



Community Coalition Sues the City of San Francisco Over Waterfront Planning

San Francisco's waterfront is a spectacular resource enjoyed by millions of tourists, commuters and residents each year. On August 18, 2010, six community groups challenged the City's recent violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in planning the future of that waterfront. They filed a lawsuit to reverse the City's endorsement of the Planning Department's Northeast Embarcadero Study — which included exceeding current height limits on the Embarcadero — without first conducting an environmental review as required by state law (CEQA).

Litigants include Neighbors to Preserve the Waterfront, Friends of Golden Gateway (FOGG), Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Golden Gateway Tenants Association, the San Francisco Neighborhood Network and San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth. The lawsuit requests a writ of mandate ordering the Planning Commission to rescind actions endorsing the Study pending full environmental review. "We couldn't let this blatant breach of environmental law go unchallenged," said Dick Stewart of Neighbors to Preserve the Waterfront. "It would set a terrible precedent for similar violations and back room development deals throughout the City."

Rationale for the Lawsuit

CEQA applies to any discretionary government action that may have a significant environmental impact. It is important that environmental review occur as early as possible in the planning process so that it is not just a pro forma rubber stamp of a direction already endorsed by city officials.

The California Supreme Court recently ruled¹ that actions short of an official project approval may be illegal if they move project momentum significantly forward. Groups filing this lawsuit believe the City violated CEQA by allowing the Planning Commission to adopt a resolution that "recognizes the design principles and recommendations of the Northeast Embarcadero Study for public realm improvements and new development in the area" without first certifying an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the Study. The Study is intended to provide guidelines for development.

Based on the Planning Commission's "recognition" of the Study, it "urged" the Port to apply the principles and recommendations in the Study to proposals for projects on Port

property. "As the Supreme Court has made clear, 'postponing environmental analysis can permit bureaucratic and financial momentum to build irresistibly behind a proposed project... providing a strong incentive to ignore environmental concerns,'" said Susan Brandt-Hawley, attorney for the coalition. She pointed out that just days after the Planning Commission endorsed the Study, a revised application for a project at 8 Washington Street was submitted to the City incorporating the Study's increased (by 50 feet) heights.

The community organizations bringing this action are unified in their concern that if the City ignores environmental law in this case, it will encourage shortcuts to environmental review in the future, "undoing decades of environmental law in California and opening the floodgates for similar stealth approvals of unpopular projects throughout the City," said Lee Radner, Chair, Friends of Golden Gateway.

Potential Outcome

The lawsuit requests that the San Francisco Superior Court issue a writ of mandate ordering the City's Planning Commission to rescind its actions endorsing the Study and to refrain from any further action relating to the Study and its guidelines until an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified.

What is the financial liability for neighborhood groups joining the lawsuit?

Organizations agreeing to join the lawsuit would enter into a retainer agreement with the Brandt-Hawley Law Group that guarantees they will have no financial liability for legal fees or costs (although they're encouraged to make a nominal contribution). Funding will be through the newly-formed Neighbors to Preserve the Waterfront. No other groups will have any financial responsibility. There is no liability for the City's attorneys' fees or possible countersuits or damages even if the lawsuit fails. CEQA lawsuits are public interest actions and if litigants prevail, the other side must pay attorney fees.

Would this issue be better dealt with at the Board of Supervisors?

Two years ago, it became clear that there was no real coordination among Planning, the Port and Redevelopment regarding long-term planning for the waterfront. As a result, District 3 residents asked Supervisor Chiu to intervene. He wrote Planning asking them to develop a "comprehensive" plan

¹ *Save Tara v. City of West Hollywood* (2009) 45 Cal.4th 116

for the Northeast waterfront that arrived at consensus on appropriate uses for seawall lots, particularly SWL 351.

What the Planning Department staff presented to the Planning Commission on July 8, 2010 fell far short of that goal. Staff described its Study as an Urban Design plan, didn't suggest it was comprehensive and admitted in the introduction that they had failed to reach consensus on what should be developed on the seawall lots, particularly Seawall Lot 351, as Supervisor Chiu had asked.

