



## The Destruction of San Francisco's Neighborhoods

San Francisco neighborhoods that consist of single-family homes had better get ready for major changes in their neighborhoods.

On March 24, the San Francisco Planning Commission unanimously approved the 2009 "Housing Element." The Housing Element is the Planning Department's blueprint for what can and cannot be built in neighborhoods. All new Planning Department decisions will be based on this new planning constitution.

Current RH-1 (residential housing/one family) and RH-2 (residential housing/2 families) are based on single-family units being built on individual property lots. The single-family houses in our neighborhoods are almost exclusively RH-1 homes. Neighborhood planning decisions used to be based on lot size for single-family homes. The 2009 Housing Element will replace the current lot size designations and allow Planning to base zoning decisions on density, instead.

The new density zoning means that the Planning Department will now be agreeable to creating secondary units/in-law housing, or rebuilding housing as multi-unit housing — in single-family neighborhoods. Section 1.6 of the 2009 Housing Element states: "In setting allowable residential densities in established neighborhoods, consideration should be given to the prevailing building type in the surrounding area so that the new development does not detract from existing character. In some areas, such as RH-1 and RH-2 prevailing height and bulk limits should be maintained to protect neighborhood character." This language attempts to insure that homes with more separate units (density) are the same size as surrounding neighborhood houses.

The new density zoning will someday allow your neighbor to either subdivide his current house into smaller separate units, or tear down an existing house and rebuild it as a multi-unit house.

The Planning Department's Director of Planning, John Rahaim, states, "It is important to understand that the Housing Element is a policy document, not code. In order for the Planning Department to change the zoning classification, heights, densities, parking requirements, etc. in any part of the City, the Planning Code must be changed. Any such changes must be reviewed by the Planning Commission, and approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. The Housing Element draft is very clear that when we do propose such changes, we must do so after a public process involving stakeholders."

There is a bad feel to this massive switch to density zoning. The 2009 Housing Element has been revised three times, with the third revision being made public in February. Mr. Rahaim states, "Public comments were never closed," but the Planning Department made several revisions *after* the 2009 Housing Element environmental impact report (EIR) was completed. The final February revision included the new changes in density zoning to RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods, and added a huge number of additional single-family homes throughout San Francisco that will now qualify for density zoning.

District Supervisor Sean Elsbernd stated, "Rest assured, I have no interest in seeing the elimination of the RH-1 or RH-2 designations,

and strongly believe it would be a mistake on Planning's part to do anything to repeal the designation."

Clearly, the Planning Department would not have gone to the trouble to add the potential for density zoning if they did not want it. There will now be a constant struggle to keep RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods from being overwhelmed with secondary units and multi-unit housing.

Let's do an autopsy on why the Planning Department made this decision to base neighborhood zoning on density, rather than on lot size. In 2008, Senate Bill 375 was signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger. The bill was designed to have communities reduce greenhouse gas emissions by limiting vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). Approximately one-third of greenhouse gas emissions come from cars. Although San Francisco already has one of the lowest greenhouse emissions for a major city in California and the nation (we have no industry), the City will receive more State and Federal transit funds if it tries to reduce VMTs and create and design mixed-use, transit oriented, high-density housing.

So let's get this straight: Density corridors along transit lines are supposed to reduce VMTs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. So why did the Planning Department convert to density zoning all of the RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods in San Francisco? **Answer:** The City hates the low density in RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods. The average property tax is based on a purchased home value of \$357,000 and the density per lot averages about 2.1 people per house. Due to Proposition 13, collectable property taxes are very low in relation to the value of the house. The City wants to ruin/change the character of the RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods so that they can charge more and higher property taxes, since every new unit will have to pay a property tax based on current value.

Muni — the transit part of this — is an underfunded basket-case featuring unreliable service, constant service cuts, an 8.5 to 7.5 mile per hour average speed, a \$40 million annual shortfall in revenue, and is headed for insolvency. Approximately 38 percent of Muni's revenue comes directly or indirectly from revenue generated by cars. Ironically, if there were no cars in San Francisco, Muni would go bankrupt.

