


CSFN NEWSLETTER



City Hall plans an end run around environmental review:

If you thought that our local city government was implementing only emergency measures during the pandemic, you would be wrong. Despite the fact that the average citizen is focused on dealing with the coronavirus, the San Francisco Planning Department is pushing through City Hall a new policy that would limit environmental reviews for development projects. San Franciscans need to weigh in on these actions now, before we lose important rights under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Planning Department's proposed ordinance to 'streamline' the CEQA process in San Francisco is known as [SER - Standard Environmental Requirements](#). Under the SER ordinance, projects that formerly might have needed extensive review under CEQA would be approved unilaterally by Planning Department staff if the projects met specific requirements. This could eliminate a few months of review, but it could also eliminate public notice, public hearings, and input that could, and often does, result in a better project.

Some of the more detailed objections to the SER Ordinance were submitted in extensive letters to the Planning Department and Commissions by both the Sierra Club and Richard Drury, a prominent local CEQA attorney. These objections include the following:

- The proposed SER process will have a negative impact on transparency and public participation in the CEQA process. Many

SER is a long-term policy that will have an impact on planning decisions that will affect all San Franciscans for many years to come, yet the Planning Department scheduled the first official approval meeting for SER on April 15th, during the stay-in-place order.

more projects will be given an exemption, called a Categorical Exemption, from the public review process. The timeline for the public to weigh in is much shorter with a Categorical Exemption than for the other CEQA categories of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Negative Declaration.

- Once the SER ordinance has been passed by the Board of Supervisors, the definition of what projects are categorically exempt under SER will be decided solely by the Planning Department and the Planning Commission in an ongoing process.
- The Planning Department has started to outline some of the mitigations that could be used to make a project categorically exemption. However, these mitigations are not subject to any kind of control by the Board of Supervisors. Not only could the currently proposed mitigations be modified at will by the Planning Department and the Planning Commission, but also new conditions could be added without consideration or approval by the Board of Supervisors. In other words, SER removes the Board of Supervisors from any decision-making on setting the actual standards that will be implemented - forever.
- Streamlining using standard conditions can preclude the possibility of a better environmental result; in fact, better alternatives to a project are often found only during a public review of the project.
- It is uncertain that the proposed SER process is even valid under state law.



SER is a long-term policy that will have an impact on planning decisions that will affect all San Franciscans for many years to come, yet the Planning Department scheduled the first official approval meeting for SER on April 15th, during the stay-in-place order. At an online public meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), callers expressed their outrage that a vote was being held at the same time as doctors, nurses, food providers and other first responders were working long hours and risking their lives to stem the pandemic and could not learn about or weigh in on a public policy hearing.

Under public pressure, the HPC voted to continue the matter, but only to May 6th. The SER policy is already scheduled to be heard at the Planning Commission on May 21st. After that, it goes before the Board of Supervisors.

Protect your rights under CEQA! PLEASE contact the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission and ask them to continue the CEQA SER policy votes until after the stay-at-home order has been lifted for at least a month.

Both commissions can be reached through: Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

Be sure to copy the Board of Supervisors on your letter; they have the final vote and need to know your thoughts. board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Written by Katherine Howard, SPEAK member



Chris Bowman provided additional information on the COVID-19 pandemic. We thought we should include it in the Newsletter:

The key findings are:

1) The pandemic has hit every state of the Union and the District of Columbia more extensively and intensively, than it has hit the majority of the roughly 200 nations of the world. Worldwide, there was one confirmed case for every 2,626 inhabitants of the planet on 04/25/20. Every state of the Union had a rate below 1:2,626, including Montana at 1:2,382, Hawaii -- 1:2,344, and Alaska -- 1:2,158. On the other end of the scale, several states have approximately the same rate found in the most horrifically impacted countries of Europe, e.g., San Marino and Italy, such as New York -- 1:67; New Jersey -- 1:84, the District of Columbia -- 1:124; Massachusetts -- 1:130, and Connecticut and Rhode Island, respectively -- 1:145 and 1:149.

