

## Tell It to City Hall

By Larry Bush

**T** rue Story: A city Department head went to the mayor asking that a nonprofit critical of his performance have its city funding cut off. When that didn't work, this same department head contacted the private foundation funders asking them to cut off funding.

In either case, nothing was done by the Lee Administration to hold the complaining department head accountable attempting something so blatantly wrong. Ultimately, Mayor Lee simply let the Department head's contract expire without being renewed.

As a journalist, I reported on those behind-the-scenes retaliatory actions because I could use the city's Sunshine Act and the state's Public Records Act to force disclosure of emails and phone records.

Indeed, any journalist could do that because it was a city agency. But, if a private entity with access to city officials did the same thing, no journalist would have been able to find out.

And neither could the public.

But you could help change that. This election the Ethics Commission unanimously voted to put a measure on the ballot to put some sunshine onto closed-door spending to influence city hall.

It's drawing some fire from those who don't want the public to know what they are spending to influence City Hall, and don't want the public to know what the issues are they lobby, and don't want the public to know who they meet with.

It hasn't drawn criticism based on ideology, but on balking at having to inform the public about their spending to win over City Hall – including some unions and some nonprofits.

Unions already are exempt from lobby laws when it comes to negotiating collective bargaining and similar issues. It is only when they lobby over budgets and other issues that they must disclose their spending – just as they had to do prior to the change in the law in 2009

Some nonprofits don't oppose applying sunshine requirements on others, but claim those standards shouldn't apply to them. It is a classic case of what is good for the goose is not good, in their opinion, for the gander. They claim their "good work" should give them an exemption from disclosing any influence peddling.

What they can't explain is how to distinguish between nonprofits that do "good work" and those who are engaged in shilling for corporate profits or that seeks to impose their social agenda against choice, environmental rules, or safety. But if they are engaged in good work, why wouldn't they want the public to know of their good works? Ironically, nonprofits already have to tell the IRS about spending for lobbying. It appears that it is just San Francisco's public that is to be kept in the dark.

*Cont. to p.2*

## Presidents Message

### Why CSFN matters so much.

**V**olunteerism—the policy or practice of volunteering time or talents for charitable, educational, or other worthwhile activities, especially in the community.

The time and energy that CSFN members selflessly spend on neighborhood issues can have an enormous impact. Every neighbor participating in CSFN is fighting for or against a cause or working with City Departments.

We often don't win, but we continue to represent neighborhood interests. Issue after issue, CSFN members wait for hours so that they can give two minutes of testimony.

City hall is controlled by real estate developers, business lobbyists, large political donors representing well-financed special interest groups, the Chamber of Commerce and pro-growth think tanks such as SPUR.

City Commissions are stacked against the very people they profess to serve. The Mayor selects a majority of the seven Planning Commissioners and the committee chair. All seven of the Recreation and park (RPD) Commissioners and the chair are selected by the Mayor.

The SFMTA is governed by a seven-member Board of Directors appointed by the mayor. The SFMTA Board has the authority to appoint the Executive Director, approve the budget and set agency policy.

Health Commissioners are appointed by the Mayor pursuant to the City Charter Section 3.100. The term of each member is four years. Vacancies occurring on the Commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of the Commission shall be filled by the Mayor.

The pendulum always swings both ways. Neighborhoods are tired of city hall ignoring the city charter and city planning rules. I am proud to say that CSFN's Government & Elections committee was able to place or sponsor seven ballot arguments in the November fourth San Francisco voter pamphlet.

With the exception of Proposition A—The Housing Bond and Proposition C—The Ethic Commission amendment for hidden lobbyists all of CSFN's votes are attempts to mitigate housing developments ( Proposition D, F, I, J and K. ) Proposition D—Mission Rock was a very hard vote as they had promised to build 40% affordable, on site housing. Unfortunately, the inability of the developer to commit to the amount of actual residential housing that would be built on site prompted CSFN to vote against this project.

There are almost Thirty thousand vacant units in San Francisco and the mayor is committed to building thirty thousand new units in the next five years. Does this make sense? CSFN is as committed to maintaining the character of our neighborhoods (1986 Proposition M) as the mayor is committed to changing the neighborhoods density.

