

Sex, Drugs and Guns

An overview of the 2016 State Ballot Measures

By Guy Marzorati and Katie Orr, KQED



The California Secretary of State's Office has certified the final list of statewide measures that have qualified for the November ballot.

Along with several big bond and tax questions, voters will get to decide the future of the death penalty, a collection of tough new gun laws, and whether they really like a yet-to-be-enacted statewide ban on plastic bags.

If you start studying now, you might be ready come Election Day. It's just 130 days away.

Gun Control: This is a package of gun control measures backed by Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom. Among its provisions is a ban on large-capacity ammunition magazines. It would also require background checks for ammunition purchases. State lawmakers have passed a similar package of laws but neither Newsom nor Senate leader Kevin de León, who pushed the bills in the Legislature, would drop their effort and support the other.

Cigarette Tax: This would place a \$2 per pack tax on cigarettes. The money would be used for health care programs as well as tobacco use prevention and control programs. The cigarette tax currently stands at 87 cents per pack. The increased tax would also apply to electronic cigarettes and other products containing nicotine. The measure comes after the California Legislature and Gov. Jerry Brown raised the state's smoking age to 21.

Proposition 30 Tax Extension: If approved, this measure would extend the income tax portion of the Prop. 30 tax increase for another 12 years. It would apply to anyone making more than \$250,000 a year. Brown, who campaigned fiercely for Prop. 30 to help bail out the state from a series of huge deficits, has not endorsed the extension.

Criminal Sentences: Measure sponsored by Brown aims to cut the state prison population by giving inmates a chance for earlier parole and allowing judges, instead of prosecutors, to decide whether a minor should be tried as an adult. The initiative faced a court challenge from the California District Attorneys Association, which said Brown improperly amended an existing initiative to get this on the ballot. However, the California Supreme Court ultimately ruled in Brown's favor.

Plastic Bag Ban Referendum: In 2014, Brown signed the nation's first statewide ban on single-use plastic bags. The governor touted the ban as a way to stop "the torrent of plastic polluting our beaches, parks and even the vast ocean itself." But the ban never went into effect, as plastic bag manufacturers were able to gather enough signatures a few months later to force a referendum.

Carry-Out Bag Revenue: This measure, backed by the same plastic bag manufacturers who qualified the referendum, would

Cont. p. 2

Presidents Message

Chopping Down The Cherry Tree

By George Wooding



Some things are so idiotic that when you hear about them you have to shake your head in disbelief.

On September 4 Matt Haney, president of the San Francisco Board of Education for the San Francisco United School District (SFUSD), posted on Facebook and Twitter a controversial proposal to change the names of schools named after slave owners in our City, including George Washington High School.

According to the September 6 *San Francisco Examiner*, Haney stated, "Maya Angelou kicked out George Washington San Francisco. Because she became pregnant, an experience she writes about in her autobiography 'I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings.' I think we should rename the school after her."



The SFUSD has at least four schools named after historical figures: George Washington High School, Jefferson Elementary School, Monroe Elementary School, and Francis Scott Key Elementary School, each of whom owned slaves.

The reactions against Haney's posts were swift, and so negative that he had to reset his social media settings to "private." Haney also received physical threats.

George Washington, the "Father of our country," had a cherry tree, while Haney "the arbitrator of political correctness," needs a fig leaf.

Apparently, Haney wants to remove the names of dead white men who owned slaves, or had problematic histories, regardless of their historical stature.

In Haney's politically correct, albeit myopic, world view perhaps we should take an axe and chop down the Washington Monument on the National Mall — among the capitol's most-visited monuments — simply because it looks too phallic.

Taking Haney's political correctness to the next logical step, should San Francisco rename Washington Street to erase George's name from our thoroughfares? Should we also rename Polk Street and the Polk Gulch area, since it was named after the United States' 11th president, James K. Polk, who also owned slaves?

There are 188 K – 12th grade schools around the nation that are named after President Washington. Will Haney go on a nationwide rant to rename them all?

Since Haney is a 33-year-old, living, white male, he might

Cont. to page 2

State Initiatives *Cont. from p. 1*

go into effect only if the referendum campaign is defeated and the plastic bag ban is upheld. It would direct money that stores collect from selling paper bags into a special state fund for environmental projects. Proponents say they're just giving voters a chance to direct paper bag proceeds to "worthy environmental causes." Critics say the plastic bag makers are trying to force grocers, who support the plastic bag ban, to spend money to defeat this measure.