Currently, nearly 32.89% of all cases worldwide have been diagnosed in the United States and 27.14% of all deaths worldwide have been American, even though we constitute only 4.31% of the World's population.

2) Although the pandemic has peaked in Europe and Worldwide, and the average number of daily cases in the United States is down from 31,443 between 03/30/20 and 04/11/20 to 29,664 between 04/11/20 and 04/25/20, if one controls for New York State having peaked in early April, in reality, the average number of new daily cases in the other 49 states and the District of Columbia is slightly higher than it was for the period of 03/30/20-04/11/20.

For 30 states and the District of Columbia, the number of new cases is higher now than it was several weeks ago, and in four states -- Nebraska, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and in the District of Columbia, the number of new cases is more than double what they were for the period of 03/30/20-04/11/20.

3) Fueled in part by what is happening in New York, the death rate for the United States nationally has climbed to 5.69% of all confirmed cases, and there are four states, including Michigan, New York, Connecticut, and Minnesota, where the death rate per case is greater than the 7.00% death rate worldwide.



A strong argument can be made that death rates per case is not the right measurement to be taken regarding deaths (given that confirmed cases are sometimes determined by the availability and use of diagnostic tests).

The alternative measurement, which I have also incorporated into my matrices, is the number of deaths per capita. Worldwide, that number on 04/25/20 was one death for every 37,654 inhabitant of the World. It's one death per every 6,131 American and one per every 6,473 European, but for New York State, it is bleaker still at one death per every 888 resident of the Empire State as of 04/25/20, and one death for every 1,515 resident of the Garden State. If one digs down to the county level in the Greater Metropolitan New York region, the numbers are even worse (and that will be the topic of my next update to you).

Certain pundits (who will remain unnamed because they don't deserve any recognition) liked to pontificate early on during the crisis (trying to dismiss the need to mobilize the nation and the international community to fight the pandemic) by arguing that COVID-19 was no worse than another version of the annual flu, or that the deaths would be fewer than those killed in car accidents, homicide, drug overdoses, and suicides. So far, COVID-19 has surpassed all those levels (and the numbers keep climbing daily). And according to an email I received today, the total numbers have exceeded the total deaths we lost in combat in Vietnam.

RealClear Politics posts on its website the average number of seasonal flu deaths (over the course of a decade) for the U.S., and for each state.

Currently, the United States has 59,266 deaths as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The ten year average number of flu deaths for the US was 40,905. In several European nations, there are nearly three times the number of COVID-19 deaths compared to the average number of flu deaths, e.g., Italy 27,359 vs. 10,058, Spain 23,822 vs. 8,091, France 23,660 vs. 9,199, and Belgium 7,321 vs. 2,662. In the US, New York has witnessed 23,144 COVID-19 deaths compared to 3,408 flu deaths and in New Jersey, it's 6,444 vs. 944.

And the flu season is over, but as I pointed out, not only has the COVID-19 pandemic (or at least its first wave) not peaked for the majority of US states, but the rest of the World



(beyond Europe, China, and the U.S.) -- mostly in Western and Central Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and Gulf States, and South Asia is catching up, and we are seeing growth rates of as high as 400% over a two week period in some of those countries -- basically, where we were six weeks ago, or Europe two months ago. So the total number of deaths and the death rates will continue to mount for several weeks, if not months to come.

The Governor of the Peach State of Georgia (not to be confused with the President of the Georgian republic in the Caucasus), has implemented his decision to lift restrictions, and he is likely to be followed by several other Governors over the course of the week and weeks to

come. Hopefully, these decisions are based on real science and the best advice from public health professionals, not political expediency.

