

UNDERSTANDING REDEVELOPMENT

The SF Redevelopment Agency is perhaps the least understood local government agency. Most people remember when Redevelopment invaded the Fillmore District forty-some years ago, displacing thousands of black San Franciscans, their beautiful Victorian homes and their businesses, all for the sake of removing what some bureaucrats considered to be “blight.” The bulldozers demolished everything that wasn’t moved.

The destruction of the Fillmore District was enabled by the creation of the first Redevelopment Project Area in San Francisco, the “A-1,” by the Board of Supervisors. Unfortunately, many more followed.

The A-1 Project Area, in retrospect, was a disaster. An artificial community model took the place of a thriving ethnic neighborhood; no grandiose “Jazz District” proclamations from City Hall will ever replace the genuine and spontaneous community that was deliberately destroyed.

Why did it happen? Some would argue that it was racism, but the real driving force was money – *our* money.

Here’s how it works. When a Project Area is created, the tax base of the designated geographical area is determined and used thereafter as a calculation baseline. From that point on, ***Redevelopment is entitled to exclusive use of all increases in property tax revenues generated in the Project Area*** – these revenues are called “tax increment.” The agency can also sell bonds secured against future tax increment without voter approval, can give public money directly to favored developers and businesses in the form of tax rebates, free land, free public improvements, and even cash grants, and can condemn private property through the use of eminent domain in order to generate more tax revenues from a different use. (For example, a property for which lower taxes are collected because of Prop. 13 protections could be condemned, taken without the owner’s consent, and replaced with a new building, generating an increase of many times more tax dollars, all of which the Redevelopment Agency is entitled to keep.)

Redevelopment is allowed to decimate neighborhoods by declaring them “blighted.” There is no

(Cont’d on p 6)

DALY MAKES HIS CASE, TWICE

In an evening packed with ballot endorsements, good government resolutions — including several emergency motions (see Minutes), the rare appearance of Supervisor Chris Daly addressing two ballot measures close to his heart dominated the March meeting.

Prop C, dealing with the composition of the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, would increase representation by elected officials: most notably, the Mayor himself. Currently the Mayor has a representative on the Authority. This legislation would make it mandatory for the mayor himself to go to the Authority meetings. The Mayor is not fond of this idea and is doing what he can to quash it. Daly, who is a strong advocate for construction of the new Transbay Terminal, located in his district, told CSFN that a panel made up of bureaucrats has an incentive to keep postponing action, whereas elected officials, who are held accountable by the voters, will be motivated to get the project off the ground. Daly feels the \$4 billion regional transit project is enormously important to the future of the Bay Area but fears it is a low priority for the Mayor. His argument was strong enough to convince a few delegates to go against the recommendation of CSFN’s Government and Elections Committee, and vote in favor of the measure. Nevertheless, the majority of delegates decided to oppose Prop C.

Daly was on shakier ground when he presented the case for Prop A, the Homicide Prevention Plan. In an amendment to the Administrative Code, it would set aside \$10 million a year for three years to mitigate the causes of violent crime through programs ranging from job creation to witness protection. When asked to describe the kinds of programs and jobs that would be “created,” Daly said that, the “council” (established as part of Measure A) would determine all that. “Not good enough,” said Nancy Wuerfel (SPEAK), “I have to know more if I’m going to vote for this. Are you talking about WPA-type job creation?” Again, Daly deferred to the decision of the future panel.

Espanola Jackson (BHPCC) strongly criticized Daly



Supervisor Chris Daly wants to insure that the Transbay Terminal project gets underway.

(Cont’d on p 6)

A COMING ATTRACTION

Starting next month the CSFN newsletter will publish an interview with one of our member group's delegates. Although host delegates have a chance to talk about their neighborhood at a meeting, not all delegates are present to listen, and individual neighborhood concerns are important enough to bear repetition.