Recreational Pot: If approved, California would become the fifth state (after Colorado, Oregon, Alaska and Washington) to legalize the recreational use of marijuana for adults 21 and over. Proponents include Newsom and former Facebook president Sean Parker.

Medi-Cal Hospital Reimbursement: Currently, private California hospitals pay a fee into a state Medi-Cal fund, which is used to bring in matching federal dollars for the state health program. In return, the hospitals receive a reimbursement for Medi-Cal services. The fund is set to expire at the end of the year; this measure would make it permanent.

Public Vote on Bonds: This measure has the potential to spark a number of statewide ballot battles in the near future. The initiative, backed by wealthy San Joaquin Valley farmer/agribusinessman Dean Cortopassi, would require a statewide vote on any project requiring \$2 billion or more in revenue bonds. What might that include? Brown's two "legacy" projects: a high-speed rail system and the proposed twin-tunnel water project in the Delta.

Multilingual Education: Placed on the ballot by Democratic lawmakers, this measure would repeal Proposition 227, the 1998 initiative (backed by Ron Unz) that ended bilingual education in the state.

School Bond: After a similar effort fell short in 2014, school districts and developers have qualified a \$9 billion bond to fund school construction. Brown is opposed to the measure, which he called "a blunderbuss effort." He has argued that the current bond system gives an advantage to large districts that are able to quickly complete first-come-first-serve funding applications.

Condoms in Adult Films: Proposal would require actors in adult movies made in California to wear condoms while filming sex scenes. Earlier this year, California's Division of Occupational Safety and Health rejected proposed regulations that would have mandated condom use.

Prescription Drug Pricing: Sponsored by the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, the same group behind the condom measure, this measure would cap the amount the state can be charged for the prescription drugs it purchases for Medi-Cal beneficiaries, retirees and prison inmates. The pharmaceutical industry is strongly opposed, arguing the measure will limit drug choices for patients.

Death Penalty Repeal: Proponents of eliminating California's death penalty (and replacing it with a max sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole) are hoping for a different result than in 2012, when voters defeated another repeal measure, Proposition 34. California has executed 15 inmates since its current capital punishment law took effect in 1978, and its current system of carrying out death sentences is the target of multiple legal challenges.

Expedite Death Penalty: A group led by former NFL player Kermit Alexander wants to take a completely different approach to reforming California's death penalty process. The initiative would limit inmate appeals, which in some cases can drag on for decades.

Legislative Transparency: Backed by wealthy GOP donor Charles T. Munger Jr., this effort would require bills be in print for 72 hours before a vote. It would also mandate that video recordings of all legislative proceedings be posted online. A late attempt by a group of state senators to place their own version of this measure on the November ballot fell short.

Citizens United: The path to the ballot for this advisory measure was arguably more interesting than the measure itself. Voters will be asked whether they support legislators using the little power they have to overturn the U.S. Supreme Court's Citizens United decision, which struck down limits on independent campaign expenditures by corporations and unions. To get on the ballot, the advisory question had to survive a challenge in the state Supreme Court over whether such advisory measures should be allowed on the ballot.

President's Message *Cont. from p. 1*

want to check his own lineage over the last 300 years to see if it would be appropriate for him to stay on the school board. What are our public school children being taught? Which "politically correct" criteria will Haney use to change school names?

History professors know that both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were opposed to the concept of slavery. Maybe it is time for Haney go back to school to learn some history.

On the other hand, who knows what revisionist history SFUSD schools are already teaching our children. Perhaps in the SFUSD system, George Washington *was* already being painted as only an evil slave owner who rode around on his horse whipping his slaves. Maybe two plus two does equal five, because close enough is good enough in San Francisco public schools.

Is it time to put a "politically correct" message like "get rid of your car" on the one-dollar bill (Washington did not own a car)? Make the Washington Monument a symbol of love, and maybe we can even erase or replace George Washington's face on Mt. Rushmore.

Matt Haney is running for re-election to the School Board in the November 8 election. Please do not vote for him. San Franciscans and their children do not need his myopic brand of political correctness. They need a good education.

William R. Whitmer, nicknamed "Mr. Bill" by parents and colleagues, an early childhood teacher, principle, and union member for 44 years states, "San Francisco's Board of Education is a failed institution. The term 'World Class School District' is a joke, given that San Francisco schools compared almost equal to Mississippi School Districts for the bottom educational rank in the United States."

