-5223
Water Task Force Chair: Joan Girardot 346-5525

Agenda

General Assembly Meeting September 20, 2005

- 6:30 I. Sign In and Refreshments
- 7:00 II. Call to Order/Ascertain Quorum
 - A. Introduction of Delegates and Guests
- Panhandle Residents Organization, Stanyan-Fulton – PRO/SF
- Potrero Boosters neighbors Association – PBNA
- 7:10 III. Approval of August 2005 Minutes
- 7:15 IV. Officers' Reports
 - A. President
 - B. Vice Presidents
 - C. Secretaries
 - D. Treasurer
- 7:20 V. Committee Action Items – written reports are in Newsletter
 - A. Land Use & Housing
 - B. Media Relations
 - C. Open Space
 - D. Water Task Force
- 7:30 VI. Gov't & Elections – Ballot Measures
 - A. Recommendation to Oppose Prop. A – College Bonds
 - B. Recommendation to Support Prop G – Concourse Garage
- 8:00 VII. Program – Candidates for Assessor, Treasurer, City Attorney
- 9:15 VIII. Unfinished Business
- 9:30 VIII. New Business
- 9:40 IX. Announcements
- 9:45 X. Adjournment

Visitors Please Sign the Visitors Roster

Location: Northern Police Station, Fillmore & Turk Streets (Parking in Rear)
Public Transit: MUNI #22 Fillmore, 31 Balboa & 38 Geary Lines



PO Box 320098 • San Francisco • 94132

Program/Action Items Final Ballot Issue Endorsements/Page 7

Next Meeting
TUESDAY
Sept
20th

Inside

- 10 Reasons to Oppose "Better Neighbhds"1
- Endorsements.....1
- Editorial: Better? Neighborhoods.....2
- President's Message.....3
- Yes on Prop G Opinion.....3
- Aug Draft Minutes/Gen Assembly.....4
- Aug ExComm Report5
- Land Use & Housing Report5 & 6
- Natural Areas Rebuttal.....6
- Gov't & Elections Committee Report.....7