We would like to encourage delegates to participate in the newsletter, and let us know what their city-wide concerns are along with those of their own neighborhood. There will be an opportunity for photos as well.

Some questions asked will be:

Why did your group join CSFN?

What kind of help can CSFN give to your group?

What one priority would your group like to accomplish?

What do you love about your neighborhood? Picture?

What do you hate about your neighborhood? Picture?

Who of your group would you like to honor? Picture?

What are your priorities for SF?

Please give us your opinions and suggestions on this idea at mhbriscoe@pacbell.net, ma-miller@msn.com, sfjberk@mac.com, dougcoms@aol.com.

...*The Newsletter Advisory Committee*

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@sbcglobal.net

Treasurer: Barbara Meskunas • sfmeskunas@aol.com

Recording Secretary: Dick Millet • millettick@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



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 NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES ITS 2006 LEADERSHIP NOMINATIONS

The nominating committee recommends the following for office in the 2006–2007 term:

President: Judy Berkowitz, East Mission Improvement Association.

First Vice President: Mary Helen Briscoe, Panhandle Residents Organization Stanyan Fulton.

Second Vice President: Hiroshi Fukuda, Richmond Community Association.

Recording Secretary: Dick Millet, Portrero Boosters Neighborhood Association.

Corresponding Secretary: Lionel Brazil, Excelsior District Improvement Association.

Treasurer: Jim Lew, North Beach Neighbors Association.

ExComm Members at Large: Joan Girardot, Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association;

Angelique Mahan, Excelsior District Improvement Association; **Tony Sacco**, New Mission Terrace

Improvement Association; **Babette Drefke**, East Mission Improvement Association.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor in the April meeting.

Voting by ballot will take place at the May meeting.

*...Submitted by Mary Russo McAfee, Chair (WPNA),
Mary C. Harris (OMI-NIA), John Barry (SHARP)*

EXCOMM REPORT

Absent: Gruel, Millet, B. Wilson

Guests: Ramona Albright, Babette Drefke, Joan Girardot
Meeting called to order at 7:07pm by Richard Shadoian
2nd Vice President

2. Additions to agenda: Review of Role of President added to new business at the request of Ramona Albright.

3. Reports

a. President: Better Neighborhood Plus legislation being amended by original authors

b. 1st VP no report

2nd VP all resolutions approved at our last general meeting have been distributed. It is the responsibility of the original authors to provide the 2nd VP with an electronic copy of the FINAL resolution, a draft of a cover letter and a distribution list before the final resolution can be transmitted.

c. Secretaries Reports No reports

d. \$804 has been spent on ballot arguments for No on A and yes on D Doug Comstock reported that their will be a new charge of \$30/month for the production of our newsletter

4. We approved the April 2006 agenda with the following amendments: spell out all names of organizations besides giving their initials.

F and G reversed under VI

Program at 8pm will be candidates for elective office

Move approval of new members to 1st VP report

Add Special Order of Business for the approval of by-law changes.

Suggestions for May meeting: Fred Abadi new director of DPW and Ed Lee, City Administrator

5. Unfinished business

Audit will be done after April 15

6. New Business

E. Boken concerned about language in newsletter

D. Comstock requests more colorful writing of articles for the newsletter

Greg Scott, President of PHRA represented his organization and won unanimous approval for sending on PHRA to the GA for consideration for membership

Lively discussion about the role of the President

7. Announcements

Next EX Comm April 26

Ramona reported that Kathy Howard will be honored by SF Tomorrow for her work on saving the trees in GGP

8 Meeting adjourned 8:20pm

...Richard Shadoian (CVIA) Acting Chair

DRAFT MINUTES: GENERAL MEETING 21 MARCH 2006

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Pres. Judy Berkowitz at 7:12 pm at Northern Police Station, Tuesday, 21 MARCH 2006

QUORUM ascertained: 21 organizations and 7 guests attending.

INTRODUCTION of Delegates and Guests.

