



## A Heads-Up on Local Ballot Measures for November 6

### **Proposition B: Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond**

*The CFSN Assembly voted overwhelmingly to oppose this bond.*

This is a General Obligation Bond that is requesting \$195M in property taxes. \$34.5M will go to the Port and \$160.5M will go to the Recreation & Park Department (RPD).

Traditionally, San Francisco taxes have paid for the RPD. As San Francisco public employees' salaries and benefits continued to increase, City Hall has deliberately decreased the amount of public funds that the RPD has received through the General Fund, the City budget.

This lack of General Funds

- 1.) has caused the RPD to defer the maintenance and repair of the park system, and
- 2.) has caused the RPD to issue
  - a \$110M General Obligation Bond (GO Bond) in 2000,
  - a \$185M GO Bond in 2008,
  - and this proposed \$195M GO Bond in 2012.

The current GO Bond was originally scheduled for 2014, but according to Dawn Kamalanathan, the RPD Director of Planning, the bond needed to be moved forward so that the RPD's planning staff could stay on the RPD payroll. To date, only 51% of the 2008 bond money has been spent — 49% remains unspent — and several 2008 bond projects will continue through 2013.

### **Financially Irresponsible**

The RPD is attempting to use this GO Bond money to partially replace the General Funding that has been deliberately taken away by the Mayor's Office. This incessant bond borrowing is a horrible financial policy because the interest on the RPD bonds is costing the public millions of extra dollars — similar to financing your car payments with credit cards. ... And remember: our paid taxes have *already* given the city *more* than enough money to pay for park infrastructure with no additional interest payments.

Unfortunately, the RPD has not been financially accountable to the citizens of San Francisco. RPD funds are routinely hidden, transferred from one park fund to another or sent directly to the City General Fund with no transparency or accountability to the public. Financially, the public can no longer trust the RPD.

RPD management staff has little to no training in recreation and park management and consists primarily of City Hall cast-offs that could not tell a mole from a gopher. Fifteen new six-figure employees, each with a 33% benefit package, have been hired in the last year.

Around the same time, RPD fired 166 local Park Recreation Directors who were mentors to latch-key children and youth. These Rec Directors took responsibility for the sites at which they worked. After they were forced out, part-time private coaches and other casuals drop in to work on an "as needed basis." There are no longer custodians/directors in our local parks.

The new RPD mission under its General Manager Phil Ginsburg has been to "extract" or "activate" as much money from the park system as possible through increased permit fees, philanthropic donations, higher or new admission fees, more events, and mandatory security fees. This has undermined the RPD's paramount responsibility to provide accessible parks and recreation facilities to the public.

In effect, the RPD has become a lobbyist for wealthy donors rather than having remained in its mission as an advocate for the public and steward of our parks and open spaces.

With no operating funds for staff our parks are deteriorating. Recreation facilities are understaffed, neglected, or shuttered. Public access is now more costly. Green spaces are being covered with hard surfaces and toxic artificial turf.

While this bond would enhance some facilities, it would reinforce the destructive practices of the Recreation and Parks Department. \$61.5M of this bond will not be dedicated to any specific project until after the it is passed. This tactic allows the RPD to promise neighborhoods throughout the City that their local park "may" receive bond funds. The RPD needs citizens' votes, but will often not honor the original promises made to neighborhoods.

RPD routinely sets up conflicts between residents and private interests. Contractors, lessees and concessionaires become investors in the "enterprise" and fight to keep their businesses, thus catalyzing more privatization of public space. Citizens' voices are routinely ignored.

Because bond funds can legally be used only for capital improvements, this measure will not meet our parks' most dire needs for the return of the dedicated park recreation directors who have been let go, plus more gardeners, custodians and

## Special Assembly Draft Minutes August 13, 2012

The duly noticed Special Assembly meeting to hear presentations and review selected ballot measures was convened at 6:45PM with 21 delegates and alternates from 20 member organizations and 6 guests in attendance. A quorum was declared. Two ballot measures were presented.