Who wouldn't want to buy a 850-square-foot "density" condo with no garage for \$550,000 on or near a dependable transit line? Oh: by the way: Your kid goes to school five miles away from your house, your new job is in San Mateo, and one-third of your 100-unit condo development is devoted to affordable housing. Your \$550,000 condo *is* one of the affordable housing units. Your vandalized car is parked eight blocks away in front of somebody's house with a secondary unit, which no longer has a garage. Welcome to the future of density planning and the end of the middle-class family in San Francisco.

Meanwhile, in the RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods people are converting their garages into secondary housing units so that they can have extra rental income. The house across the street was just torn

# SF's Neighborhoods

(cont'd from p.1)

down and turned into a triplex that is 10 feet taller than any of the surrounding homes. The triplex can be larger because it conforms with the 40-foot height limit designated by RH-1 neighborhoods — even though every other house in the area is only 30 feet tall. The Planning Department will argue that this cannot happen, but unfortunately other homes in the neighborhood have *already* added a third story, and Planning will claim that there is a height precedent “in the zoning envelope” that is already developed. There is absolutely no parking, because most of the RH-1 garages have been turned into density units, more people live in your neighborhood, and the people who purchased housing near transit lines with no parking are using your RH-1 density-zoned neighborhood to park their cars.

Middle-class families can no longer afford to purchase RH-1 single-family housing, because they are now competing with developers who want to build a second unit or rebuild the original house for clients willing to pay an additional \$150,000 more than the middle-class family. The middle-class family will now either have to rent, purchase a much smaller unit that they will have to share with other families, or leave San Francisco. The City will eventually have low-income housing, some affordable housing, a lot of high-end housing — but little housing for middle-class folks who have children.

The final betrayal of *all* neighborhoods in the 2009 Housing Element by the Planning Department is really quite clever: Planning revised the term “neighborhood-supported” to “community-based.” The “neighborhood-supported” designation meant that your neighborhood was the major stakeholder in defending the character of the neighborhood. RH-1 and RH-2 homeowners’ associations and their established neighborhood covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) will eventually lose their right to self-determination of their individual neighborhoods to well-financed community-based developers. Unless your homeowners’ association has the money to hire a good lawyer, Planning regulations supersede homeowners’ CC&Rs.

By substituting the term “community-based” into the 2009 Housing Element, the document now states: “Any new community-based planning processes should be initiated in partnership with the neighborhood and involve the full range of City stakeholders.” Why would the surrounding neighborhood stakeholders need citywide input from the developers, lobbyists, think-tanks, and non-profits that claim to be the community-based component?

Director of Planning John Rahaim explains, “The Planning Department has always included a broad variety of stakeholders in our work. We cannot deny anyone the right to speak about a project or plan. I do not believe it is appropriate for me to state that one point of view is more important than another. In each planning effort we must consider a range of issues, some of which apply to the immediate neighborhood and some to the City at large. The term ‘community based’ simply reflects this broader participation.” Basically, this is a nice way of telling the lower income RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods that they are screwed.

**The Winners:** Developers; contractors; the Planning Department, since approximately 85 percent of its revenue comes from developer fees; and the City, which may receive more State and Federal funds and more property taxes.

**The Losers:** RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods, homeowners’ associations, people with cars, middle-income families with children, and anyone who has to rely on Muni as their sole means of transportation.

The primary goal of the 2009 Housing Element was to create 31,000 housing units in San Francisco and to reduce VMTs. The 2010 Census reports that San Francisco has 31,131 vacant units, or 8.3 percent of the 376,942 total units. The City has approximately 30,000 illegal in-law/secondary units; between 2000 and 2008, only 80 of these illegal units were legalized and only 204 illegal units were removed. The new 2009 Housing Element revisions to the RH-1 and RH-2 secondary units — and the recent revision to add secondary units to housing in proximity to major Muni transit lines — have opened the door to almost 70,000 potential new housing units. Why do we need so many new housing units when so many existing units are currently vacant?