Throughout the process, the majority of the public attending the workshops opposed Planning's position that the waterfront needed a "hard edge" and they opposed the one development that seemed to be driving staff's push for significant height increases along the Embarcadero. That project, 8 Washington, included 170 luxury condos sitting atop a 430-car underground (underwater) garage. It also required demolishing the Golden Gateway's active community recreation facility that has served its residents and families from throughout the city for decades.

Had Planning done an environmental review of its study as required by state law, that environmental document approval could have been appealed to the Board of Supervisors. But the action it took on July 8th, because it lacked environmental analysis, could not be reviewed by the Board. The only way to challenge the Planning Commission's attempt to bypass environmental review was through a court challenge.

Will CEQA, zoning and other requirements remain in effect for evaluation and approval of specific projects along the waterfront?

While any individual project must still undergo its own CEQA evaluation and approval, the danger is that the developer can now argue that the Planning Commission has already approved a significant upzoning — the 50' height increase for 8 Washington — making it hard for the City to then reverse this pre-approval later in the entitlement process. It is this pre-approval, without environmental review that is at the heart of the lawsuit. Left unchallenged, this "creative" interpretation of environmental law will likely result in similar attempts at incremental approvals of controversial developments throughout the City.

What is the larger outcome that litigants seek?

First and foremost, to stop this kind of end run around CEQA in the future by putting the City on notice that such tactics will not go unchallenged. But the litigants are also committed to thoughtful and comprehensive planning.

Earlier this year, many who participated in Planning's Northeast Embarcadero Planning process felt it was primarily meant to justify current, unpopular proposals the Port already had in mind such as 8 Washington. In response, they began an alternative community planning process they hoped would result in the kind of comprehensive plan for the waterfront that Supervisor Chiu had called for.

Unlike Planning's effort, their plan seeks to develop real consensus on the right balance of revenue generating, public

and active recreation uses across **all** seawall lots north of Market Street. In addition, it makes specific proposals to create better connections between Chinatown, North Beach, Telegraph Hill and the Embarcadero, and recommends ways to use existing garages more efficiently, eliminating the need for massive, new garages. It also preserves and expands existing active recreation and open space; improves pedestrian, bicycle and transit access along major streets; and recommends alternate uses for the Port's seawall lots that, by generating broad-based community support, would make them both politically and economically feasible.

In 30 days, when the first phase of this community based alternative waterfront plan is complete, its community sponsors look forward to presenting it to the City and any CSFN member organization that would like such a presentation.



Resolution of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods to Join a Public Interest Lawsuit to Challenge the City's Failure to Conduct Environmental Review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on the Northeast Waterfront Planning Study.

Whereas, San Francisco's Planning Commission recently approved the Northeast Embarcadero Study without first completing an environmental review as required by state law (CEQA); and

Whereas, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) applies to any discretionary government action that may have a significant environmental impact; and

Whereas, there is concern that if the City can ignore long established state environmental law in this case, it would encourage the City to short-cut environmental review requirements in the future, therefore be it

***Resolved*, that the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods joins the Neighbors to Preserve the Waterfront and others in a no-cost, no-liability lawsuit which asks the Superior Court to issue a writ of mandamus ordering the City's Planning Commission to rescind its actions taken relating to the Northeast Embarcadero Waterfront Planning Study and to refrain from any further consideration of the Study and its guidelines until an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been completed and certified.**

...Gerry Crowley (THD)

Land Use & Housing Committee Report

September 13, 2010

The Regular Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened by Chair Hiroshi Fukuda on Monday, September 13, 2010 at 5:45 P.M. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

The Committee considered the following items

1. Housing Element 2009 DEIR Comments period has passed. Responses will take several months. Will follow.
2. California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) Long Range Development Plan Project is too large, need to evaluate alternatives. Attend Sept. 23, 2010 to address project. Ignores the Van Ness Plan heights, bulk, and 3 to 1 replacement provision. Raises cost of housing and no economic benefit.