**Proposition F:** “Water Sustainability & Environmental Restoration Planning Act of 2012” aka “Water & Environment Plan” aka “Restore Hetch Hetchy,” a measure to approve a study to be funded by San Francisco to remove the dam and drain the Hetch Hetchy reservoir and find alternate ways to supply water to the system. Adrian Covert of the Bay Area Council spoke in opposition to the measure. Joan Girardot provided information on past studies to restore the Hetch Hetchy Valley. The proponent of the measure had to cancel at the last moment and could not find a replacement. Both sides were presented at the Government and Elections Committee meeting on July 23. The G & E Committee sent a recommendation to the General Assembly to oppose the measure. The motion to support the G & E Committee’s recommendation to oppose was passed unanimously 18 - 0 (2 abstentions). A motion to write a ballot argument for the voters’ handbook passed 16 - 1 (2 abstentions).

**Proposition B:** “Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond 2012,” a measure to allot funds for repairs and improvements to selected neighborhood, waterfront and citywide (Golden Gate and John McLaren) parks. Rosemary Cameron of San Francisco Parks Alliance and Rachel Taylor of the Trust for Public Lands presented the argument in favor of the bond measure. Former President of the Board of Supervisors Aaron Peskin presented the argument in opposition to the bond measure. On July 23, the members of the Government & Election Committee voted to send the measure to the General Assembly with the recommendation to oppose the measure. The motion to support the G&E committee’s recommendation to oppose the bond measure was passed by assembly delegates 16 - 2 (1 abstention). The motion to write a ballot argument for the voters’ handbook was passed 15 - 2 (1 abstention).

Charles Head, the chairman of the Government & Elections Committee, said that other ballot measures will be considered at the next General Assembly meeting on August 21. President Berkowitz adjourned the Special Assembly at 8:50PM.

...*Penelope Clark (RHIA) Recording Secretary*

### How to Reach Us

**President:** Judith Berkowitz • sfjberk@mac.com • 824-0617  
**1st VP:** George Wooding • mother\_ed@bigeds.com  
**2nd VP:** Rose Hillson • gumby5@att.net  
**Recording Scrtry:** Penelope Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com  
**Corresponding Secretary:** Dick Millet • milletdick@yahoo.com  
**Treasurer:** Dick Millet • milletdick@yahoo.com  
**Member-at-Large:** Charles Head • charleshead@hotmail.com  
**Parliamentarian:** Evelyn Wilson • evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net

## Executive Committee Report

### July 19

Chair George Wooding called the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Present were Judy Berkowitz, Wooding, Rose Hillson, Penelope Clark, Charles Head, and Evelyn Wilson. Dick Millet was excused. There was a quorum.

### Officers’ Reports

President Judy Berkowitz started the meeting with a discussion on the two vacancies on the Executive Committee (ExCom) created by the early withdrawal of Lorraine Lucas and Angelique Mahan from their positions. A discussion ensued as to who might be interested in joining the ExCom. Although some names were thrown out, volunteers are welcome. President Berkowitz stated that little has happened since her report to the GA two days ago. Also in regard to committee posts being filled: we’re still looking for more members to sign up for committees.

The SFMTA’s meter madness was discussed. As the cash-hungry SFMTA continues to add parking meters and patrol neighborhoods, a group called ENUF — Eastern Neighborhoods United Front — has been formed that is fighting the SFMTA’s attempt to add more parking meters on the Eastern side of SF. The ENUF blog is located here <http://metermadness.wordpress.com/>. The group is unique in that it already has a big victory under its belt.

According to President Berkowitz, more people in North Beach are upset about the noise, dirt and disruption to their businesses as North Beach streets will be blocked or closed due to the preparation of having the giant underground digging machines emerge in North Beach. With serious work — and long road closures — underway on the Central Subway project, North Beach residents and merchants have complained with increasing vigor that their lives and livelihoods will be ripped apart in order to construct a subway that isn’t planned to extend to their neighborhoods. North Beach Neighbors (NBN) is holding a series of forums concerning these issues.

2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President Penelope Clark mentioned that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted the OneBayAreaGrant (OBAG) program will be spending \$38.8 in federal transportation funds and will be looking for projects over the next four years.