Also, and I don't have an answer for this -- looking at the data, where you have states in the Great Plains which are currently being hit hard by the virus next to the states of the Northwest (Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana) where either the pandemic has run its course, or it never got a foothold to begin with, one wonders how regional or state-by-state lifting of restrictions will work, or if the lifting of restrictions in relatively unpopulated portions of states where there haven't been any cases confirmed so far, will work.

Governor Newsom contemplated opening up parts of California (such as Trinity, Modoc, Lassen, Sierra, and Mariposa Counties) which have been so far unscathed by the pandemic, only to argue against it because people from regions of the state where the pandemic is still raging (as it is in much of the San Joaquin Valley, Inland Empire, and Los Angeles County), may choose to go there to "escape", and bring the virus with them.

There appear to be no easy solutions to all of this other than the virus burning itself out or an effective vaccine and cure are developed.

Hopefully, I'll have more encouraging numbers to report two weeks from now, when I will update my matrices.

Christopher L. Bowman, author



FROM THE PRESIDENT’S DESK

Welcome to the CSFN May 2020 Newsletter.

I SPOKE AT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING ON TUESDAY APRIL 28, 2020

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Good afternoon, President Yee and Supervisors. My name is Charles Head, and I am the President of the Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods – not of some neighborhoods, but for all neighborhoods.

All of us have watched for many months the coming of the crisis of unsheltered people living on the streets, with its attendant consequences. Everyone of us has been currently caught up in the coming of the

COVID-19 virus to menace our communities, and all have been affected by the SHELTER IN PLACE order promulgated by Mayor Breed.

But unsheltered people cannot shelter in place. It is unconscionable for the City to pay less attention to the plight of those of us without the protections of personal space and separation from others. None of us has “herd immunity”, yet we ignore the possible ravages of this plague to” cull the herd “of those who live on our streets

It is laudable for the Board to search for solutions and to unanimously put pressure the Mayor to act without delay. But delay she has, and the movement from streets to shelters to hotel rooms has been too slow. In the interim come now suggestions for congregant living in sites in public spaces such as Keezar Stadium, Everett Middle School and even Golden Gate Park . What an irony is in the last location suggested, for many survivors of the 1906 twin tragedies of earthquake and fire sheltered in place there for many moons . (Are those who don’t learn from history doomed to repeat it?)

Such stopgaps may supply the respite needed until the Covid-19 crisis is behind us. But the question remains: what is to be done now? And then what is to be done later? Having saved the Unsheltered, evicting them in the near future is unconscionable. We must come up with better long term solutions: we must think carefully about it!

Note: I also mentioned that two of our neighborhood groups very much impacted by the situation on our streets were spearheading the formation of an alliance of organizations to solve our problem, now and in the future. It is called “ Rescue SF “, and their message is both our program for this month and our resolution from DHIC in New Business.

We have a number of things to bring to your attention beside the fact we are having another ZOOM meeting. Be sure to register with the invitation you receive from Cindy Beckman for the ZOOM conference. If you do not get an invitation be sure to request one.

We have two articles this month, one from our very own Kathy Howard. The other article is from Christopher Bowman whose Election summaries are very popular. We hope you find these articles interesting.

Some of our members believe we need a new logo to remain relevant. Therefore, we have three new logos for you to review and vote on. Of course, our present logo is still being considered as a choice. In choosing your favorite logo, be sure to see how it appears when it is the leader introducing a new topic in our Newsletter.

We are having our Election for officers, be sure to participate.

Claire Zvanski has modified our Bylaws to include technical meetings like ZOOM to allow us to conduct business as usual. We will need a 2/3 majority of delegates to pass these new exciting changes so be sure to be present.

We look forward to your presence at the next CSFN ZOOM meeting this May 19, 2020.