Whitmer's point of view may help explain Haney's pomposity.

The November 8 general election will feature Proposition A, the school bond. Unlike other bonds which need 66.6% of the vote to pass, San Francisco school bonds need to be approved by only 55% of voters. The School District can add bonds to the ballot whenever they want to, and aren't accountable to the City or to anyone else.

Every property in San Francisco will pay an annual property tax of \$25.00 per one-hundred-thousand in assessed value — approximately \$250 per year. Due to assessments, some years citizens will pay over \$300 annually.

The potential changes besides basic maintenance will be \$100 million to move the Ruth Azawa School of the Arts to Van Ness Av-

Cont. to page 7

Draft Minutes General Assembly Meeting • Sept 19 '16

1. **Call to Order.** President Wooding (MTHA) brought the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Northern Police Station Community Room.
 - a. *Quorum declared.* 19 delegates and alternates represented 15 CSFN member organizations. 3 guests signed in.
 - b. *Agenda approved.*
 - c. Introduction of delegates and guests. Short announcement: there will be an election forum on ballot measures at SHARP on Monday Oct. 10. Signup for CSFN committees!
 - d. Hosts: 1. EMIA: Mari Eliza spoke of development issues in the Mission, e.g.. red lanes hurting businesses.
2. MTHA: Rick Johnson said his group has the fewest problems of us all. It works with the local police station and is currently working on rezoning.
2. **Officers' Reports.**
 - a. **President Wooding (MTHA) Message in NL about CSFN activities.**
1st VP Morgan (CHNA) – no report
 - c. **2nd VP Boken (SPEAK) – absent**
 - d. **Recording Secretary Head (SHARP)** said the draft minutes were in the NL on p. 7. Two meetings of note: RPD's Equity Metrics were introduced at the BOS GA&A committee meeting, and the proposal by MAP to lease the Palace of Arts was turned down by the full Rec n Park Commission, which called for new proposals again.
 - e. **Corresponding Secretary Rogers (PMAC)** spoke about the dinner Dec. 13 at Patio Espanol.
 - f. **Treasurer Scott (PHRA) – absent.** The 2016-2017 budget was passed out, discussed and approved unanimously.
3. **Committee Action Items**
 - a. Executive – in NL.
 - b. *Government & Elections.* Chair **Charles Head (SHARP)** said the report was on p. 1. The committee celebrated its work on the record number of ballot measures by having dinner instead of meeting this month but will have its regular one at Taraval in October.
 - c. *Land Use.* Chair **Hillson** said there would be a meeting on Urban Design Guidelines on Monday Sept. 26. The city meeting will be on Oct. 6, and the Article 7 meeting on Oct. 13.
 - d. *Open Space.* **Kathy Howard (SPEAK)** thanked Charles Head for reporting on RPD; she has been on vacation. Use of drones by city departments were reported on in the Examiner today. She will be running for the Executive Board of the Sierra Club.
 - e. *Transportation.* Chair **Mari Eliza (EMIA)** No report.
 - f. *Bylaws* – no report.
 - g. *Dinner* – The menu was mentioned: it will be on the invitations...
4. **Approval of the August 8 and 16, 2016 GA minutes – they were approved unanimously.**
5. **Unfinished Business – None.**
6. **New Business –**
 - A. Paul Webber (THD) introduced the Resolution opposing the Jamestown Project on Pier 29, answered questions and said it would be printed in the NL and voted on next month.

B. Paul also introduced the Urban Design Guidelines Resolution, reading it and answering questions. It too will be voted on next month.

C. After the program presentation, the Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association brought forth of resolution calling on SFMTA to delay completing changes on RPPs until there is further study, research and input from neighborhood groups.

7. **Program : Mark Miller reviewed the SFMTA Proposals to overhaul Residential Parking by changes in the Permits (RPPs) and answered all questions.**

8. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:15.