### Unfinished Business:

- Recruit for two ExCom members-at-large seats; develop a list of candidates and
- *Community Forum on the Future of Transit in San Francisco*, Saturday, August 18, Koret Auditorium, Main Library, 100 Larkin Street 10 AM to 4 PM

### New Business:

- CSFN Assembly will meet on August 13<sup>th</sup> to hear pro and con arguments on Nov 6 ballot measures deemed by the G&E Cmte as rising to the level of our interest.
- General Assembly on August 21<sup>st</sup> will hear measures on the November ballot as well.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15.  
...*George Wooding (MTHA) Chair*

# CSFN Draft Minutes: General Assembly Meeting July 17

1. **Call to Order.** President Judith Berkowitz brought the July 17 meeting to order at 7:02PM at Northern Police Station.
    - a. *Quorum declared.* 23 Delegates and alternates represented 20 CSFN member organizations. 9 guests signed in.
    - b. *Agenda approved.*
    - c. *Introductions.* Delegates and guests introduced themselves. Hosts Kathy Devincenzi of Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n (LHIA) and Nick Pasquariello of Liberty Hill Neighborhood Ass'n (LHNA) described their organizations' objectives, history, and current issues.
  2. **Minutes.** The June General Assembly draft minutes were approved as printed on p 3 of the July newsletter.
  3. **Officers' Reports.**
    - a. **President Berkowitz** (EMIA) reminded delegates that CSFN is co-sponsoring the *Community Forum: The Future of Public Transportation in San Francisco* to be held in the Koret Auditorium at the SF Main Public Library on Saturday, August 18 from 10:00AM until 4:00PM. A sheet with the tentative agenda was distributed to delegates. • Enforcement of the City's Transit Effectiveness Project will probably be funded by a bond issue. • She also noted that the funding of the Central Subway was pulled by Rep McClintock from the Federal Transportation Act funding before it went to the US House of Representatives, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DRGODHF1Uco&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DRGODHF1Uco&feature=player_embedded) but it might reappear in the reconciliation process with the Senate's version of the measure. • She thanked George Wooding's for his brilliant article in the newsletter on the ineffectiveness of the Ethics Commission. • North Beach Neighbors (NBN) is hosting a series of forums re Central Subway disruption/construction. • CSFN committees need you! Join one (or two!) • She again noted that unless you have added your neighborhood organization to the Citidex list, it will not be included in the Planning Department's notification list. <http://citidex.sfgov.org/profile> • Because the Election Voter Info Pamphlet (VIP) deadline is August 16, there will be a CSFN Special Assembly meeting on Monday, August 13, at 6:30PM, with pro and con arguments for measures presented by the Govt & Elections Cmte for delegates to vote on. The Government & Elections Committee will meet to preview these issues. • She also announced that Lorraine Lucas and Angelique Mahan had resigned from the board; George Wooding is now 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President.
    - b. **2<sup>nd</sup> VP Hillson** (JPIA) also urged delegates to attend the August 18 forum on transportation. Those wishing to attend should contact Bob Feinbaum of SaveMuni SF ([bobf@att.net](mailto:bobf@att.net)). • She noted that the ballot initiative on spot zoning (re the 8 Washington St. project) had qualified for the ballot with over nineteen thousand signatures, and if the Board of Supervisors did not change its ruling on the EIR for that project it would be sent to the voters in the next election after this November. • The Planning Department filed for an exemption from environmental review in April for the list of parks in the \$1.95 million 2012 Parks bond. • She noted that the cost of replacing old vehicles in Muni's fleet in the Transit Effectiveness Project would be underwritten by a new bond issue, probably in 2015. Muni has the oldest fleet of any city in the country.
  4. **Committee Reports**
    - a. *Bylaws:* Chair **Evelyn Wilson** (SPEAK) said her committee has not been able to meet yet to act on the issue of CSFN's ability to join an existing law suit.
    - b. *Government & Elections:* Chair **Charles Head** (SHARP) announced the committee would meet Monday, July 23, to review ballot measures and plan for further pre-election meetings.
    - c. *Land Use & Housing:* Chair **Hiroshi Fukuda** (RCA) reported on the issues which are also in his report in the July newsletter (p 2), including proposed new dimensions for efficiency units and the CPMC EIR.
    - d. *Open Space:* **Kathy Howard** (SPEAK) reported that the Board of Supervisors approved the EIR on the Golden Gate Park soccer fields 10 to 1 (Olague was the dissenting vote). An appeal will be filed with the Board of Appeals, which will be followed by an important appeal to the California Coastal Commission. Delegates are urged to join in this appeal process.
    - e. *Transportation:* Chair **Gary Noguera** (MPIC).
    - f. *Water Task Force:* Chair **Joan Girardot** (MCIPOA).
  5. **Unfinished Business.**
  6. **New Business:** Representatives voted to send letters should to US Representative McClintock for successfully having the Central Subway federal funding deleted from the bill, and to Supervisor Olague for her opposition to the Soccer fields EIR.
  7. **Program:** Chester Fung, Principal Transportation Planner, presented a program on the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit plan. This included a lively discussion on the merits of aspects of the plan.
- Adjournment.** The July CSFN General Assembly meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.
- ...Penelope Clark (RHIA) Recording Secretary