HOST ORGANIZATION presentation: Twin Peaks Improvement Ass'n (TPIA) & West Presidio Neighborhood Ass'n (WPNA).

OFFICERS REPORTS:

President's MESSAGE: Judy Berkowitz, page 2, Mar. '06 Newsletter. Judy thanked the CSFN for their support and attendance at Mayor's meeting on March 15.

1st VICE PREZ, Steve Gruel, None, absent.

2nd VICE PREZ, Richard Shadoian: Announced that all "resolution" submittals must be e-mailed to the 2nd VP in order to have letters written.

RECORDING SEC'Y, Dick Millet: 21 Feb. '06 Minutes in Mar. '06 Newsletter, page 5 Moved/2nd/approved as printed in newsletter.

TREASURER, B. Meskunas: Cash Activity Report as of 21 March '06 submitted.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, Lionel Brazil: Hosting Schedule, see page 7 of Feb 06 newsletter.

ACTION ITEMS:

LAND USE COMMITTEE resolutions:

* Be it RESOLVED that the CSFN urges the Planning Commission to request the Board of Supervisors to refer to the Planning Commission the proposed "Better Neighborhoods Planning & Implementation Process" ordinance as amended to date for hearing and recommendation. Moved, 2nd, PASSED verbally.

* Be it RESOLVED the CSFN urges the Board of Supervisors to refer to the Planning Commission the proposed "Better Neighborhoods Planning and Implementation Process" ordinance as amended to date for hearing and recommendation. Moved, 2nd, Passed verbally.

BYLAWS COMMITTEE PROPOSED CHANGE: changing "Eligibility for Office" will be voted on a April meeting: "ELIGIBILITY FOR OFFICE. Only those delegates or alternates duly representing member organizations in good standing, and who have attended at least six meetings within the 12 months including the April meeting immediately preceding the May meeting wherein the candidate will stand for election, shall be eligible to run for office."

PROGRAM: by GOVERNMENT AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

SF REFUSE (garbage) RATE PAYER ADVOCATE, LINDA EGGERTH: Linda presented the process and status of Garbage rate application increases requested by Sunset Scavenger Co., Golden Gate Disposal and SF Recycling & Disposal Inc. all subsidiaries of NORCAL. Present \$19.08 (32 gal. container) requested rate to go to \$23.57 in 2007 increasing annually up to \$26.37 or \$29.58 in 2011.

Staff recommendation is present \$19.08 to \$18.93 in 2007 then increasing annually to \$21.15 or \$23.73 in 2011. Not yet a done deal.

Linda recommends getting personally involved. Send

comments to: Robert Beck, Dept. Public Works, <robert.beck@sfdpw.org>

BALLOT PROPOSITION "A," "Homicide Prevention" Plan, Survivor Assistance, Funding Violence Prevention Programs and appropriates \$10 M for the next 3 years, \$30M total. Supervisors Daly, Ammiano, Maxwell, Mirkarimi sponsors. CSFN Gov. & Elections recommends a NO on Proposition A and that we write an opposing ballot argument. Moved, 2nd, PASSED. (17-0-0)

BALLOT PROPOSITION "C," Transbay Joint Powers Authority membership. Establishes designation of the 3 S.F. members:

a) the Mayor; b) Supervisor (Daly) of the district (6) in which the terminal is located; a representative of the City of SF appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Daly (author of legislation) spoke in FAVOR of C: wants membership to be elected of_cials rather than beaurocrats. Mike Farrah, of the Mayor's Of_ice spoke in lieu of the Mayor: forces the Mayor to attend these meetings. Government and Elections recommends "NO on C," Yes to oppose. Moved, 2nd, FAILED, (6 yes, 9 no, 2 abstentions) so CSFN takes no position.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTIONS:

CLOSURE OF GOLDEN GATE PARK STREETS TO PARKING ON SATURDAY (6 month trial) by Supervisor McGoldrick. Tomasita Medal spoke against the legislation. CSFN not support this Legislation, YES vote means NO. Moved, 2nd, PASSED (15 yes, 2 no).