NOTE: A public hearing on the project's Draft EIR will be held before the Planning Commission on Thursday, September 23, 2010 beginning at 1:30 p.m. in City Hall, Room 400. Public comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, October 19, 2010. If you would like a CD or hard copy of the Draft EIR, please contact Devyani Jain 575-9051 Devyani.Jain@sfgov.org or Chelsea Fordham 575-9071 Chelsea.Fordham@sfgov.org.

3. Park Merced: Will increase housing by 5,600 units of which 852 will be affordable units. Water and sewer will be zero net change due to recycling and capturing rain water. Problems such as historic preservation designation, and gentrification mitigation not resolved. CSFN has not taken a position.
4. (A. RODGERS: 558-6395) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORTS- Proposed Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mirkarimi [BF 101098] amending the San Francisco Administrative Code by amending Sections 1.56 and 8.12.4, adding Section 8.12.5, and re-numbering Section 8.12-1 as 8.13, to provide for the electronic distribution of documents more than 10 pages long prepared by City departments.

This will make it more difficult for residents to who do not have a computer, printer, or have difficulty in reading documents on a computer screen. Cost for printing by the City is \$0.10/page.

5. (K. DISCHINGER: 558-6284) PLANNING COMMISSION IN-KIND AGREEMENTS POLICY AND PROCEDURES - The Planning Code imposes impact fees on new development in Rincon Hill, Market and Octavia, Balboa Park and Eastern Neighborhoods, and provides an option for project sponsors to seek impact fee waivers if they agree to build community improvements through an in-kind agreement. These agreements must be recommended by the Planning Director and approved by the Planning Commission. The proposed policy outlines a process for intake, consideration, and approval of an in-kind agreement. Preliminary Recommendation: Approval
LU&H Committee will request a continuance on this matter.
6. Japantown Better Neighborhood Area Plan: Organizing committee is attempting to change the priority from making the Japan Center an "opportunity site" for condos to making the plan an opportunity for the community to save Japantown as we know it today as one of three remaining Japantowns in the US.
7. Rec/Park: SF Westside Recycled Water Project, Notice of Preparation on an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping meeting. Last one is on 09-23-10 7 PM at the GG Park Senior Center, 6101 FulSuite 400, SF, CA 94103.
8. Bay Citizen web site has SF city employees' salaries, position, and county of residence. Higher paid live outside of the city, lowest paid live within SF.

<http://www.baycitizen.org/government/story/many->

Executive Committee Report

August 25, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 5:43PM by the Committee chair, Penelope Clark. Those present were Judy Berkowitz, Penelope Clark, Angelique Mahan, Demian Quesnel, Dick Millet, Sue Cauthen, Lorraine Lucas, Rae Doyle, and Evelyn Wilson. Jim Lew was an excused absence. There was a quorum. The agenda of the upcoming meeting were approved.

Officers' Reports

President Berkowitz noted that written comments for the draft Housing Element were due on August 31. She said she had been contacted by KQED for an appearance on its Forum program with a discussion on the City's Transit First policy. However, she was given little notice and was unable to respond to the invitation in time.

There were no reports from either Vice President or the Recording Secretary. **Corresponding Secretary Millet** said that sponsors of High Speed Rail were giving a presentation before Potrero Hill Boosters. Of special interest was the proposal to put Third Street underground where it intercepted the railroad tracks rather than undergrounding the rail line.

Representatives from the Liberty Hill neighborhood group who had asked CSFN to act as their fiscal agent did not accept the invitation to attend the Excom meeting. In a discussion of fiscal agency it was noted that CSFN is a 501(c)4 not a 501(c)3 organization, so it cannot provide tax exempt status for donations. Everyone agreed that CSFN should have a statement of policy regarding acting as a fiscal agent for member or non-member groups.

We recommended to **Gerry Crowley (THD)** that she contact delegates from individual member groups of CSFN to inform them about joining suit against the City to obtain an EIR on the Northeast Waterfront Plan. If she could obtain a super majority of members to agree, then CSFN could join as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00PM.