## Two Local Measures

maintenance workers.

Only after the wayward Parks Department has resumed its appointed role as steward of our cherished parks will we gladly vote to allot them more money.

### VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B!



### Proposition F: Water and Environment Plan

*The CFSN Assembly voted unanimously to oppose this ordinance.*

The ordinance will request a study that would examine the ramifications of tearing down O'Shaughnessy Dam and restoring the Hetch Hetchy Valley back to its original undammed state. If approved, the study will cost approximately \$8.0M.

Nearly a century ago, the O'Shaughnessy Dam was built to contain water from the Tuolumne River in The Hetch Hetchy Valley. Under the provisions of the 1913 Raker Act, which permitted the dam's construction, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SF PUC) is allowed to draw water from the reservoir. The Hetch Hetchy Valley is located in Yosemite National Park.

San Francisco and its 28 wholesale water customers — cities and towns on the peninsula — represent over 2.5 million people. Due to the water clarity and the granite riverbed, the Hetch Hetchy water system delivers some of the highest quality water in the United States.

Proponents of Proposition F state that this is simply a study that will help San Francisco develop more environmental sources of energy, restore the Hetch Hetchy valley, improve San Francisco's water recycling capabilities and maintain San Francisco's current water supply.

The costs of achieving Proposition F's goals are estimated to cost anywhere from \$3.0 Billion to \$10.7 Billion. San Francisco just spent \$4.8 Billion to upgrade our water system. The proposed studies estimated costs are incremental and are estimated to cost each average San Franciscan almost \$2,000 more per year. This, of course, would come from charging higher water and power rates.

The real purpose of this ordinance is not the study but the actual implementation of the study. If approved, the ordinance traps and forces the citizenry into having to vote for or against the adoption of the plan. The ordinance states the following: "Complete the planning process by November 2015 in time for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors or a group of citizens to propose a charter amendment to be voted on at the November 2016 election, which if passed, would authorize implementation of the plan."

Looking at it simply as a concept, everyone is agreeable to restoring a beautiful valley in a National Park, but this

ordinance is a factual misrepresentation that has been contrived to deceive the public.

Let's count the ways:

- 1.) There is no way for environmental energy sources to make up for the lost hydroelectric power and no way for these energy sources to duplicate the lower hydroelectric costs. San Francisco will be stuck either purchasing hydroelectric power at much higher rates from outside sources or relying on environmental energy sources which are 5 to 8 time more expensive.
- 2.) San Francisco is already using alternative water sources and plans to decrease the city's dependence on Hetch Hetchy water. Additionally, the city already has a deal in place to build a reverse osmosis wastewater facility which will treat wastewater to a semi-potable level.
- 3.) The recapturing of San Francisco's limited rainfall and irrigation water would be extremely expensive and yield little water at an exorbitant cost.
- 4.) San Francisco already has a sustainable water system that utilizes water filtration. The study features "water filtration" because once the dam is dismantled, the city's drinking water will have to be stored in several dammed locations that have much higher levels of sediment. To be potable, this water will have to go through higher levels of filtration.
- 5.) The study also asks for higher levels of public water conservation. San Francisco already has one of the highest levels of water conservation in the state. The average citizen uses approximately 57 gallons of water per day. When implemented, the new conservation level goals would reduce usage to 49 gallons of water per day. In contrast, the average citizen in San Jose uses approximately 120 gallons of water per day.
- 6.) The authors of this study want to extract a much higher rate of potable groundwater from the aquifer beneath San Francisco. The city is already extracting approximately 2% of its water from the aquifer and wants to increase this amount to at least 4% or more. The PUC must proceed with caution. If too much of the aquifer water is extracted the remaining aquifer water may start to become brackish or salty over time.
- 7.) Proposition F is supposedly good for the environment, but the dismantling of O'Shaughnessy Dam will cause tremendous environmental damage. Camp Mather will have to be used as a holding station for 675,000 cubic yards of cement and dam refuse. And... the tap water that we receive will not be as good.