OPPOSITION TO "3575 Geary Blvd 150 unit SENIOR HOUSING PROJECT" submitted by Laurel Heights Improvement Assoc. LHIA: Be it RESOLVED that the CSFN express its opposition to the "3575 Geary Blvd Project" to the Planning Commission and request, in writing, that the Commission deny the "Project" as proposed, deny certi_cation of the Final Environmental Impact Report, and approve a plan that downsizes the of_ice space, omits the conference center, increases parking, and retains the senior housing units (150) within a 50 foot building height. Moved, 2nd, PASSED (14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain)

REQUEST TABLING OF "EIR" RATIFICATION OF BAYVIEW/HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT requested by Bayview/Hunters Point Neighborhood Group (BANG): Be it RESOLVED that the CSFN urge the Board of Supervisors to "table" the rati_cation of the Bayview/Hunters Point Redevelopment project area amendment at least until California voters decide in November whether to limit eminent domain; and be it further resolved that the SF Neighbors that comprise the Coalition pledge to stand together against the unwanted intrusion of the Redevelopment Agency into any San Francisco neighborhood. Moved, 2nd, TABLED (12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

SPEAK resolution urging the Mayor to demonstrate good government by denying operational cost shifting by city departments to the garbage ratepayers. Be it RESOLVED that the CSFN urges the Mayor to demonstrate his support for good government transparency and accountability by not allowing the garbage rates to become a way of secretly taxing people for City services without their knowing it; and further resolved that the Mayor stop

the precedent of shifting City costs to garbage ratepayers by exercising his power to withdraw from the 2006 Norcal garbage rate application both the proposed 5-year budget of \$6M for the DPW and the costs associated with expanding the city litter can pickups, plus requiring that departmental efficiencies offset those deletions, and to also review the proposed budget for the former “Solid Waste Management Program” funded by the Impound Account in the garbage rates to ensure it demonstrates cost effectiveness and efficient use of public funds, and that the Mayor act on this request by March 29, 2006 so that the DPW Director’s Report reflects these cost deletions. Moved, 2nd, PASSED (13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: Neighborhood Seismic Safety and Earthquake Disaster Preparedness concern and support is requested by Charley Marsteller of Van Ness Neighbors (VNN): Charley spoke of the resolution before the CSFN: an action list on the issues of seismic public safety. He referred to land uses, evacuation plans, survival training (NERT), survival kits, Bldg Code changes. Resolution for CSFN support full text in Feb NL. Moved 2nd PASSED unanimously

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

MEDIA RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Needs members or won’t exist. Next meeting: 5:00pm Monday, 17 April at Northern Station.

ADJOURNMENT: 10:10 pm.

...Dick Millet (PBNA) Recording Secretary

POLICY TO DENY PUBLIC ACCESS ISLAIS LANDING WATERFRONT PARK

At the Third Street bridge over Islais Creek, Islais Landing Waterfront Park was intended to be San Francisco’s premier public launching pier for kayaks and canoes. In fact the “Public” Pier in Islais Landing is a superb example of how a launching pier for kayaks, canoes, and other small boats should be built. It is well-made and sturdy; it floats with the tide; it is low in the water. Piers for larger boats are usually so high above the water that they are unsafe for launching a kayak or canoe. Clearly the designer gave this launching pier a lot of thought.

Unfortunately, the “Public” Pier is locked with a massive and rusty padlock. In a 6-months long period of visiting this park the locked, rusty padlock hasn’t changed and inquiries among the local store owners indicate the Public Pier has not been open for some time. Sadly, the City feels no appreciation for, or need to maintain, this lovely Public Pier.