The CSFN's members are committed to protecting neighborhoods throughout the city.

*George Wooding President*

**Tell It To City Hall** *Cont. from p. 1*

Quite simply. . . all work that involves the public and their money deserves to receive the brightest sunshine exposure.

Some opponents to Prop C fall back to claim that exempting good guy non profits – even if it means keeping secret “bad” nonprofits – is a small price to pay because having to disclose their lobbying is inconvenient and involves paperwork.

Today. . . in real time. . . Take a second look at what would happen if we blacked out lobbying reports from nonprofit groups:

No reporting from the astroturf nonprofits backed by Airbnb – groups created largely for the purpose of supporting the views of their funders.

No reporting from astroturf nonprofits set up by Coca Cola to promote less regulation on sugary sodas

No reporting on groups secretly filming Planned Parenthood and using the films to lobby to defund that agency

No reporting on the nonprofit American Legislative Council Exchange that has been writing and lobbying for laws like “Stand Your Ground” that was the legal basis for shooting Trayon Martin, killing him and which seeks to cut back environmental laws.

No reporting on the nonprofit lobbying effort undertaken at the request of Comcast, which contributed money to them, to support Comcast’s position on a merger.

Look at the state Fair Political Practices Commission having to go to court to find who was pouring \$11 million into defeating a state proposition that came from an Arizona nonprofit, that in turn was funded by an east coast nonprofit, and whose original donors have never been revealed. Money just gets washed from one nonprofit to another until it lands in our City Hall.

So how does Proposition C, the Expenditure Lobbyist measure, actually work and how did it end up on your ballot?

San Francisco used to require disclosure of all money spent to influence City Hall decisions – both in direct contacts with city officials and through public campaigns that urged the public and voters to contact City Hall for someone’s pet concern.

It is the same disclosure standard as elsewhere in California – Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, Sacramento and at the state level.

Then in 2009 the Ethics staff pled that this was just too much work and, anyway, not that many people filed. So why not “streamline” the city law and drop requiring disclosure of public lobbying campaigns. Nowhere did they explain to the Board of Supervisors hundreds of thousands of dollars were being spent every 3 months in 2009. . . the very year they said not too many people filed.

And so the disclosure requirement that had been put there to help the public see the flow of dollars was repealed with no disclosure of its impact on the public – just the impact on the Ethics staff and the regulated lobbyists.

In 2014, the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury looked at Ethics policies and practices and recommended that this disclosure be restored to our law. Earlier this year, after several hearings and a special Interested Persons meeting, the Ethics Commission unanimously voted to reinstate the law by putting it on the ballot themselves.

The ultimate protection for the public is having voters recognize that we have the power to make change, and that to participate in the decisions that affect our city, we are entitled to know who, what and how those decisions are influenced and made.

Proposition C is an important step in that direction, and its success should be followed by further steps that improve transparency and voter empowerment.

*Larry Bush was a member of the 2013-2014 SF Civil Grand Jury and works with Friends of Ethics, a volunteer group that supports and advocates passage of November’s Proposition C, the Expenditure Lobbyist disclosure ballot measure.*

## **Draft Minutes for the General Assembly Meeting August 18, 2015**

1. **Call to Order.** President George Wooding brought the August 18 meeting to order at 7:00 pm in the Northern Police Station Community Room.

a. Quorum declared. 23 delegates and alternates represented 20 CSFN member organizations. Seven guests signed in.

b. Agenda approved.

c. Introductions. Delegates and guests introduced themselves. Hosts: Cathy Lentz (PmAC) lamented the loss of the Parkmerced court case and said she would now be the alternate, not the prime, delegate from PmAC. Hiroshi Fukuda (RCA) said things were quieter now in the Richmond District but worries about Japantown style development.

2. **Program: Prop C. Expenditure Lobbyists Ordinance. G&E Chair Head (SHARP) presided over this.**

Jesse Mainardi, Associate Director, Ethics Commission, spoke on the requirements of the ordinance, cautioning he could not advocate, only inform.