The laws of unintended consequences are about to shine on the Planning Department. San Francisco’s greenhouse gas emissions will increase rather than decrease. More people results in more greenhouse gas emissions. The average vehicle miles traveled will increase as the number of cars increase due to reliance on poor mass transit and job commutes. The City of San Francisco will become overbuilt, when middle-class families with kids flee the City and vacancy rates continue to increase. Most importantly, the RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods will fight the Planning Department at every step to maintain our neighborhood character, and keep secondary units and multi-unit housing out of our neighborhoods.

...George Wooding (MTHA)

---

## LU&H Cmte Report

(cont'd from p.4)

- File 110302 — SUD rezoning sectional maps. (consistency with General Plan and Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1) File 110303 amending the SF Planning Code and the SF General Plan, to amend the site heights. Parkmerced final hearing will be on May 24th at SFBOS with a possible Land Use hearing the day prior on approval/dis-approval of the project on May 23rd.
5. Japantown Better Neighborhood Area: there will be four community meetings, the first will be June 1, 2011 at the JCCNC, 6:30–9 PM on heights, scale, Japan Center. The second on June 27, 2011 Public Realm, Transportation and Circulation.
  6. Market Octavia Appeal update – Ask each organization to support administrative cost.
  7. Middle Polk Neighborhood reported on their issue of

- subpoenas for communications re 1601 Larkin.
8. Live Nation: The Honorable Ernest H Goldsmith, Judge of the Superior Court of San Francisco, has issued decisions to rule in favor of Nob Hill Neighbors in BOTH the categorical exemption and letter of determination court cases.
  9. Need to follow: SB 375 & the Bay Area’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) [http://www.onebayarea.org/plan\\_bay\\_area/housing.htm](http://www.onebayarea.org/plan_bay_area/housing.htm)

The next regular meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, June 13, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station located at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

...Hiroshi Fukuda (RCA) Chair

# CSFN Draft Minutes: General Assembly Meeting April 19, 2011

1. **Call to Order.** President Judith Berkowitz brought the meeting to order at 7:00 at Northern Police Station.
  - a. *Quorum declared.* Delegates and alternates represented 22 CSFN member organizations. 6 guests signed in.
  - b. *Agenda approved.*
  - c. *Introductions.* Delegates and guests introduced themselves. Hosts Bill Sauro, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) and Richard Magary, Buena Vista Neighborhood Association (BVNA) described their organizations' objectives, history, and current issues.
2. **Minutes.** The March General Assembly draft minutes were approved as printed on p 3 of the April newsletter
3. **Officers' Reports.**
  - a. **President Berkowitz** (EMIA) Spoke with reporters from the *Bay Citizen* and the *SF Examiner* regarding the Housing Element. Also spoke at the Save Muni SF Press Conference.
    - Post Earthquake Resiliency meeting is tomorrow, Wed, April 20 at Office of Emergency Services.
    - AT&T uVerse Big Boxes before BoS April 20.
    - Thanked Nominating Committee members Noguera, Devincenzi, Head for their service.
  - b. **1<sup>st</sup> VP Clark** (RHN) noted ExComm Report is on page 4 of NL. Parkmerced Action Coalition (PmAC) met criteria for membership and has been recommended by the Executive Committee to the General Membership for approval. General Membership unanimously approved PmAC membership by voice vote.
  - c. **2<sup>nd</sup> VP Mahan** (EDIA)
  - d. **Acting Recording Secretary Mahan** (EDIA)
  - e. **Corresponding Secretary Millet** (PBNA) Mail distributed.
  - f. **Treasurer Lew** (NBN) submitted a written report.



Dave Grennell explains Supe Chiu's proposed Yellow Pages Ordinance.