The “2 HOUR PARKING” sign and the rusty padlock forcefully indicate that Islais Park is no longer intended to encourage use of San Francisco shoreline and waterfront. The padlock clearly denies access. The parking limitation confirms it by making launch of a canoe or kayak pointless, even if the “Public” Pier were open and maintained. Taking a kayak or canoe from a car requires 15-minutes, then putting it back on the car takes at least the same time. A quick 1-hour 30-minutes on the water is barely enough time to get from Islais Landing down Islais Creek to the Bay water, then turn around and come

back. This kind of “maintenance” deliberately flaunts the lack of practical access and use.

In 2001, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors directed that Islais Landing Waterfront Park be maintained with public access as a special condition [II-B-2] imposed on SFPUC construction. See: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions01/r0520-01.pdf>. Is the padlock a symbol of “public access” for the present Board of Supervisors...? Oops...!

Blessed with both climate and shoreline, San Francisco’s Bay waterfront should be one of the most active on the west coast.

Instead, access to the water is almost impossible (unless you are a member of a private club, or you are willing to pay \$25 for each access, or you are willing to use the other public pier, designed for large boats). Compare this to any of the other coastal cities of California, Oregon, or Washington. Most of San Francisco’s public waterfront south of the ball park is squalid and neglected. Islais Landing Waterfront Park is only moderately filthy compared to other parks. What Islais Landing Waterfront Park does show, however, is a deliberate policy to deny public access.

There is a remedy: [1] Persons wishing to launch canoes or kayaks should be able to obtain the Pier gate key. It is not unreasonable to require a key deposit, but it is unreasonable to simply deny access. [2] Along with the key should be provided a day parking permit to display on the dashboard of the car. The money spent to build and improve the Park, including the Park parking spaces, was not spent to provide short-term parking for the neighborhood, it was spent to provide access to the Park and to the water. [3] Directions, telephone numbers, and other information for such Park Access and Use should be provided by signs. [4] General maintenance of Islais Landing Waterfront Park should be brought up the same standards as obtain in more affluent parts of San Francisco. There should not be a special “slum maintenance standard” for parks in areas south of Market and near the shipyards.

Wayne Lanier (PROSF)

This is the third and last in a series on waterfront parks in eastern SF. “Park maintenance is currently a priority in San Francisco...” SF Performance Report 2005.

You can read about the City’s plan [The HUB Project] for Islais Park at: <http://www.islaiscreek.org/baytrailoperationislaislub.html>.

objective definition of blight – blight is pretty much whatever Redevelopment says it is at the time. For that reason, most court challenges of the designation eventually prevail. But how does the average property owner victim know that, when most taxpayers don't have the slightest idea how enormous in scale is this misappropriation of our tax dollars?

A study was completed in 2000 that determined Redevelopment agencies consume **8%** of all property taxes statewide, which at the time was \$11.5 billion. But total indebtedness for bonds issued by local agencies topped **\$41 billion**. Redevelopment agencies and the Project Areas designated thereafter are created without the vote of the taxpayers that will eventually repay all of this money, with interest.

Redevelopment does not pay for schools or libraries, does not fix streets, and does not pay for police or fire protection. Simply, it takes our money and spends it to benefit friends and supporters of whatever Mayor is calling the shots at the time. In San Francisco, hundreds of millions of dollars have been directly diverted from the city's tax base in recent years, money that could have gone directly into the General Fund. Instead, our Supervisors increase user fees every year to cover budget shortfalls, and rubber-stamp all new requests from Redevelopment because they seldom consider the consequences of their actions.

This discussion is timely because the Board of Supervisors is poised to create two new Project Areas this year – the Mid-Market; and Bayview-Hunter's Point, the latter being the largest in the Agency's history, covering over 2500 acres, almost an entire zip code.

Anyone who follows real estate knows that Bayview home prices are rising, and that commercial development is booming in Mid-Market. Both areas would undoubtedly do quite well without interference from Redevelopment.