Larry Bush of the Civil Grand Jury spoke of the necessity of the changes outlined in the ordinance.

On a motion from Claire Zvanski (EDIA), the G.A. declared it an emergency (19-0-1) and voted to support this ballot measure (19-1).

Chair Head also went over a list of all the Props we had considered (not B,E,G or H) and how we had voted to support all but D. He then said we had signed on to proponent arguments (and one opponent argument) for the V.I.P. using only \$530 of the \$1600 authorized by the G.A. at the Aug. 3 Special Meeting for one Paid Ballot Argument.

3. **Officers’ Reports.**

a. **President Wooding (MTHA)** said his message was in the August newsletter. He emphasized the budget priority and thanked Charles Head and G&E for hard work and good results

b. **1st VP Morgan (CHNA)** thanked Corresponding Secretary Glenn Rogers (PmAC) and Webmaster Avrum Shepherd (GWPNA) for all their work in updating current membership lists.

c. **2nd VP Hillson (JPJA)**- excused

d. **Recording Secretary Head (SHARP)** noted that the draft minutes of the July General Assembly were on p. 3 of the August news-

letter.

- e. Corresponding Secretary Rogers (PmAC) reported that a correspondence file was available for review by the Delegates.
- f. Treasurer Scott ( PHRA) presented the draft budget, and a motion to approve was passed 13-3-3. In response to a question from Delegate Chooi Eng Grosso (SHARP), Treasurer Scott responded that to date, he had not discovered any evidence of impropriety or malfeasance in the records he has reviewed.

**4. Committee Action Items**

- a. Executive - none
- b. Bylaws - none.
- c. Dinner – Marlayne Morgan has exchanged emails with Committee members about selection of venue for the Holiday Dinner.
- d. Government & Elections. Chair Charles Head (SHARP) said there was no meeting on the 17th, and that minutes of the Special Meeting on the 3rd would be in the next newsletter.
- e. Land Use - no report.
- f. Media Relations. – no report
- g. Open Space - no report
- h. Transportation. Chair Mari Eliza (EMIA) invited delegates to join her at the next meeting on 8/24.
- i. Water Task Force. Chair Joan Girardot (MCI&POA) – no report

**5. Approval of July 21, 2015 GA minutes – approved unanimously with one correction ( Joan Downey (CVIA) submitted the Segway reso).**

**6. Old Business – corrections of minutes referred to ExCom meeting Aug. 26 .**

**7. New Business:** Marlayne Morgan (CHNA) introduced 3 guests from the **South of Market Action Coalition ( SMAC)** who spoke about the 5 M (5th/Mission ) project which was being fast tracked to exempt this site from the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan through an ordinance sponsored by the Mayor. **She introduced an emergency resolution** which passed 18-1, and a motion to oppose this which passed 19-0, stating:

**Therefore, be it resolved that the Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods opposes the variances required for the proposed 5M Project, and supports the approval of a Code Compliant project on this site.**

**8. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:11.

*... Charles Head (SHARP) Recording Secretary*

---

**CSFN Resolution To Prohibit Carve Outs And/Or Spot Zoning For The 5M (Chronicle) Project**

**WHEREAS**, the Developer Forest City is proposing height and bulk variances for the 5M (Chronicle) project, up to 470’ towers; and

**WHEREAS**, On July 21, 2015: Mayor Lee introduced “Ordinance No. 150787- To Create the 5th and Mission Special Use District” and “Ordinance No. 150788 - Ordinance to Approve a Development Agreement Between the City and 5M Project LLC”, and;

**WHEREAS**, In this Ordinance, the Board of Supervisors is certifying the Final EIR, re-moving the ability for the public to appeal this Final EIR, and;

**WHEREAS**, this Ordinance would set all impact fees, specifically

excluding for 5M the “Transportation Sustainability Fee,” which is currently being considered by the BOS. The public should be able to challenge this exclusion at the BOS, but this ordinance would nullify this appeal, and;

**WHEREAS**, in this Ordinance, the City is authorizing the purchase of the property at 967 Mission Street, instead of the BOS considering this property transaction as a separate item, and;