...Charles Head (SHARP) Recording Secretary

Proposed Retail Mini-Mall Development at Pier 29

In 1990 the voters of San Francisco passed Proposition H, which banned hotels on piers and required the Port to create and abide by a San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan. Among other things, the Waterfront Plan designated Piers 27, 29 and 31 for a "unique and inviting waterfront mixed-use recreation project" that "could provide a venue for all San Franciscans and Bay Area residents to actively participate individually or as groups, in diverse amateur recreation sports, physical fitness and related activities while enjoying the scenic waterfront setting." In 2005, CSFN joined with Telegraph Hill Dwellers, environmental groups, Fisherman's Wharf businesses and the Citizens to Save the Waterfront coalition to defeat a plan that would have let national shopping mall developer Mills Corporation build a large mall and private office complex on those piers.

Notwithstanding that rejection, and undaunted, in April of this year, not having sought a recreation project for Pier 29, the Port Commission voted to instead let another mall and office developer build a retail shopping center inside a portion of Pier 29. The Atlanta-based real estate developer, Jamestown LP, would be given the right to lease the prime Embarcadero-facing approximately 25000 square feet of the Pier for retail space, and its proposed lease would run for a period of at least 15 years. This Pier 29 proposal also envisions, at a later date, occupying, subject to regulatory approval, a large portion of the outside public access areas adjacent to Pier 29 for private commercial uses. Finally, in its proposal to the Port, Jamestown also included a "future prospective phasing" plan which envisions eventually expanding its retail operations to the entire length of Pier 29 out to the Bay.

Representatives of Telegraph Hill Dwellers and the Fisherman's Wharf Restaurant Association met with representatives from the Port and Jamestown this summer to discuss concerns that the proposed project would violate the Waterfront Plan's designation of Pier 29 as the site for a mixed-use recreation project, not a shopping mall. Additional concerns raised included the granting of a 15 year lease or longer lease to Jamestown without going through the public review process for longer term leases, and new information suggests that the developer's promise that it would have all of the retail stores run by the organization SF MADE and featuring locally-made products will not be the case.

CSFN has consistently stood up to protect the integrity of the waterfront by opposing real estate developments that do so, such as the Mills Project a decade ago and 8 Washington more recently. The consequences of allowing the Jamestown Pier 29 project

Cont. to page 4

Mini-mall *Cont. from p. 3*

to proceed would likely be the continued chipping away at the Waterfront Land Use Plan with waivers for other highly-profitable commercial projects at the expense of recreational use by San Francisco and Bay Area residents.

The proposed CSFN resolution to oppose the Jamestown Pier 29 retail project, introduced by Telegraph Hill Dwellers at the September CSFN General Assembly meeting, is set out elsewhere in this Newsletter.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING PIER 29 "MINI-MALL" RETAIL PROJECT

WHEREAS, San Francisco's Waterfront Land Use Plan, which the voters created by passing Proposition H in November 1990, designates Piers 27, 29, and 31 for "a unique and inviting waterfront mixed-use recreation project" that "could provide a venue for all San Franciscans and Bay Area residents to actively participate individually or as groups, in diverse amateur recreation sports, physical fitness and related activities while enjoying the scenic waterfront setting;" and

WHEREAS, CSFN previously joined with the Citizens to Save the Waterfront coalition to stop a prior plan that would have allowed national shopping mall developer Mills Corporation to build a large mall and office complex at Piers 27, 29, and 31; and

WHEREAS, instead of pursuing a new project that complies with the Waterfront Land Use Plan, the Port Commission on April 26th voted to let another mall and office developer, Atlanta-based Jamestown Properties, build what would be, in effect, a "mini-mall" retail center inside the historic bulkhead building of Pier 29 on the Embarcadero at Chestnut Street; and

WHEREAS, the Port has put the Jamestown retail center proposal on a fast-track timeline, with a plan for final approval of a 15-year lease intended to take place this fall;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods joins with the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, the Fisherman's Wharf Restaurant Association, and others to oppose the Jamestown Pier 29 mini-mall retail proposal and urges the Port to reject this flawed plan and instead comply with the "unique and inviting waterfront mixed-use recreation project" called for in the Waterfront Land Use Plan.

Submitted by Paul Webber (THD)

Is the Evaluation of the Residential Parking Permit Program Legitimate?

SFMTA is putting the finishing touches on their Resident Parking "Evaluation & Reform Project." As the agency will soon propose changes to the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) program based on the evaluation, now is a good time to review their efforts.

At the onset, the agency promised a "comprehensive data driven review" and declared as one of the evaluation principles: "In predominantly residential areas or blocks, the SFMTA prioritizes access to parking for nearby residents."