- c. *Transportation Committee* Gary Noguera, Chair (MPIC) ParkSF Congestion Pricing will be going into effect April 21, 2011. Affected neighborhoods Hayes Valley, Mission, Japantown, and Civic Center.
- d. *Bylaws Committee* Evelyn Wilson, Chair (SPEAK)
- e. *Land Use & Housing:* Hiroshi Fukuda, Chair (RCA)

noted committee report is on pg 4 of newsletter.

**Resolved:** the LU&H Cmte recommends to the CSFN GA that CSFN join the appeal of the 2004 and 2009 Housing Element FEIR.

### **Motion passed 20-0**

**Resolved:** that CSFN opposes the current design of the Booker T Washington Project and requests the building be redesigned due to conflicts with the architectural character of the street. It should be redesigned to complement features of surrounding buildings; and it has inadequate parking design.

### **Motion passed 18-0-4**

f. *Water Task Force:* Joan Girardot, Chair (MCI&POA) gave an extensive report.

## 5. Unfinished Business.

## 6. New Business.

## 7. Program.

Dave Grennell presented details regarding Supervisor David Chiu's

proposed Yellow Pages Ordinance. The ordinance seeks to stop unwanted Yellow Pages delivery and prevent seven million pounds of Yellow Pages waste from going into the landfill.

8. **Adjournment.** The April CSFN General Assembly meeting was adjourned at 9:45PM.

...Angelique Mahan (EDIA) Acting Recording Secretary



## How to Reach Us

**President:** Judith Berkowitz • sfjberk@mac.com • 824-0617  
**1st VP:** Penelope Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com  
**2nd VP:** Angelique Mahan • angelmahan@hotmail.com  
**Rec Sec (acting):** Angelique Mahan • angelmahan@hotmail.com  
**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

4. **Committee Reports**
  - a. *Nominating Committee:* Gary Noguera, Chair (MPIC) noted the NomCom Report is on page 3 of the NL. The cmte recommends the following to serve on Executive Committee 2010-11:
    - President:** Judith Berkowitz (EMIA)
    - 1st VP:** Penelope Clark (RHN)
    - 2nd VP:** Angelique Mahan (EDIA)
    - Recording Secretary (Acting):** Angelique Mahan (EDIA)
    - Corresponding Secretary:** Dick Millett (PBNA)
    - Treasurer:** Jim Lew (NBN)
    - Members-at-Large:** Rose Hillson (JPIA), Sue Cauthen (NBN), Lorraine Lucas (HAIA).
    - There were no nominations from the floor.
  - b. *Open Space Committee:* Kathy Howard reported that the

## Land Use & Housing Committee Reports

### May 2, 2011

A Special Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened by Chair Hiroshi Fukuda on Monday, May 2, 2011 at 5:43 P.M. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

The Committee considered the following item:

Appeal of Final Certification EIR of 2009 Housing Element, Board of Supervisors Meeting May 10, 2011, Special Order 4 PM. File #045212. Hearing, Appeal Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Planning Case No. 2007.1275E, through its Motion No. 18307, for the 2004 and 2009 Housing Elements (Citywide). (Appellant: Kathryn R. Devincenzi, on behalf of various organizations.) (Filed April 12, 2011; Companion to File Nos. 110453, 110454, and 110455.)

The next regular meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, June 13, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station located at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