These two new project areas are on the fast track to approval because many of the Redevelopment Agency's older Project Areas, like the A-2 Western Addition, are due to expire in the next few years, and replacement Project Areas must be designated now if the agency's bloated payroll and team of politically-connected contractors is going to be maintained. Plus, taxpayers have grown weary of approving new general obligation affordable housing bond proposals, turning down the last two because there was no discernable, responsible oversight authority for the money requested. To compensate, tax increment monies are being shifted outside of the project areas that generate them keep non-profit housing developers afloat; "affordable" housing now

consumes a super majority of Redevelopment's tax increment revenues.

Every taxpayer in San Francisco should consider the devastating effect that the creation of these two new Project Areas will have on our General Fund **for decades to come** – your grandchildren will still be paying back the debt about to be incurred this year by this insidious expansion of an agency whose usefulness has been in grave doubt for over fifty years. Call your Supervisors and ask them to vote against these Project Areas. And then ask the Mayor why he's not keeping his campaign promise to scale back Redevelopment, but appears to be expanding it, instead.

...Submitted by Barbara Meskunas, Beideman Area Neighborhood Group, (A-2 Project Area)

for the arrogance implicit in the measure, (Who are you to) "tell the people of Bayview Hunters Point what they need to do." Joined by Francisco Da Costa (BHPCC), they insisted that the problem was the result of a lack of jobs and referred to a city policy requiring employment of San Franciscans for city openings. "Why aren't African Americans getting these jobs?" they asked Daly. "And I'm not talking about Muni," added Espanola.

Barbara Meskunas (BANG), who has done extensive work in public housing, also expressed skepticism. "I'm on a citizens' advisory committee for the Western Addition. These meetings go on and on and the nonprofits end up talking to each other and nothing gets done. I don't want the city to give money to all the same people and repeat the mistakes of the past."

Delegates voted to oppose Prop A. For Daly, who spoke at length and graciously answered questions while bouncing a sleepy toddler in his arms, it was, alas, not a successful evening.

...Karen Crommie (CVIA)

THE PUC ANSWERS QUESTIONS

1) Is a portion of the water/sewer bill used for street cleaning?

Water fees are used only for water-related projects and wastewater fees are only allocated towards wastewater-related projects. This allows us to have a clear accounting of the money that is being spent in the PUC. Although we don't fund the street cleaning program, we do rely on DPW's engineering and construction services when fixing broken sewer mains or side sewer connections. It has to do with the transfer of wastewater programs over to the PUC from DPW a while back. For some reason, not all the functions required to have a fully autonomous wastewater group were transferred over. So thus, even though we are responsible for maintaining the sewers, we still have to contract out sewer engineering and construction services to DPW. I think there is a pretty high overhead that we are charged for their services. There is the possibility that they use some of the money from their services and allocate to other areas like street cleaning, but you would have to ask DPW to make sure.

2) Why don't we have a capacity fee for new development?

You are correct that our Commission, at the recommendation of the Rate Fairness Board, passed a new Wastewater Capacity Charge that was supposed to be effective as of July 1, 2005. There have been quite a few hiccups and hurdles to getting it fully implemented. I actually have just recently been asked to help with this process to make sure we can get it up and running as soon as possible. Over the last two weeks, we've made some significant progress and are close to implementing the charge. Rest assured, we plan to review building permit applications filed since July 1, 2005 and will go after any new development or expanding developments that fit the criteria.

a) What is the timeline?

We are estimating in the next 2-3 weeks that we will have a full-fledged Wastewater Capacity Charge program which includes a PUC staff person assigned to DBI to monitor any new permit applications.

b) What is the PUC doing to get the Board of Supervisors to increase capacity fees?

Sometime in the coming year the Rate Fairness Board will convene again to look at rate setting issues. One item that will be on their plate is to evaluate the capacity charge. If after their review, they propose an increase of the fees then our Commission will need to vote on it. The BOS does not set water/wastewater rates. They can only reject any proposed rate changes offered by our Commission.