...*Penelope Clark (RHN) 1st VP, Chair*

- high-paid-employees-live-and-spend/
9. CSFN possible future change to Bylaws to make it less difficult to join litigation.
10. South of Mission Historic Buildings Survey to be done <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2473>
Meetings 6 PM Wed Sept 22 & 10 AM Sat Sept 25, 825 Shotwell Street between 22 and 23 Streets.
11. Paper chase problems at City Hall. Since August 9 Rose Hillson (JPIA) has been requesting info re those buildings/owners who will benefit from Nov 2 Prop A monies. She finally got answers. Cost \$53 for 530 pages.
12. North Beach Library.
13. Live Nation — categorical exemption, Neg Dec upheld by BOS. (There are several parties suing the City)
14. New metered parking spaces in some areas of the City i.e. Civic Center, Potrero Hill will take away free street parking, residential parking program.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

The next regular meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, October 11, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station located at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

...*Hiroshi Fukuda (RCA) Chair*

Golden Gate Park to Lose More Open Space

The San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission has just issued an Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation (NOP) announcing plans to build a water treatment plant in the western part of Golden Gate Park. The project will include approximately 40,000 square feet of buildings as well as new roads, parking, and lighting. The plant would filter and disinfect 2 to 4.2 million gallons of pre-treated sewer and storm water each day to irrigate Golden Gate Park, the Presidio Golf Course and Lincoln Park. Currently, potable water from the aquifer under Golden Gate Park is used for this irrigation. According to the PUC, the purpose of the project is to use the aquifer water for drinking water and to replace the irrigation water with treated water from the new facility. Estimated construction cost of the proposed project is \$109 million, with construction planned for completion in 2015.

The placement of the plant aboveground in Golden Gate Park raises a number of issues about the location and design of the facility. According to the 1998 Golden Gate Park Master Plan, this space should be converted to recreation and parkland uses. The Master Plan also states that if a water treatment plant is installed, it must be placed completely underground with recreational uses on top of it. But the SFPUC is planning to build large buildings above ground, at a height of 30 feet in some places. There are many questions about this project:

- Why was this location selected?
- Why aren't the buildings being placed underground?
- Why are we giving up valuable parkland to what is essentially an industrial use?
- Why are we giving up open space to paving, buildings, parking, and lighting?

The plant will be built on what is now a construction yard. One argument given in favor of the plant by the SFPUC is that it will return open space to the Park. But building a factory is not adding open space. This land could, and should be, used for park and recreational uses. Golden Gate Park can always use more recreation areas and meadows — try to find a picnic table on a busy weekend! Has anyone asked San Franciscans what other uses they might like to see for this precious open space?

The need to come up with ways to address San Francisco's drinking water supply for the future cannot be denied. But it is important that all concerns about our parkland are

addressed before this plant is constructed. Public input at the early stages of this process is very important in order to protect and preserve open space in Golden Gate Park.



RESOLUTION to request exploration of alternative locations outside of Golden Gate Park and alternative designs for the Westside Water Treatment Plant

Whereas, The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission is planning to build a water treatment plant in Golden Gate Park, on land managed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department; and,

Whereas, This water treatment plant will consist of approximately 40,000 square feet of buildings, some up to 30 feet high, as well as paving, parking and night lighting; and,

Whereas, According to the 1998 Golden Gate Park Master Plan this space should be used for recreation and parkland; and,

Whereas, According to the Master Plan if a water treatment plant were installed, it must be placed completely underground with recreational uses on top; therefore be it

***Resolved*, that CSFN recommends that the Environmental Impact Report for the Westside Water Treatment Plant include an in-depth exploration of alternative locations outside of Golden Gate Park for the water treatment plant. In addition, CSFN recommends that the EIR contain an in-depth exploration of alternative designs for the plant building, including but not limited to a completely below-grade plan, as described in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, if it is located in Golden Gate Park.**

Submitted by the CSFN Open Space Committee for approval at the September general membership meeting.