### May 9, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened by Chair Hiroshi Fukuda on Monday, May 9, 2011 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. Appeal of Final Certification EIR of 2009 Housing Element, Board of Supervisors Meeting May 10, 2011, Special Order 4 PM. File #045212. Hearing, Appeal Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Planning Case No. 2007.1275E, through its Motion No. 18307, for the 2004 and 2009 Housing Elements (Citywide). (Appellant: Kathryn R. Devincenzi, on behalf of various organizations.) (Filed April 12, 2011; Companion to File Nos. 110453, 110454, and 110455.)
2. BOS Land Use & Economic Development Committee, Monday, May 16, 1:00PM  
The San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Economic Development Committee will hold a public hearing to consider proposed legislation that amends the General Plan: File No. 110397. Ordinance amending them San Francisco General Plan by adopting the 2009 Housing Element as the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan; making findings, including environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of the Planning Code Section 101.1.  
Monday, May 16, 2011, 1:00 p.m., Room 250
3. Planning Commission May 12, 2011 5 PM, Item 13 — This is the second of four scheduled informational hearings that will provide an overview of CPMC's development projects. Specific topics to be discussed at this session include an overview of the architecture, urban design, and public realm improvements proposed at the Van Ness and Geary Campus, St. Luke's Campus, and Davies Campus, and an overview of the requested entitlements.
4. Parkmerced, BOS Land Use and Economic Development Committee, Monday May 16th 1:00pm land-use meeting on

(cont'd on p.2)

## Executive Committee Report

### April 27, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 5:45PM; there was a quorum. Present were Judy Berkowitz, Penelope Clark, Angelique Mahan, Dick Millet, Lorraine Lucas, Rae Doyle, Sue Cauthen and Evelyn Wilson. This was the last meeting attended by Rae Doyle before the new Executive Committee meets in May. Everyone on the Committee appreciates her participation on the Committee. Unable to attend was Jim Lew, and we wish him well in his recovery.

### Officers' Reports

President Berkowitz attended the Post Quake Resiliency summit hosted by NEN's Daniel Homsey, which focused on what citizens should do in the weeks and months following a major quake. However, it is still unclear what the City expects as a process from neighborhood groups.

- A Redistricting Task Force is being assembled, with nine members. Three are appointed by the mayor and the Board of Supervisors president each; there are three spots that the public can apply for via the Elections Commission. Dick Millet has applied. The deadline to apply was April 29 with an Elections Commission meeting on May 4 for applicants to attend. Angelique Mahan said she would also attend and report back to the CSFN membership.

The first vice president had no report. Second vice president Angelique Mahan said that there had been no additional meetings of the New Century Transportation Advisory Panel which she had been attending. There were no further reports by Committee officers.

There was a general discussion on the next General Assembly program. It was suggested that some of the issues that will appear on the November ballot could be presented. But most thought it was a little premature, and the issues in their final form should be taken up later. It was decided that the process of redistricting and its political ramifications would be a topic of interest to the membership, and President Berkowitz said she would contact Chris Bowman to talk about it to the membership at the May meeting.

Another topic of discussion was the procedure for making resolutions, including amendments to motions, and it was decided to put the procedures on the website as a reference for members.

Angelique Mahan brought up the topic of the cost to CSFN of the telephone answering service. She noted that there are now newer, more cost effective alternatives, such as Google Voice and Magic Jack. She will research the alternatives and report to the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28PM.

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

## Candidates' Statements

### **JUDITH BERKOWITZ (EMIA) • PRESIDENT**

I have served as CSFN President for five years, working, and sometimes even succeeding to create a City that is responsive to its neighborhoods' needs. I have served in successive CSFN roles: Recording Secretary, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President and am the past Chair of its Land Use & Housing Committee.

Besides continuing to serve on the Land Use & Housing Committee, I work on both the Government & Elections and the Newsletter Committees. Also, I currently sit on the SaveMuni SF organization's Board, the (City's) Public Safety Working Group and the Elections CAC. I served as an independent consultant on the 2009 Housing Element CAB. I've formed alliances between CSFN and the Green Party and other groups in the battle to ensure an individual's right for a full DR hearing before the Planning Commission.

I would be honored to serve as President again this coming year. You know me as a listener who respects differing views and the value of teamwork. The amazing variety of our neighborhoods requires inclusion of all members' opinions in our Coalition.

Again, it is an honor to continue to serve CSFN again this year.

I thank you for the opportunity and will do my best to serve you well.