**WHEREAS**, the City has improperly removed the 5M Project from both the Eastern Neighborhood Plan and the Central SoMa Plan, and;

~~**WHEREAS**~~, the developer and the City have excluded the community and neighbors from the planning process in their efforts to fast track this project, and;

**WHEREAS**, spot zoning for this one project will create a ripple effect throughout this neighborhood and other neighborhoods and will create a “second financial district” in the SoMa neighborhood, and;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods opposes the 5M project as proposed, and supports the approval of a Code Compliant project on this site.**

*Submitted by Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association (CHNA)*

---

**August 26 Excom Draft Meeting Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 5:38 pm by Chair Marlayne Morgan. Present were Wooding, Head, Rogers, Scott, Clark, Graham and Lucas. Hillson was excused. Guests present were: Devincenzi, Girardot, Pasquariello, Webber and Zvanski.

Several program suggestions were received , one from a member organization (item a), one from Land Use on AHDBP (item b), and one from the Waste Management Corporation which was referred to the Government and Elections Committee. After some discussion, the Committee voted 8-0 to present the following program at the 9/15 General Assembly:

- a. A Director’s presentation and short trailer on “The Other Barrio”, a film on Mission District gentrification, currently being shown by film festivals across the country and scheduled for San Francisco in October. Nick Pasquariello, (LHIA)
- b. A presentation from SF Planning on proposed legislation from the Mayor’s Office on the Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program (AHBP).

**Officers Reports**

President Wooding announced he was seeking a volunteer for the position of Newsletter Editor as Secretary Rose Hillson has declined to serve in that capacity on a permanent basis. He also is continuing to seek volunteers for the positions of Parliamentarian and Sergeant at Arms .

First VP Morgan reported on the administrative procedures that had been put in place since the May election, including timely delivery of the agenda ten days in advance of each GA, updating and posting the by-laws and membership list, providing the monthly correspondence file and Treasurer’s report for Delegate review each month and passing the 2015- 2016 budget.

Recording Secretary Head provided draft minutes of the 8/3 Special Meeting and 8/18 GA meeting for review by the ExCom. A number

of edits were suggested to both sets of minutes before submission to the GA.

Treasurer Scott provided the August bank statements for review, and will roll over the CSFN CD at the SF Credit Union. He will also begin seeking quotes for CSFN Directors (E & O) Insurance. In response to a question from the Chair, he clarified that his report at the August GA of “no irregularities or malfeasance” in our financials is based on records he has to date been able to access and examine. He is not able to comment on transactions and accounts that are not available for his review.

**Unfinished Business**

Due to concerns for some groups who can’t afford the dinner hosting, there was a discussion on the value of continuing to provide food, which also lengthens the meeting time. While arguments were made for only providing water and/or coffee and tea, like most other meetings held in San Francisco, it was determined we would continue to work with those groups who are having problems hosting and the Corresponding Secretary will report back any ongoing difficulties.

The issue of membership eligibility was referred to the ExCom at the June GA. We will discuss this item at the September ExCom.

There were three requests for corrections of past meeting minutes.

Correction to June ExCom Minutes- agreed to change the word “Delegate” to “Guest”. Boken (SPEAK).

For a request made for changes to April ExCom minutes, the Chair requested the Delegate listen to the tape of that meeting before proceeding with considering the request. Zvanski (EDIA).

A request for changes and corrections to May GA minutes from Delegate Devincenzi was not supported by the ExCom. A motion by Member Lucas to decline to publish these changes in the newsletter was passed 6-2.

A revised and expanded version of draft May GA minutes was then presented by Secretary Head, who had authored the May draft minutes that appear in the June newsletter. These revised minutes were not supported by the ExCom. Due to challenges to many of the additions and changes in his second version of the draft minutes, the Chair asked the Secretary to listen again to the tape of that meeting and revise his document accordingly.

**New Business**

President Wooding will renew his request for volunteers for the position of Newsletter Editor, Parliamentarian and Sergeant at Arms at the September GA. The President explained his ongoing commitment to establish a Code of Conduct for CSFN meetings, and will refer this item to the ByLaws Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 pm.