We love Yosemite Park. However, Proposition F is a proposal that will completely change San Francisco's water and power system.

It's just not worth \$10 Billion dollars.

### VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

...George Wooding (MTHA)

## Gov't & Elections Committee Report

At the July 17 GA, Chairman Head announced a G&E Committee meeting for July 23, and President Berkowitz announced a Special Assembly for August 13 to consider ballot measures only.

On July 23, 2012, the G&E committee met to discuss ballot measures for the fall election. Present were Charles Head, Rose Hillson, Paul Webber, Mary Harris, Al Harris, Penelope Clark, George Wooding and Joan Girardot. We decided to focus on debate style presentations of three top tier measures at our next meeting: "Restore Hetch Hetchy," Rec and Park Bond, and CCSF Parcel Tax.

On July 31, the committee met again at Northern Station. Present were Charles Head, Rae Doyle, Joan Girardot, Kathy Howard, Nancy Wuerfel, Penelope Clark, Betsey Eddy, Claire Zvanski, Rose Hillson, Mary Harris, George Wooding, Al Harris, and Evelyn Wilson.

A. We heard from Chris Ricco of Restore Hetch Hetchy and Matt Regan of Save Hetch Hetchy. Later we voted to recommend that CSFN oppose Restore Hetch Hetchy ballot measure 11 - 2.

B. We heard from Matt O'Grady of the SF Parks Alliance speaking in favor of the 2012 Rec and Park Bond measure, and from Aaron Peskin opposing it. Later we voted unanimously to recommend that CSFN oppose the bond measure.

C. We heard from Adrienne Messier, CCSF union leader and English Teacher, in favor of the Parcel Tax Measure and from Ann Clark, retired CCSF teacher, speaking against it. Later we voted 8 - 3 (2 abstentions) to recommend that CSFN support the parcel tax measure.

...Charles Head (SHARP) Chair

## Open Space Cmte Muses on RPD Bond

A city department is not an autonomous independent entity with a sovereign at its helm. It is a creation of the public to respond to our needs and to implement the will us all. RPD's power struggle with the public is a big red flag of more trouble to come, since they do not respect the fact that they report to us, the people.

Here is why we came to oppose the bond, despite it including funding for West Sunset, and how this can work with our alternative proposal.

It takes a little history.

- We were excited when RPD first brought out the proposal for West Sunset playing fields renovation as part of the 2012 Bond. This meant that they knew that West Sunset also needed renovation and were willing to raise funding for it. Surely, RPD would see that the materials could be switched between the fields and it would both protect the park and provide more hours of play. We therefore included it as a feasible alternative for the EIR hearings and wrote it up as such for the BOS and others. We also did analyses and presented this information to the public, to show that here was a location in the western end of San Francisco that could meet many of the needs that soccer players have expressed.
- Since then, we have been disillusioned with their response. We were frankly shocked that RPD never wanted to talk about doing this. They have made it clear to both us and to the soccer community, that they would not seriously consider this alternative at West Sunset. Since we have tried written communications and extensive public testimony and gotten nowhere, we decided that the next step is to have the Bond defeated this time and then rewritten to include a revised West Sunset option the next time.
- We support a new Bond in the next few years — this should include renovating West Sunset to meet the current soccer player needs as we described. This would provide the alternative we have outlined.

Meanwhile, what happens right now? Beach Chalet has been poorly maintained by RPD — whether this is intentional or not it's irrelevant to the soccer players. What RPD fails to state is that the Beach Chalet fields can be renovated right now with the 2008 Bond funding.