Neither claim holds up to scrutiny. SFMTA internal documents show agency staff decided on policy changes prior to any data gathering and that research was designed to generate figures favorable to those policies. SFMTA material also makes clear the agency's intention to shift the focus of the Residential Permit Parking program away from current residential permit holders.

The evaluation included two primary data gathering efforts: a parking utilization study and a survey of residents.

SFMTA sells 90,000 parking permits every year, of which approx. 60,000 are annual residential permits. The agency has a home or business address for every permit holder, and sends a renewal notice to each. Instead of surveying this large, accessible pool of program customers, the agency chose to survey a "representative sampling" of households – persons who provided their email address to the Dept. of Elections. Among respondents, there were only a few hundred permit holders.

The questions asked of respondents is also revealing. For example, the survey asked how long it took residents to find a parking spot on their most recent trip home – but neglected to ask what time of day (or night) that trip occurred. That doesn't contribute to an understanding of parking patterns or the effectiveness of RPP. And at public meetings SFMTA failed to make clear when results included responses from all residents in a permit area – regardless of whether or not they had a permit.

In the parking utilization (occupancy) survey, SFMTA made other interesting choices. Staff chose not to include streets surveyed during prior parking surveys, and surveyors used different methods for capturing data (car counts, inventory of parking spaces) from prior SFMTA tests. This was a lost opportunity to leverage earlier work and make direct year over year comparisons.

At public meetings SFMTA focused attention on high levels of parking occupancy found in some RPP areas. SFMTA informed us that high occupancy is tied to permit "oversell" – selling more permits than RPP spaces. But the figures SFMTA showed included both permitted and non-permitted cars. The agency has – but declined to show or discuss at public meetings – far more relevant data: the share of cars on RPP streets with permit vs. those without permit. The raw occupancy numbers are meaningless for any effort to truly evaluate effectiveness of RPP.

SFMTA declined to study many other items that impact current customers, including: the impact of newly metered blocks adjoining RPP areas, how well different grace periods for non-permitted car (e.g. 1-HR vs 2-HR) create parking availability, and extending RPP hours beyond 6pm.

The Evaluation and Reform Project represents a missed opportunity. SFMTA needs to redo much of the study. Project staff needs to include members skilled and certified in traffic engineering. The agency needs to be held accountable to produce research that truly contributes to a better understanding of parking patterns in residential areas, and to put forward policy recommendations that serve current RPP customers as well as overall goals for reducing traffic and congestion.

Until the agency can demonstrate use of credible methodology as well as a commitment to community engagement, we urge CSFN to oppose adoption of changes to the existing program.

Submitted by Mark Miller (CHNA)

Resolution on the SFMTA "Residential Parking Permit Evaluation & Reform Project"

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") has recently undertaken an effort to evaluate and reform (the "Evaluation Project") the Residential Permit Parking Program ("the Program"); and

WHEREAS, SFMTA presented the Evaluation Project as a comprehensive, data driven effort, with data collection efforts including neighborhood Parking Occupancy & Duration Studies ("Occupancy Studies") and a survey of registered voters who provided email

addresses to the City Board of Elections ("Household Survey"),

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Project did not directly seek information, via online survey or other means, of a meaningful number of existing Program users for the purpose of obtaining permit holder evaluation of Program effectiveness and recommendations for improving the Program; and

WHEREAS, the Occupancy Studies and Household Survey were substantively deficient in the collection of relevant data and analytic procedures; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Project failed to research aspects of the Program that drive parking demand from non-permitted users of residential parking areas, and failed to evaluate changes to reduce that demand;

WHEREAS, SFMTA presented deficient and misleading information, data, and analysis at Project related open-houses and community meetings;

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Project goal objective was to achieve "60% support from key neighborhood associations and business groups" for recommendations resulting from the Evaluation Project for reform of the Program; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA staff propose to put forward process and policy changes to the Program during Fall 2016;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Coalition:

Requests a reasonable amount of time for its members to review and consider specific process and policy changes to be proposed for the Program, prior to consideration by the SFMTA Board;

Does not accept the Evaluation Project as correct or complete until SFMTA performs studies on non-resident impacts on Program and surrounding areas, has a certified traffic engineer review and approve of all studies done as part of the Evaluation, and proposes process and policy changes to reduce non-resident demand on parking supply in those areas; Does not support policy recommendations that may lead to any increased non-resident parking demand and vehicle traffic in neighborhoods, without research as to the potential impacts created by each specific policy change.