*Marlayne Morgan (CHNA), Chair*

**CSFN – August 24, 2015 LU&HC Committee Report**

Chair Hillson called the meeting to order at 5:35PM in the Community Room at Northern Station on Turk at Fillmore.

**1. Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP)**

Presentation by Kearstin Dischinger (Planning), Jeff Buckley\* (stated he was Mayor’s Housing Policy Advisor), Menaka Mohan (Planning) <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4233>

Ms. Dischinger provided an overview of what led to the AHBP and the ordinance for it that will come out in September. AHBP is a product of the Mayor’s Working Group on how to address the affordable housing crisis.. Mr. Buckley stated that the focus was also to include the moderate and middle income sector as there were few incentives to do those.

Ms. Dischinger highlighted the State Density Bonus (SDB) Law which has been around and it gives 100% affordable projects a density bonus. She mentioned that in 2013, the Supreme Court ruled that projects that provide on-site affordability – required by inclusionary law – can ask for the SDB.

SF is covered by the inclusionary housing law for buildings with 10 units or more – have to pay a fee, provide units on site, or provide units off site.

She stated that **the city came up with a program to take advantage of the SDB Law and also incorporated input from Mayor’s Working Group, Sunset Blueprint, other Planning efforts, Housing Element.** One solution is this AHBP.

Mr. Buckley stated that the Supreme Court is requiring the city to do something with the SDB Law.

Ms. Dischinger stated the Mayor asked them to look at what could be done. 4 policy goals emerged:

1. Higher levels of affordability on site (12% inclusionary (SF voters via Prop K supports 33% target))
2. Looked at unfeasible height and density parcels and zoning
3. Establish middle-income program
4. 100% affordable projects need to be facilitated

A map of the “Program Area” (PA) was posted on the website (currently user cannot manipulate map to see exact streets/parcels). The PA looked for residential uses allowed lots, where density is controlled by units-to-lot-area, exclude sites where owners not likely to develop affordable housing on site at 10% or 20% (RH-1/RH-2).

SDB Law allows people to get bonus if they have 5 units or more.

Lots identified in RC, RM, NCD with density limit control and within ¼-mile of a Muni Rapid Network.

Soft-site analysis has determined there are 30,000 parcels.

AHDBP has two options – **State Program (SP) or the Local Program (LP):**

SP hits only 2 of the 4 policy goals (higher affordability + helps some infeasible sites). SP says owner can cover lot-to-lot but had prescriptive items and incentives to many things including rear yard variance, exposure variance, additional height, parking variances, waivers to make space for extra units. Under SP, rental projects are 13% affordability on-site/inclusionary; owner projects at 20% afford-

**Next Meeting:  
CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2015**

ability; different income levels of housing: Inclusionary at 55% AMI or 90% AMI as required today + few low or very low income units. SP would not hit the 30% affordable the Mayor wants.

### **The SDB Law will be put into the Planning Code.**

LP offers the following if project does 30% affordable (12% inclusionary, 18% middle income):

1. 2 more stories in height
2. Density controlled by height and bulk
3. Require 40% 2-BR (or 40% 2-BR + X% 3-BR) – this requested by Sunset Blueprint input (Supervisor Tang)

Working with Supervisor Christensen on “Neighborhood Preference Program” (NPP) also. Nothing is drafted in terms of legislation yet. Under LP, for 100% affordable projects:

1. Expedite entitlement
2. Control density by height, unit mix, building envelope
3. Get 3 stories more in height

Mr. Buckley spoke about stretching their scarce local dollars to reduce per unit cost in relation to land value.

Some projects mentioned were 490 S. Van Ness, 16th & Mission, 17th & Folsom.

Ms. Dischenger stated that they tried to create a situation to add value to the land by making the unit potential greater.

12 sites were studied by David Baker Architects and the resulting document will get posted on the website next week. The financial feasibility study was done by Libby Siefel of Siefel Consulting. This is a result of the 12-site study.