Note:

The PUC has scheduled an EIR Scoping Session at 7 pm on September 23, 2010, at the GGP Senior Center, Fulton St./ 37th Avenue. Everyone is encouraged to attend the meeting, and submit your comments at that time or in writing no later than October 13. Your input is important to assure all issues are considered during this stage of the EIR process. For additional concerns go to www.goldengateparkpreservation.org

...Katherine Howard (SPEAK) Open Space Committee

CSFN Draft Minutes: General Assembly Meeting August 17, 2010

1. **Call to Order.** President Judith Berkowitz (EMIA) brought the meeting to order at 7:01 pm at Northern Police Station.
 - a) *Quorum declared.* Delegates and alternates represented 21 CSFN member organizations. 9 guests signed in.
2. **Introductions.** Delegates and guests introduced themselves. Hosts Mary Harris (OMINIA) and Steve Currier (OMMRA) described their organizations' objectives, history, and current issues.
3. **Minutes.** The July 2010 General Assembly and Special Assembly draft minutes were approved as printed on p 4 and p 3, respectively of the August 2010 newsletter.
4. **Officers' Reports.**
 - a) **President Berkowitz (EMIA)** reported and discussed:
 - i. *SaveMuni* effort
 - ii. Thanked those who attended August 9 Special Assembly meeting
 - iii. All city symphony concert
 - iv. Parliamentary Workshop seminar
 - b) **1st VP Clark (RHN):**
 - i. ExComm Report is on page 3 of August newsletter
 - ii. Midtown Terrace, unanimous voice vote to accept them as new members of CSFN
 - c) **2nd VP Mahan (EDIA)**
 - d) **Recording Secretary Quesnel (EVPA):** Thanked 1st VP Penny Clark for assuming recording secretary duties for the Special Assembly meeting.
 - e) **Corresponding Secretary Millet (PBNA)**
 - f) **Treasurer Lew (NBN)**
5. **Committee Reports**
 - a) **Land Use & Housing:** Acting Chair Rose Hillson (JPIA) discussed the following issues:
 - i. Housing Element 2009/2004
 - ii. Code cleaning ordinance
 - iii. CPMC
 - b) **Open Space:** Kathy Howard (SPEAK):
 - c) **Water Task Force:** Chair Girardot (MCIPOA):
 - i. Recycled water EIR draft
 - ii. Water system improvement program
 - iii. Revenue bond oversight committeeEmergency resolution: PASSED 13-0-0 Resolved, that CSFN strongly urges the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee to enter into a contract with designated experts at U.C. Berkeley and U.C.L.A. to conduct a thorough organizational review and status report of the WSIP (Water System Improvement Program) to determine if the projects can be completed on budget and by Dec. 31, 2015 as mandated by State Law
 - d) **Transportation:** Chair Noguera (MPIC)
 - e) **Bylaws:** Chair Wilson (SPEAK)
 - f) **Gov't & Elections:** Chair Charles Head (SHARP) Ballot Arguments on Fix Muni Now, Civil Sidewalks, Police Beats submitted to Dept of Elections for inclusion in Voter Info Pamphlet.
6. **Unfinished Business**
 - a.) Dan Lieberthson (MPIC) re resolutions on windmills published in the August newsletter on page 2
 - b.) Motion opposing permit for wind turbine at 400 Teresita Boulevard in Miraloma Park: Motion PASSED 15-2-4
 - c.) General motion regarding wind turbine installation Motion to defer vote on resolution failed 8-11-2 Resolution PASSED 14-4-3 Resolved that the Coalition for San Francisco Neighbors (CSFN) will support the MPIC and the neighbors in their opposition to this permit by writing to that effect to the Planner assigned the project: Mr . Adrian Putra, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103.
7. **New Business**
 - a.) Clint Mitchell of Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association requested that CSFN act as fiscal agent for them in their efforts to oppose the project at 1050 Valencia Street. Motion to postpone action on the matter PASSED 16-3-2
 - b.) Gerry Crowley (THD) presented to the assembly the matter of CSFN joining the Public Interest Lawsuit regarding the requirement for an extensive EIR on the N.E. Waterfront development. Motion to declare the matter an Emergency PASSED 15-5-1 Motion to Postpone one month CSFN action on the matter PASSED 18-3-0
8. **Announcement**

Donald Stroh (DHIC) presented to the assembly that CSFN at our next meeting discuss preservation of historical buildings and character of areas where the Planning Department has, with great neighborhood objection, proposed to plant very large structures entirely out of scale with a neighborhood.
9. **Program.**