Submitted by Mark Miller (CHNA)

RESIDENTS BEWARE

By Rose Hillson

San Francisco residents defeated Mayor Lee's and Supervisor Tang's attempt to rezone all but the Residential Housing-1 and -2 areas under the Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP), a densification idea. AHBP's goal: Increase the permissible density of housing units at the expense of neighborhood character by allowing developers to receive accommodation around existing Planning Code regulations using a "one size fits all" approach. Vigilant neighbors and small business owners held in abeyance the AHBP. Although a 100% AHBP did pass, the rest of the AHBP including its design guidelines haven't been approved yet.

With recent state legislation, the City's now focused on liberalizing zoning guidelines that modify the permissible building volume and density. One such attempt to seek to liberalize and leave subject to broader interpretations is the proposed "Urban Design Guidelines" (UDG) which permits waivers to allow the equivalent of spot-zoning by waiver. The UDG also is a clone of the previously introduced AHBP Design Guidelines (AHBPDG). Clarification is needed to determine if the UDG will pre-empt the Urban Design Element of the General Plan.

Further, Planning Staff ("Staff") introduced the "Article 7" reorganization which governs neighborhood commercial districts (NCD). In this, the Control Tables reference "Urban Design Guidelines" with a reference to the existing General Plan's Commerce and Industry Element (CIE) UDG. The UDG reference should be clarified to mean those existing in the CIE vs. the draft UDG document.

Next, Staff has indicated that in 2017, the "Residential Design Guidelines" (RDG), which further delineate the rules for residential development features such as front, side, rear yard setbacks and architectural style, will be revamped. Clarification is needed on its interaction with the other design guidelines.

Apparently, Staff is also proposing changes to the November 2008 draft "Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines" (GFRDGD). These are noted in the UDG document but it cannot be ascertained how this current draft might be changed, if at all. In the 2015 draft AHBPDG, there is a reference to the GFRDGD. Clarification is needed on the ultimate disposition of either of these drafts.

Neighbors are requesting the UDG, with any other design guidelines which may be under consideration or are being replaced including but not limited to the UDG, the Urban Design Element of the General Plan, any RDGs, or any AHBP design guidelines, be considered concurrently so that the City neighborhoods understand very clearly how each set of guidelines interacts with the others and with neighborhood or other regional guidelines, too, to avoid "one size fits all" guidelines.

Subject may still be "live" in November. Comment today.

-10/13: "Article 7" neighborhood commercial districts (NCD) reorganization. It references "Urban Design Guidelines." One interpretation of this reference could be UDG application to residential buildings in NCDs. Clarification is needed to not apply to residential buildings.

RESOLUTION ON URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

WHEREAS, the Staff of the Planning Department (the "Department") of the City and County of San Francisco has recently published a 2nd Draft of Urban Design Guidelines (the "Guidelines"), which will be considered for adoption by the San Francisco Planning Commission (the "Commission"); and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines have been prepared without meaningful input from either the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (the "Coalition") or individual neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines are substantively deficient in a number of respects, as more fully outlined in the Telegraph Hill Dwellers letter published in the September 2016 Newsletter of the Coalition; and

WHEREAS, other deficiencies in the Guidelines, or in the opportunities for neighborhoods to review them, may come to light over the course of further review of the Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, subsequent action by the Department or the Commission may warrant additional responses;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Coalition opposes the approval of the Guidelines, as currently drafted; and authorizes representatives of the Coalition to engage with the Commission, the Department, and others for the purposes of seeking the withdrawal of the Guidelines or modifications acceptable to Coalition representatives.

Submitted by Paul Webber (THD)

Executive Committee Report • September, 2016

The September ExCom Meeting was cancelled.

Land Use Committee September 26, 2016

The Regular Meeting of the CSFN Land Use and Transportation Committees met on Monday, September 26, 2016, at the Taraval Police Station. The meeting commenced at 5:35pm. Topics discussed were Urban Design Guidelines and Residential Design Guidelines and what that would mean to the neighborhoods. The Committees discussed the role of Planning and Article 7 and their asking the neighborhood people to speak only to their supervisors for any changes. The proposed "Tantamount to Demolition" ordinance was discussed and the potential consequences of that to neighborhoods. Another topic was the transportation issues from Chair Mari Eliza. (see Transportation Committee Report)

The President took part in a very unstructured discussion of how all of these things are being brought before the Planning Commission and other Boards and we voiced our opinions on what actions the neighbors could take. The issue of public use of private areas was also mentioned. As the hot evening wore on with the doors to the room left open for a hint of breeze, an uninvited visitor arrived and caused a bit of a stir. The evasive and tough intruder was killed and thrown in the garbage bin. The meeting adjourned at 7:25pm. On the way out, additional members of the intruder's family made their appearance around us. It was the time and season for the subterranean termite swarm.