Various questions arose as to financial feasibility, whether SP was required (yes), whether LP was required (Mr. Buckley says they believe it is “legally defensible” but did not say “yes” or “no”), that the EIR will use the 2014 HE EIR (part in appeal today) and Sara Jones (Planning ERO) will put out finding. Ms. Dischinger stated the Court found the city was in good standing in regards to the CEQA documents for the projects. Question on interface of DRs to the SP/LP brought up; other questions.

2. “Corovan” Project – no show, no feedback received.
3. 1481 Post Update: Community meeting on Sept. 15, at JCCNC, Marlayne to send flyer out.
4. Code Corrections update:
  - A. Eliminated text that applied only to SoMa & Eastern Neighborhoods put back in so rear yards citywide for RH-1/RH-2 will not end up being shrunk to potentially 15 ft for all.
  - B. Same elimination of text for 100% SRO buildings even in RH-1/RH-2 to shrink back yards to 15 ft. as-of-right.
  - C. Resolution text for Recommendation #5 to allow City Attorney to make any corrections they find that are “non-substantive” (and being rear yards not considered “substantive”) amended to include to work with Planning. Passed 5-0.

D. Height for RH-1 changed from “Buildings” to “Dwellings” to be up to 35 feet vs. all buildings going to 40 feet due to schools e.g. that can go to 40 feet.

E. Step down in heights with Sec. 260/261 retained vs. default

increase to 40 feet when rear and front lot lines differ in height by 20 feet or more.

Everybody needs to pay attention to ordinance regardless of guidelines, surveys, ballot measures because ordinance will reign for Planning.

5. Other:

A. “5M” – Issue with creation of an ordinance that exempts practically everything in Planning Code as an SUD, new rules apply, no appeal on EIR by Mayor. This can be applied by even supervisors? This is spot-zoning. This will be at Planning on 9/3/2015.

B. Kirkham Heights Project – meeting at SHARP on 8/31 at 7pm at 1736-9th Avenue.

C. “Monster in the Mission” (Plaza 16) – developer / seller agreement lawsuit holding project. Agreement was never signed while negotiations were going and option expired on July 9, 2015. <http://www.socketsite.com/archives/2015/08/331-unit-monster-in-the-mission-embroiled-in-new-legal-battle.html>

D. 75 Howard at Planning on 9/3.

E. Resolution on Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program

### **Emergency Resolution on Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program**

**Whereas**, the Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program invited stakeholders as part of the process for the last 18 months and CSFN had to initiate a meeting with Planning based on a BizJournals article and only met on Aug. 24, 2015 to get some insight into the Program;

**Whereas**, CSFN is afforded a very limited time to respond to a non-existent plan;

**Whereas**, there is no clear timeframe for this Program for implementation;

**Whereas**, CSFN is to respond to a draft ordinance that is purported to be out by September;

**Whereas**, exhibits are not provided per the presentation given nor does the website have all the information posted in final draft form;

**Whereas**, it is unknown how the Large Projects Authorization will be blended into the Program;

**Whereas**, the EIR will be tiered off of the 2014 Housing Element which is still under appeal;

**Whereas**, open questions remain on the financial feasibility of the Program;

**Whereas**, transit impact fees are not defined, infrastructure impacts are not fully addressed, retention of character of neighborhoods is questionable;

**Whereas**, it is unknown how the Discretionary Review process will interface with operational procedures of this Program;

**Whereas**, the Local Program is not mandatory and CSFN does not have all the details on it;

**Whereas**, the city has already in excess of over 20,000 vacant units;

**Be it resolved**, the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods opposes the fast-tracking of this poorly thought out and incomplete preliminary ordinance and requests continuance after ample meaningful discussion with and input with CSFN and other neighborhood constituents have been seriously addressed.

Passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned 7:35 PM.

*Respectfully submitted: Rose Hillson (JPIA), Chair LU&HC*

---

## Special CSFN Meeting on Ballot Measures Aug. 3, 2015

Twenty-two delegates from 20 organizations and 9 guests signed in for this event. The program began at 6:45., with Government and Elections Committee Chair Charles Head (SHARP) presiding.