## LU&H Committee Report

### August 13

The Regular Meeting of the CSFN Land Use & Housing Committee was convened by Hiroshi Fukuda on Monday, August 13, 2012 at 5:35 P.M. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station at Turk and Fillmore Streets.

The Committee considered the following items

1. CPMC: Committee voted to request the ExCom to schedule a CPMC program to cover all issues including EIR, height, bulk, traffic, housing, jobs, seismic, gas pipe, gentrification, Healthcare Master Plan, etc.
2. Student Housing: BOS on 7/31/12, approved first reading; second reading scheduled for 9/4/12. New construction is encouraged. Conversion of residential housing to student housing is allowed in two instances, one USF lot and one SFIA Student Housing contract.
3. Parkmerced Superior Court hearing date rescheduled to September 13, 2012. Judge's decisions thus far appear to favor City.
4. 1601 Larkin to be heard at Planning Commission Aug. 16, 2012. CSFN supports efforts to preserve and adaptive reuse of the historic building.
5. Efficiency unit: BOS approved first reading on 07/31/12, second reading on 9/25/12. Concerns are open space requirement for common areas, affordable housing issues, decrease in family housing. Major change includes requirement that it must be new construction and not renovations.
6. Establishing Four Outer Sunset Neighborhood Commercial Districts: concerns include noise from increased in horsepower and odor in residential areas.

The next regular meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, September 10, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. in the Community Room of the Northern Police Station located at Turk and Fillmore.

Adjourned: 6:30 PM

...Hiroshi Fukuda (RCA) Chair

## Open Space Committee Report

### Open Space Committee recommends to the General Assembly

**Resolved:** The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods joins as a co-appellant to the administrative appeal of the Local Coastal Zone Permit to the California Coastal Commission for the Beach Chalet Soccer Fields project.

**Background:** The SF Group of the Sierra Club, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Friends of Lands End, SPEAK, SF Ocean Edge, Save Ocean Beach, Viking Soccer Parents for Real Grass in Golden Gate Park, and many other groups and individuals are filing an administrative appeal to the California Coastal Commission of the Beach Chalet Soccer Fields project. They feel that the 150,000 watts of night lighting in particular will have a negative impact on Ocean Beach and the area of the park within the Local Coastal Zone. Their hope is that the California Coastal Commission will broker a compromise that supports youth soccer while protecting the shoreline habitat and enjoyment of the beach for all San Franciscans. Joining as a co-appellant is free and incurs no obligation for CSFN — financial or otherwise.

...Kathy Howard (SPEAK)

## Open Space Cmte Succinctly Explains the Beach Chalet Soccer Fields

The Polo Fields were renovated for \$1.4 million, and they are much larger than Beach Chalet. The Polo Field renovation was not, however, as good as the one we want for Beach Chalet — it did not include gopher controls or a new sub-surface irrigation system. That would cost closer to \$3–4 million. The current Beach Chalet project has been estimated at over \$13 million. Even using \$4 million for a top-notch grass playing surface, that would leave \$9 million for other playing fields all over San Francisco.

There is some important and useful information that might help CSFN members to better understand how there can be a win-win solution to better fields for kids while protecting the Park. The Appeal to the Coastal Commission may help to achieve this compromise.

1. There is an alternative to building this soccer complex at Beach Chalet. It combines renovating the West Sunset Fields with safe (non-SBR rubber) artificial turf and neighborhood-appropriate lighting combined with renovating the Beach Chalet fields with real grass and no lights.
2. The Beach Chalet fields can be renovated for greater player safety with real grass. This is not a choice between “fix up” or leave as is. SF Ocean Edge has always advocated for the Beach Chalet fields to be renovated.
3. Our proposal for renovating the Beach Chalet fields includes an effective sub-surface drainage system, better soil structure, a new state-of-the-art irrigation system, and gopher controls. Interestingly enough, West Sunset has few gophers — this is because the just-retired gardener kept them out. And West Sunset does not even have a gopher barrier or other ways to control them.
4. Using Rec and Park’s own data, we have calculated about the same number of hours of play would be gained by this combined alternative.
5. The Coastal Commission will probably be most concerned about the lights. The 150,000 watts will be on from dusk to 10:00 p.m. Fog will compound the problem — On nights with ground fog, the entire area will glow 10 to 20 brighter with these lights, than on a clear night — the impact on the Park, on views of the park from Sutro Heights, on people walking on the Promenade, and on Ocean Beach will be enormous.
6. Because West Sunset is further from the Beach — and outside of the Coastal Zone — the West Sunset alternative might be more acceptable to the Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission might also encourage RPD to use less bright lights, even at that location.