Respectfully submitted, Rose Hillson (JPIA)

Transportation Committee Report • September 2016

As everyone knows by now there is a chance to take back some semblance of sanity on our streets by passing Proposition L. Complaints about the SFMTA are many, but most involve power and money. We feel that Prop L takes on both of these issues, by changing the makeup of the board and making it easier for the elected District Board of Supervisors to override the SFMTA budget.

CSFN members voted to support Prop L. As Transportation Chair, I attended a lot of endorsement meetings and garnered a lot of support from the groups where I presented the case for Prop L. We heard last week that Norman Yee has opened an account for Prop L so we are able to accept funds. No real direction yet on how to implement that, but, Eileen and I are working on it as well as promoting press and publicity where we can. I managed to write an op-ed and a few letters for the *Potrero View*, *Sunset Beacon* and *Richmond Review*. I heard that the Richmond paper is out.

On Wednesday, September 28 Eileen Boken and I presented our case for Prop L at an editorial meeting with SF Media Company. Editors and writer for SF Examiner and SF Weekly met with us for around 35 minutes.

I brought the perspective of many the citizen groups throughout the city I have been talking to who are upset and frustrated over the lack of respect and response they receive from the SFMTA Board and staff. People feel that the current SFMTA Board has failed to meet the two primary goals of improving Muni service and balancing the budget. Michael Howerton, Editor in Chief at the SF Examiner quizzed me on how changing the appointments would change the direction of the SFMTA Board. I pointed out the difference between dealing with the Planning Commissioners, who enjoy dual appointments and the SFMTA Board. I feel optimistic when

I speak before the Planning Commissioners and confident that my voice will be heard and I will not be ignored.

Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez agreed with me that there is a world of difference between the SFMTA Board, with dual appointments, and the Planning Commission Board whose members are appointed by the Mayor. He said he can't remember a time when the SFMTA Board "no" to staff suggestions, whereas, he has witnessed many amendments and concessions to public requests for changes by the Planning Commissioners as well as a lot of exchanges of different perspectives by that more diverse Board that is comprised of split appointments.

Given the strong case we made and the backing of Joe on my statements, we feel we may receive some support from the editors of SF Media Company.

Matters of concern to the Neighborhoods:

A lot of this has already been discussed but we are going over the details now for people looking for arguments for Prop L and in support of supervisor candidates who support Prop L.

Honesty and transparency: Let's start with the incredible amount of time citizens spend trying to get information out of this public entity. Why should the public have to spend any time gathering data that is paid for by the taxpayers? Why are the facts hidden from us? We need an open, honest and transparent transportation system, not a secretive conniving one that spends millions of dollars on PR to "sell" us on their latest schemes.

Controversial projects: The new Red Carpet lanes on Mission Street have ignited a firestorm of opposition from residents and merchants all over the city who feel that the SFMTA has gone too far. Many people oppose all red lanes and BRTs in their neighborhood after witnessing the effects on Mission Street and the lack of concern SFMTA has for the residents and merchants effected by this controversial project. A couple of ideas that were put forward by Mission and other neighborhood groups were to not enforce the red lanes 24/7. Limit the enforcement hours to rush hour only. That will give people who need to drive to the area a reason to only go on off hours. The carrot that is missing. Charge less for parking in the middle of the day. Limit parking to non-rush hours like they do elsewhere.

No respect for the public SFMTA is supposed to serve: At the SFMTA Board meeting hearing on Taraval we learned that Livable Streets implements no left turns. Do they also suggest other traffic controls such as forced right turns? How do they implement these decisions? Do they hire contractors to put up signs or work with DPW? Do they just come up with the idea and pass it on to some other department to execute? Many unanswered questions. One of the suggestions that the folks in the Richmond came up with is that the SFMTA needs to change their priorities from being an enterprise agency to being a public service agency. Quit cutting service, claiming it is not cost effective. Nothing they do is cost effective.