1. **Prop J: Legacy Business Historic Preservation Fund.** Supervisor Campos and Desiree Smith ( SF Heritage spoke in favor of the legislation because of the needs of older businesses the city wants to help. Chris Bowman criticized the Historic Register and the cost of the program. After discussion, the G.A. voted to support the Prop 12-6.
2. **Prop I: Suspension of Market-Rate Development in the Mission District** David Salavery (Save the Mission ) argued for affordable housing and neighborhood stabilization. Jay Cheng of SF Realtors said you can't pause demand for development. The G.A. voted 13-4 to support the Mission Moratorium.
3. **Prop A: Affordable Housing Bond.** Bill Barnes of the Mayor's Office asked for support or neutrality for the measure. The G.A. voted to support by 13-4
4. **Prop K: Surplus Public Lands.** Peter Cohen ( CCHO) presented the plan, and Chris Bowman lauded the intent but criticized the details. The G.A. voted to support by 11-5.
5. **Prop D: Mission Rock.** Vote on tabled previous measure: 11-5 to oppose.
6. **Prop F: Short Term Rentals.** Previous vote on supporting measure. Tony Kelly ( PBNA ) proposed writing Ballot Arguments on Props I, D and F, with the amendment to spend no more than \$1600. The vote was 13-4 in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30.

---

## Committee Meetings

**Bylaws: Vacant, TBA**

**Gov't & Elections: Chair Charles Head • charlesnhead@hotmail.com, TBA**

**Land Use & Housing: Monday 5:30 pm, 4th Mondays, Northern Police Station Chair Rose Hillson•gumby5@att.net**

**Media Relations: Vacant, TBA**

**Open Space: Chair Nancy Wuerfel •nancy42penguins@sbcglobal.net, Co-chair R Albright• 621-9621, TBA**

**Transportation: Monday 5:30PM 4th Mondays, Northern Police Station \* Chair Mari Eliza • mari@abazaar.com**

**Water Task Force: Chair Joan Girardot • csfnwatertaskforce@gmail.com • 346-5525**

## Transportation Committee Report

On Monday, August 24 (4th Monday) met jointly with Land Use at the Northern Police Station. This will be our meeting schedule for the time being.

Transportation Committee and Land Use Committee participated in a presentation on the Affordable Housing Bonus Density Plan (AHBD), outlined in the LU Report and attached Resolution. Since the justification for SFMTA plans are based on the dense development theme, it seems most appropriate to approach the transit problems at that level.

Marlayne, Glenn, Hiroshi, and I spent hours at Planning yesterday. There were at least three, possibly more, hot items. During the long hours of waiting, we worked on developing and finalizing the move-on.org petition that we hope the CSFN will support sponsoring this month. (See below)

We are continuing to meet on a regular basis with outside groups to develop some priorities for how we can fix the mess that SFMTA is delivering on our streets.

Please join us if you can or send people from your district to represent your group. **Our next meeting will be Monday, September 28, 5:30 pm at the Northern Police Station.**

If you can't make it, send in a written report on your issues. Those will be published in this monthly report: <https://metermadness.wordpress.com/media/newsletters>

### San Francisco Needs a Better Plan- the Petition

Per the CSFN Resolution on the Mayor's Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program (AHBD) we want homes we can afford, jobs for San Francisco residents, and streets that move freely. Therefore we request that the City:

1. Stop approving expanded development in our residential neighborhoods.
2. Stop amending City Planning Codes that incorporate more density into residential neighborhoods.
3. Enforce zoning laws that restrict development in residential neighborhoods.
4. Prioritize stopping evictions and displacements from currently affordable homes.

### Petition Background

Signing this petition will let city authorities know you have had ENUF. All comments go directly to the Supervisors.

Under AHDB, dense development will be coming to all our neighborhoods including the Marina, Cow Hollow, Richmond, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Western Addition, and the Sunset. Described and illustrated by charts and maps seen here. <http://www.sf-planning.org/AHBP>

We can say goodbye to private yards, garages and other single-family home amenities in the future San Francisco. If you don't have your own now, you probably have friends who do.