### **PENELOPE CLARK (RHN) • 1<sup>st</sup> VICE PRESIDENT**

I came to San Francisco in 1960 to study interior design at the Rudolph Schaeffer School of Design which had moved to its final location on Potrero Hill. I worked as an interior designer for a number of years (I am still a member of A.S.I.D., but retired). Ultimately I became interested in antiques — principally from China and Japan. After having an oriental antique shop for many years I now sell antiques privately, mainly wholesale. After being a renter my first decade in San Francisco, I became a homeowner on Russian Hill in 1971.

After doing several building projects for myself, I became very interested in how the City's Planning and Building Departments operate, and worked on the Design & Zoning Committee for Russian Hill Neighbors. I realized that it is important to be concerned with the City's policies for the entire city, not just one's own neighborhood, so I joined the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee in 2005.

### **ANGELIQUE MAHAN (EDIA) • 2<sup>nd</sup> VICE PRESIDENT and RECORDING SECRETARY**

A native San Franciscan, I have lived in the Excelsior all of my life and am a proud graduate of Mercy High School. After returning from my second stint in

college I became active in the Excelsior District Improvement Association. I have served on EDIA's Executive Board for four years and served three years as Vice President and one as 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President. I have been a Delegate to the District 11 Council, and have been a Delegate to CSFN for several years. I have served as a member of the CSFN Executive Committee for the last four years, two years as an at-Large Member, two years as 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President. It is my honor and privilege to continue to serve on the CSFN Executive Committee.

### **DICK MILLET (PBNA) • CORRESPONDING SECRETARY**

I am an Architect and have lived in SF since 1962. I bought a home in Potrero Hill in 1969 and have lived there ever since. I have been involved in Potrero Hill neighborhood activities all that time, holding various offices in the Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association, including president for nine years. I have been a delegate to the CSFN for some years and held the offices of Treasurer for 2, Corresponding Secretary for 4, and Recording Secretary for 2. I volunteered in former Supervisor Sophie Maxwell's office for 6 years.

### **JIM A LEW (NBN) • TREASURER**

I have been a neighborhood activist for some 20 years as a member of North Beach Neighbors. I served as its president for two years. I was its newsletter editor for five years. I currently am on its Board of Advisors. I have also previously served on the CSFN Executive Board for a number of years and as treasurer.

In order for volunteer organizations like North Beach Neighbors and the CSFN to survive, different individuals must step forward to carry on their good work so that that they can survive as viable entities. But for them, there would be no one standing to protect and enhance the neighborhoods. I am willing and able to contribute my effort towards that very worthy task.

### **SUE CAUTHEN (NBN) • MEMBER-at-LARGE**

A CSFN delegate for 25 years, Sue Cauthen has also served as vice president and corresponding secretary. She wants to continue as member-at-large to assure that City Hall is responsive to community concerns and neighborhood groups have maximum participation in their government.

At a time when bedrock civic protections like discretionary review, density levels and historic preservation are under siege, CSFN's capacity to mount a strong response is critical. Sue wants to be part of the creative process that crafts that response. She chairs the Sunshine Task Force's education and outreach committee, as well as the Board of



# Bringing Your Issue to CSFN

With so many new organizations coming into CSFN and as a refresher for everyone, it is helpful to review how member organizations bring their issues to CSFN, and what happens after we consider them.

A resolution is a formal way to consider issues. After identifying your organization's issue, craft a statement or resolution stating the problem and the action you want CSFN to take. There are three ways an issue can come before CSFN:

**First**, If a resolution which has been adopted by your organization is relevant to the CSFN mission and may benefit from a vote by CSFN, briefly introduce your issue and resolution at a CSFN General Assembly meeting under the Agenda's "New Business." Distribute ± 30 copies of the reso on your organization letterhead to the delegates attending this meeting.