No respect for first responders: Emergency vehicle drivers are not happy about the narrow lanes and difficult traffic situations they are working in. Fireman named Henry Tasto testified before the SFMTA Board in opposition to the Taraval Project.

"My name is Henry Tasto. I stand before you today in staunch opposition of this program both from professional and personal grounds. Starting with professional, I work for the fire department, and, although this boondoggle may have been rubber stamped,

by administrative chiefs, I can tell you from first hand knowledge as someone who drives the rigs and works in the field, not

in a starched white shirt in a little red car but someone that drives trucks and engines, any time you impede the flow of traffic by putting in island or other obstructions, you are putting human lives in danger. Fire doubles in size every thirty seconds. In the event of a major conflagration or earthquake with building collapses that will further impede traffic, who do you want resounding to help you? Someone in a white shirt and a little red car, or someone wearing protective gear, driving apparatus and trained to help? That is a rhetorical question..."

All volunteers are invited to contact Mari Eliza or Eileen Boken for information on how you can help pass Prop L. **mari@abazaar.com**. Updates on **stopsfmta.com**.

Submitted by Mari Eliza, (EMIA)

President's Message *Cont. from p. 7*

enue, and to build two new high schools in unnamed locations in Mission Bay and the Bayview. Here's a revolutionary idea for Haney to mull over with his cherry tree hatchet: Rather than renaming George Washington High School, why not name one of the two new schools after Maya Angelou?

Please vote "Yes" on the school bond. And since I can't tell a lie: Vote a big "No" for Matt Haney.

ExComm—How to Reach Us:

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

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

2nd VP: Eileen Boken • aeiboken@gmail.com

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: Mary Harris maryharris_dist11@msn.com

Member-at-Large: Claire Zvanski czvanski@hotmail.com

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Bylaws Chair Claire Zvanski, czvanski@hotmail.com. Ongoing meetings.

Gov't & Elections Chair Charles Head, charlesnhead@hotmail.com. 6pm, second Friday, Taraval Police Station.

Land Use & Housing Chair, George Wooding, gswooding@gmail.com. Ongoing meetings

Open Space Chair Nancy Wuerfel, nancenumber1@aol.com, 731-6432, Co-chair Ramona Albright, 621-9621. Ongoing meetings.

Transportation Chair Mari Eliza, mari.eliza@sbcglobal.net Ongoing meetings.

Water Task Force • Chair Joan Girardot, csfnwatertaskforce@gmail.com, 346-5525. Ongoing meetings.

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. .

CORRECTIONS TO NEWSLETTER

Turn in written submissions to ExCom Chair (marlayne16@gmail.com)

Join Us!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

THE
44th Annual Anniversary
HOLIDAY DINNER

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2016

Patio Español Restaurant
2850 Alemany Boulevard

MENU

Roasted Prime Rib
Breast of Chicken in Sherry Cream Sauce
Paella Valenciana
Vegetarian Pasta Primavera

KEY NOTE SPEAKER
Judge Quentin Kopp

SPECIAL RECOGNITION
RICHARD DRURY, LOZEAU, DRURY

HONEREE
CINDY WU, CHAIR,
SF Democratic Central Committee

INDIVIDUAL \$65.00
SPONSOR (ONE TICKET) \$130.00
HALF TABLE (FIVE TICKETS) \$475.00
FULL TABLE (TEN TICKETS) \$875.00



October, 18 2016 • 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. Middle Polk Neighborhood Association**
 - 2. Miraloma Park Improvement Club**
- 7:15 III. Officers' Reports
 - A. President
 - B. Vice Presidents
 - C. Secretaries
 - D. Treasurer
- 7:30 IV. Committee Action Items—written reports in Newsletter
 - A. Executive
 - B. Bylaws
 - C. Dinner
 - D. Government & Elections
 - E. Land Use & Housing
 - F. Open Space
 - G. Transportation
- 7:45 V. Approval of September 20, 2016 Minutes
- 8:00 VI. Unfinished Business
 - Jamestown Project on Pier 29 - Resolution**
 - Residential Parking Program - Resolution**
 - Urban Design Guidelines - Resolution**
- 8:15** VII. New Business
- 8:30 VIII. **Program - Sex, Drugs and Guns - 2016 State Ballot Resolutions- Speaker TBA**
- 9:15 IX. Adjournment