This program was designed without any neighborhood groups or residents' knowledge or involvement. The city authorities plan to approve it very soon with as little public notice as possible.

No notice was given to citizens who are signed up to get such notice; and no property owners have been mailed any notices about this new Plan.

No full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is planned for his program. The EIR will be rely on the 2014 Housing Element EIR and seen as “legally defensible”.

*Submitted by Mari Eliza (EMIA)*

---

### **ExComm—How to Reach Us:**

**President:** George Wooding • gswooding@gmail.com • 695-1395

**1st VP:** Marlayne Morgan • marlayne16@gmail.com

**2nd VP:** Rose Hillson • gumby5@att.net

**Recording Secretary:** Charles Head • charlesnhead@hotmail.com

**Corresponding Secretary:** Glenn Rogers • alderlandscape@comcast.net

**Treasurer:** Greg Scott • lgscpa@icloud.com

**Member-at-Large:** Penny Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com

**Member-at-Large:** Barbara Graham • barb.graham.sf@gmail.com

**Member-at-Large:** Lorraine Lucas • wozopoza@pacbell.net

**Parliamentarian:** vacant    **Sergeant-At-Arms:** vacant

**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 3rd (third) of the month to: Newsletter Editor (2nd VP) in Microsoft Word-compatible document (i.e. no pdf's) in-line or as attachment. 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, Non-members/\$15.

### **CORRECTIONS TO NEWSLETTER:**

Turn in written submissions to ExCom Chair (1st VP)

## **THANK YOU**

### **TO OUR SPONSORS!**

#### **BENEFACTORS**

David Winthrop Allen Family Trust

FX Crowley Company

Recology

San Francisco Police Officers' Assn

San Francisco Assn of Realtors

Sutro Tower, Inc.

#### **PATRONS**

Bernie Choden & Lois Scott

Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Assn – CHNA

Cole Valley Improvement Assn – CVIA

Denise LaPointe

Dick Millet

Ground Floor Public Affairs | Alex Tourk

Midtown Terrace Homeowners Assn – MTHA

Pacific Heights Residents Assn – PHRA

Retired Firemen & Widows Assn

San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Sharebetter Coalition

#### **SPONSORS**

Barbary Coast Neighborhood Assn – BCNA

East Mission Improvement Assn – EMIA

Forest Knolls Neighborhood Org – FKNO

Miraloma Park Improvement Club – MPIC

OMI Neighbors in Action – OMI-NIA

Richmond Community Assn – RCA

Sunset Heights Assn of Responsible People – SHARP

Sunset Parkside Education & Action Cmte – SPEAK

Telegraph Hill Dwellers – THD

University Terrace Assn – UTA

Hon. Mayor Art Agnos

Danita Kulp, RE Broker

John Bardis

Hon. Loretta Lynch

Judith Berkowitz

Hon. Kathrin Moore

Penny Clark

Hon. Aaron Peskin

Sheryl Connell

Jim Stearns

John Farrell

Paul Webber

Jon Golinger

Steve Williams, Attorney

## SEPTEMBER 15, 2015 CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGENDA

**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. Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association (LHIA)

2. Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People  
(SHARP)

**7:20 III.** Director's presentation and short trailer on "*The Other Barrio*", a film on Mission District gentrification, currently being shown by film festivals across the country and scheduled for SF in October. Nick Pasquariello, (LHIA)

A presentation from SF Planning on proposed legislation from the Mayor's Office on the **Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program** (AHBP).

**8:10 IV.** Officers' Reports

**A.** President

**B.** Vice Presidents

**C.** Secretaries

**D.** Treasurer

**8:30 V.** Committee Action Items—written reports in  
Newsletter

**A.** Executive

**B.** Bylaws

**C.** Dinner

**D.** Government & Elections- Upcoming programs and  
meetings

**E.** Land Use & Housing

**F.** Media Relations

**G.** Open Space

**H.** Transportation

**I.** Water Task Force

**8:45 VI.** Approval of August 3, Special Meeting minutes

Approval of August 18, General Assembly minute

**9:00 VII.** Unfinished Business

**9:15 VIII.** New Business

**9:30 IX.** Adjournment