Presentation by Alex Volberding on Yes on Proposition F
10. **Adjournment.** The August 2010 CSFN General Assembly meeting was adjourned at 9:32 PM
...Demian Quesnel (EVPA) Recording Secretary

How to Reach Us

President: Judith Berkowitz • sfjberk@mac.com • 824-0617
1st VP: Penelope Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com
2nd VP: Angeliqne Mahan • angelmahan@hotmail.com
Recording Secretary: Demian Quesnel • dquesnel@usa.net
Corresponding Secretary: Dick Millet • milletdick@yahoo.com
Treasurer: Jim Lew • emtjal@sbcglobal.net
Member-at-Large: Sue Cauthen • scau1321@aol.com
Member-at-Large: Rae Doyle • raedoyle@sbcglobal.net
Member-at-Large: Lorraine Lucas • wozopozo@pacbell.net
Parliamentarian: Evelyn Wilson • evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net

Chronicle Abets North Beach Library Fiasco

The brouhaha over the North Beach library has provoked more hysteria and misinformation than any land use issue for a long time. And nowhere has that hysteria and misinformation been more manifest than in the pages of the San Francisco Chronicle.

Granted the beleaguered daily is in a fight for its life, as advertisers and readers desert in droves. But the incredible shrinking newspaper posts higher losses than a good many of its peers. Experts have tied the spectacular declines to the Chronicle's failure to understand its market. Bingo!

Add to that a penchant for development, a relaxed attitude toward the facts and a real nonchalance when it comes to providing both sides of an argument. Witness design critic John King's king-size opinion pieces denouncing the historic library and the minuscule news stories about key events, including the Historic Preservation Commission's critical vote to declare it a landmark.

Mystified observers tie the uneven treatment to the "New Chronicle," which is urgently reinventing itself to attract more readers. Unfortunately for the folks at Fifth & Mission, the paper no longer has the influence it once had and no wonder. World news consists of canned items gleaned from the wire services and other papers, while local events are covered as much by the paper's columnists as by solid news stories.

Part of the problem here is that many experienced staffers have left the paper, leaving much of the news coverage to newcomers. And the one-time "voice of the West" seems to have taken a pro-development stance, with scant regard for the facts, including massive neighborhood support for preservation of historic buildings.

Don't forget that the Chronicle was an ardent foe of Proposition J, which created the Historic Preservation Commission. Observers suggest that the paper is letting its opposition to the HPC color its reporting. Despite the fact that the voters passed Prop J by a comfortable margin, the paper appears to be using the North Beach library controversy as a gambit to damage the credibility of the HPC.

"The Most Historic"

Neither the King columns nor the dinky news stories mention the fact that analyses by numerous architectural historians and the Planning Department found that the library has the most historical integrity of any of the eight branches built by the famed architectural firm of Appleton & Wolfard.

Supporters say the elegant building exemplifies an era and an architectural style that adds to the city's texture and character. Reason enough for both the Telegraph Hill Dwellers and North Beach Neighbors to call for preservation, modernization and expansion, another fact ignored by the Chronicle. Ignored also is the fact that countless community members and citywide groups have been working hard to save the library from the wrecker's ball. Destroying this critical piece of our cultural heritage, they argue, would diminish the rich architectural fabric of North Beach and do a grave injustice to the literary tradition fostered for generations within its walls. Further, they say, the proposed library crams all key services into a space that is too small for them and features a windowless 120-foot-long wall along Columbus. Neighborhood leaders deplore the fact that the planned building is totally at odds with the community's architectural character.

Significantly, this opposition has never made its way into the King columns and is given scant mention in the tiny news stories. On the contrary, a tone of outrage informs the two King columns, as well as a lengthy piece on the subject that dominated the Sunday Insight section some months ago.

There is also a vast difference in how news of the landmarking

THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS!