This is a well-reasoned discussion that clearly presents options that RPD will just not talk about! When we compare the SFPUC’s reaction to public opposition to putting their factory in GGP with RPD’s reaction to public opposition to the proposed Beach Chalet project, it is clear that top management of each department is in control of these projects. However, SFPUC chose to cut their losses and move on to another site in order to achieve THEIR goals. RPD is just arbitrarily fighting the public for the sake of being a bully. If the goal for RPD was more soccer fields/time, then they could have that GOAL with the compromises proposed.

...Kathy Howard (SPEAK), Nancy Wuerfel (SPEAK),  
Jeanne Quock (UTA)

## THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS!

### BENEFACTORS

David Winthrop Allen Family Trust  
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798  
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn

### PATRONS

Cole Valley Improvement Assn  
Dick Millet  
Forest Knolls Neighborhood Org, George Wooding  
Haight Ashbury Improvement Assn  
Pacific Heights Residents Assn  
Retired Firemen & Widows Assn of SFFD  
Sunset Parkside Ed & Action Cmte (SPEAK)

### SPONSORS

Buena Vista Neighborhood Assn  
East Mission Improvement Assn  
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Assn  
Laurel Heights Improvement Assn  
Miraloma Park Improvement Club  
OMI Neighbors in Action  
Richmond Community Assn  
Sunset Hts Assn of Responsible People (SHARP)  
Telegraph Hill Dwellers  
John Bardis                      Kathryn Devincenzi, Attorney  
Judith Berkowitz              Tony Kelly  
Penny Clark                      Hon Fiona Ma  
Sheryl Connell                   Bert Polacci  
Steve Currier                    Jeanne & Winchell Quock  
Steve Williams, Attorney  
(And thanks! to Jim & Ella Mae Lew)

**Special thanks to Office Depot for photocopying services!**



### COMMITTEE MEETINGS

**Land Use & Housing** • Monday 5:30PM Sept 10 • Northern Police Station • Chair Hiroshi Fukuda • ninersam@aol.com • 386-2212  
**Open Space** • Ongoing Meetings • Chair Nancy Wuerfel • nancenummer1@aol.com • 731-6432, Co-chair Ramona Albright • 621-9621  
**Transportation** • Chair Gary Noguera • garynoguera@earthlink.net  
**Water Task Force** • Chair Joan Girardot • 346-5525  
**Bylaws** • Chair Evelyn Wilson • evelynwilsregparl@earthlink.net • 566-9826  
**Gov’t & Elections** • Chair Charles Head • charlesnhead@hotmail.com

<b>AGENDA</b>	
<b>General Assembly Meeting</b>	
<b>August 21, 2012</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. Parkmerced Action Coalition — PmAC 2. Richmond Community Assn — RCA
7:15	III. Approval of July 2012 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. Bylaws B. Government & Elections C. Land Use & Housing D. Open Space E. Transportation F. Water Task Force
7:45	VII. Program: Measures which will appear on the November 6 Ballot.
	VIII. Adjournment

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

**Next Meeting**  
Tuesday  
August 21

**Contents**

Two Local Measures: Park Bond & "Restore Hetch Hetchy" .....	1
Special Assembly Draft Minutes .....	2
July ExComm Report .....	2
July Assembly Draft Minutes .....	3
Gov't & Elections Cmte Report .....	5
LU&H Committee Report .....	5
Open Space Cmte Report .....	5
Open Space Cmte on Park Bond .....	5
Open Space Cmte Explains Soccer Fields..	6

*CSFN meets the third Tuesday of each month except for December at Northern Police Station Community Room, Corner of 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.