Before the next month's meeting, expand on the issue in an article for the CSFN newsletter. This article plus the resolution will be printed in that month's newsletter. An example by FHCA is on page 3 of the January 2008 newsletter, online at [www.csfn.net](http://www.csfn.net).

**Second**, Matters can come before the General Assembly through the CSFN committees. Your organization may bring your issue to a committee by first notifying the chair that you wish time on the committee agenda. After presenting your matter and getting a committee vote there, the *committee* will bring it to the GA for a vote.

**Third**, Regarding issues that come up suddenly when a CSFN vote on an issue is needed within the same month (emergency issues): Prior to the next GA meeting, you may submit the article and resolution to the newsletter before the meeting without it having been introduced at the meeting the month before.

You will have to explain why this issue should be treated as an emergency matter. Two votes will be taken: one on the nature of the matter's emergency, and a second vote on the issue itself.

**Fourth**, In the case of an emergency matter, you may introduce your org's issue to the GA at that meeting

having first discussed it with the president. You will need approximately 30 copies of your organization's resolution on organization letterhead

In any case, speak with the president before the meeting... ideally, prior to the newsletter publication date. The president needs to arrange with the vice-president for the meeting agenda to provide the time to present the issue, have a discussion, and take the vote. The vice-president also must ensure that the agenda includes your item before submitting it to the newsletter.

Distribute ± 30 copies of the reso on your organization letterhead to the delegates attending the General Assembly meeting. At this meeting, after you have explained the issue and taken questions from delegates, the delegates vote, as in example 3, on its emergency nature and on the matter itself.

In all the cases above, should CSFN adopt the resolution, it then goes to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President, who will write a standard "form" letter on CSFN letterhead unless you provide a specially-tailored letter. Attached to the letter will be the full text of the resolution as adopted at the GA. *It is up to you to provide the 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President with any special text for the letter.*

The 2<sup>nd</sup> VP will need a list from you of persons/offices and addresses to whom the letter should be addressed and cc'd.

The VP will then give the finished letter back to you so that you may distribute it to its intended recipients. Should there be a BOS, Planning Commission, etc hearing on the matter, it is up to you to notify the president as to the time and place it will be held. The president (or VP) will attend the hearing and present CSFN's official position.

...Judith Berkowitz (EMIA)



## How to Write a Resolution

Correct form and punctuation of a resolution is as follows:

*Whereas*, The...(text of the first preamble clause); and  
*Whereas*, ...(text of the next to last preamble clause); and  
*Whereas*, ...(text of the last preamble clause); therefore be it  
*Resolved*, That...(stating action to be taken); and be it further  
*Resolved*, That...(stating further action to be taken).

The *Whereas* clauses, while not necessary, are useful and explanatory.

...Evelyn L. Wilson (Parliamentarian)

<b>AGENDA</b>	
<b>General Assembly Meeting</b>	
<b>May 17, 2011</b>	
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. Cow Hollow Assn — CHA 2. Cayuga Improvement Assn — CIA
7:15	III. Approval of April 2011 Minutes
7:20	IV. Officers' Reports A. President B. Vice Presidents C. Secretaries D. Treasurer
7:25	V. Committee Action Items — written reports in Newsletter A. Water Task Force B. Transportation C. Open Space D. Land Use & Housing E. Government & Elections F. Bylaws
7:40	VI. Special Order of Business — Election of Executive Committee 2011–2012
7:45	VI. New Business
8:00	VII. Program: Chris Bowman turns redistricting inside-out.
	VIII. Adjournment

**Action Item:** Election of officers 2011–2012, term. Page 5.

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

*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 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 [sfjberk@mac.com](mailto:sfjberk@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.

Next Meeting  
Tuesday  
May 17

Contents

- Destruction of SF's Neighborhoods ..... 1
- April Assembly Draft Minutes ..... 3
- LU&H Committee Reports ..... 4
- April ExComm Report ..... 4
- Candidates' Statements ..... 5
- Bringing Your Issue to CSFN ..... 6
- How to Write a Resolution ..... 6