BENEFACTORS

David Winthrop Allen Family Trust
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn

PATRONS

Cole Valley Improvement Assn
Haight Ashbury Improvement Assn
Retired Firemen & Widows Assn of SFFD
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

SPONSORS

Barbary Coast Neighbors Assn
Buena Vista Neighborhood Assn
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Assn
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Assn
Eureka Valley Promotion Assn
Forest Knolls Neighborhood Org
Friends of the Music Concourse
Greater Geary Blvd Merchants & Property Owners Assn
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Assn
Laurel Heights Improvement Assn
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
OMI Neighbors in Action
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Assn
Richmond Community Assn
San Jose/Guerrero Coalition to Save Our Streets
Sunset Parkside Education & Action Cmte (SPEAK)
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
John Bardis
Judith Berkowitz
Sue Cauthen
Bernie Choden
Penny Clark
Sheryl Connell
Hon Fiona Ma
Kathryn Devincenzi, Attorney
Rafael Mandelman
Dick Millet
Gary Noguera
Joel Ventresca
Jamie Whitaker
George Wooding

Special thanks to Office Depot for
photocopying services!

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Land Use & Housing • Monday 5:30PM Oct 11 • Northern Station • Chair Hiroshi Fukuda • ninersam@aol.com • 386-2632
Gov't & Elections • Chair Charles Head • charleshead@hotmail.com
Bylaws • Chair Evelyn Wilson • evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net • 566-7826
Open Space • Chair Nancy Wuerfel • nancenumber1@aol.com • 731-6432, Co-chair Ramona Albright 621-9621
Water Task Force • Chair Joan Girardot • 346-5525
Transportation • Chair Gary Noguera • garynoguera@earthlink.net

decisions was played. While King's cranky critiques landed on the front page and tallied upwards of 900 words, the two articles about the HPC's decision to landmark the library were buried. The first one was a mere 130 words, hidden in an inconspicuous site in the first section. The recent and definitive landmarking decision got a scant 157 words and was buried in the Insider column.

What happened to the principle that journalism is the balanced presentation of the news?

...Sue Cauthen (NBN)

AGENDA	
General Assembly Meeting	
September 21, 2010	
6:30	I. Sign In and Refreshments
7:00	II. Call to Order/Ascertain Quorum A. Introduction of Delegates and Guests / Short Announcements B. Hosts 1. Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Assn — MCIPOA 2. Miraloma Park Improvement Club — MPIC
7:10	III. Approval of August 2010 Minutes
7:15	IV. Officers' Reports A. President B. Vice Presidents C. Secretaries D. Treasurer
7:25	V. Committee Action Items — written reports in Newsletter A. Land Use & Housing B. Open Space — Reso concerning EIR for Water Treatment Plant in GGP. C. Water Task Force D. Transportation E. Government & Elections F. Bylaws
7:35	VI. Unfinished Business: Reso concerning NE Waterfront EIR Suit
8:00	VII. New Business
8:10	VIII. Program: Ballot initiatives: Part Troix
	IX. Adjournment

*CSFN meets the third Tuesday of each month except for December at Northern Police Station, Turk & Fillmore Streets (Parking in rear off Turk)
Public Transit: Muni #22 Fillmore, 31 Balboa & 38 Geary Lines*

Visitors: Please Sign the Guest Register

Neighborhood Views is published monthly, the official voice of the Coalition for SF Neighborhoods, Inc., a 501(C)4 organization.
To Submit Articles: Email articles by the 5th of the month to sfiberk@mac.com
Either inline text or an attached document can be used.
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. We reserve the right to edit where necessary. Member organizations may receive two copies of the newsletter without charge. Subscription: Members\$10, Nonmembers/\$15.

*Coalition for SF Neighborhoods
P.O. Box 320098 San Francisco CA 94132*

Action Items:
Reso concerning joining NE Waterfront EIR Suit. Page 2.
Reso concerning EIR for Water Treatment Plant in GGP. Page 4.
Measures on November Ballot.

Next Meeting
Tuesday
Sept 21

Contents

1	NE Waterfront EIR Suit
3	August L&H Report
3	August ExComm Report
4	GGP to Lose More Open Space
5	August Assembly Draft Minutes
6	Chronicle Abets NB Library Fiasco