Hopefully this answers your questions. Let me know if you have any other follow-up questions or concerns I can help you with.

...Tyrone Jue, submitted by Judith Berkowitz (EMIA)



Committee Meetings

Land Use & Housing • Monday March 20th 6PM;
at Northern Police Stn. • Chair: John Bardis •
jbardis@xdm.com 776-2014

Media Relations • Monday March 20th 5PM;
at Northern Stn. • Chair: Richard Shadoian •
sfrichard@sbcglobal.net • 387-9085

Bylaws • Chair: Evelyn Wilson • 566-7826 •
evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net

Government & Elections • Chair: Barbara Meskunas •
sfmeskunas@aol.com

Newsletter • Chair: Mary Helen Briscoe • 346-1448

Open Space • Chair: Ramona Albright • 621-9621

Water Task Force • Chair: Joan Girardot • 346-5525

BENEFACTORS

San Francisco Apartment Association
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
Residential Builders Assn

PATRONS

Retired Firemen & Widows Assn of SF
Law Offices of Steven F. Gruel

SPONSORS

Hon. Quentin & Mara Kopp
Buena Vista Neighborhood Assn
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Assn
Excelsior District Improvement Assn
Forest Knolls Neighborhood Org
Laurel Heights Improvement Assn
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Creek Harbor Assn
New Mission Terrace Improvement Assn
North Beach Neighbors
OMI Neighbors in Action
PRO-SF

Richmond Community Assn
Russian Hill Improvement Assn
Russian Hill Neighbors

SPEAK

Twin Peaks Improvement Assn
Van Ness Neighbors
Friends of the Music Concourse
SF Taxpayers Union
John Bardis
Judith Berkowitz
Sue Cauthen
Karen & David Crommie
Joan Girardot

Al & Mary Harris
Ed Jew
Fiona Ma for Assembly
Barbara Meskunas
Dick Millet
Frank Noto
Janet Reilly for
Assembly
Richard Shadoian
Patricia Vaughey

Our Sponsors 2006!

HOSTING ORDER

April: BVHPCC & BANG
May: VNN & HAIA

Agenda

General Assembly Meeting

April 18, 2006

- 6:30 I. Sign In and Refreshments
- 7:00 II. Call to Order/Ascertain Quorum
 - A. Introduction of Delegates and Guests
 - B. Hosts
 - 1. Bayview Hunters Point Coordinating Council / BHPCC
 - 2. Beideman Area Neighborhood Group / BANG
- 7:15 III. Approval of March 2006 Minutes
- 7:20 IV. Officers' Reports
 - A. President
 - B. Vice Presidents - Approval of New Member
 - C. Secretaries
 - D. Treasurer
- 7:30 V. Committee Action Items - written reports are in April 2006 newsletter
 - A. Land Use & Housing
 - B. Media Relations
 - C. Open Space
 - D. Water Task Force
 - E. Gov't & Elections
- 8:00 VI. Program -- Candidates' Night
- 9:15 VII. Unfinished Business
 - A. Special Order of Business, By Laws Committee / By Law Changes
 - B. Nominating Committee reports
 - C. Nominations from the General Assembly Floor
- 9:25. VIII. New Business
- 9:35 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

ACTION ITEMS

- Govt & Elections Endorsements
- Emergency Resolution: Garbage Rates - **SPEAK**
- Resolution Re Seismic Safety (Feb Issue)
- Resolution Re Better Neighborhoods - p. 7

Next Meeting

TUESDAY
April
18th

Inside

Geary Bus Rapid Transit.....	1
Controller Ed Harrington.....	1
President's Message.....	2
Rincon Park Loss.....	3
Warm Water Cove Trashed.....	4
Divisadero Corridor.....	4
Govt & Elections.....	5
February Draft Minutes.....	5
Media Relations Report.....	6
Land Use and Housing.....	7