Charles Head, President CSFN



CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY MINUTES ON ZOOM TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2020

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** PRESIDENT HEAD (SHARP) called it at 6:40. There were 21 delegates representing 15 Organizations.
- II. **INTRODUCTION**
 - A. Since delegates had already signed in on screen, short announcements were made instead of introductions. Cow Hollow will have its May 7 meeting on Zoom, not St. Francis Woods Club. Miraloma Park has done District 7 outreach of 300 calls to the elderly sheltering in place. Some people who don't need stimulus checks can donate theirs instead to food banks, etc.
 - B. Host - Carolyn Kenady was not present.
- III. **PROGRAM** – Joshua Switzky of SF Planning gave a report on Plan Bay Area SF 2020 and answered our questions.
- IV. **OFFICERS' REPORTS**
 - A. President - Monitored BOS and PC meetings and learned about Zoom
 - B. Vice President – Expressed concern about two fold Covid-19 crisis and wild fire season coming up.
 - C. Recording Secretary – Draft Minutes in NL
 - D. Corresponding Secretary – No report
 - E. Treasurer – reported on financials
- V. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**
 - A. Ex. Comm. – In NL.
 - B. Bylaws – Emergency status discussed and the vote was 9-1 to proceed. Claire will have amendments finished next time.
 - C. LU&TC – No meeting. Chair sent report for President to read. Balboa Reservoir GPA initiated in Planning, Geary /Masonic Special Use District approved in BOS, SFMTA board approved LRV expenditures, Capital Committee meetings cancelled.
 - D. G&E Committee – see NL
 - E. Media – Mari spoke about the blog.
 - F. Nominations – Maurice reported the slate for May: President – Charles Head, Vice President – Glenn Rogers, Recording Secretary – Cindy Beckman, Treasurer – Greg Scott, At Large Dick Frisbee and Maurice Franco. Vacant – 2nd VP, Corresponding Secretary, #3 At Large. President called for nominations from the floor: VP Rogers nominated Maurice Franco for Corresponding Secretary, who declined. Seeing no further nominations, President declared them closed.
 - G. Events – President is still accepting volunteers until April 30.



- VI. **APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES** (in NL) was unanimous.
- VII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
 - A. Treasure Island Resolution was introduced by VP Rogers and was seconded and discussed. It passed 6-2.
 - B. The Conversation Continues...Claire Zvanski asked if there had been outreach to former member groups, and President said no, that we should discuss this in Ex Comm. David Osgood said we should consider Zoom meetings even after the SIP order is lifted.
- VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. May meeting will feature Elections, the Logo Fair , and Bylaws Amendments.
 - B. The Solar Panels Letter from EDIA was discussed.
- IX. **ADJOURNMENT** was at 8:30.

Charles Head, President CSFN

EXCOMM. - HOW TO REACH US:

- President:** Charles Head, charlesnhead@hotmail.com
- Vice President:** Glenn Rogers, alderlandscape@comcast.net
- Recording Secretary:** Cindy Beckman, MarinaFlats@gmail.com
- Treasurer:** Greg Scott, lgscpa@icloud.com
- Member at Large:** Richard Frisbie, frfbeagle@gmail.com
- Member at Large:** Maurice Franco, maurice1950@comcast.net



CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, May 19, 2020 / 6:30 PM / ZOOM

- I. **SIGN IN;** delegates mark poll; ; salutations and hellos.
- II. **CALL TO ORDER;** members allowed to give short announcements.
- III. **PROGRAM;** RESCUE SF.
 - A. Carolyn, Brooke and Mark speak (MUTE ALL)
 - B. Q&A (UNMUTE ALL)
- IV. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. Emergency Resolution from DHIA Read by Carolyn Kenady. Seconded and Discussed. MUTE ALL during Polling Marking.
 - B. Calling Attention to Kathy Howard's Article in NL.
 - C. June meeting: Virtual Installation of Officers.
- V. **DRAFT MINUTES OF APRIL 21 GA.** (Call to approve)
- VI. **OFFICERS REPORTS** (Unless in NL)
 - A. President
 - B. Vice President
 - C. Secretaries
 - D. Treasurer
- VII. **COMMITTEE REPORTS** (Unless in NL)
 - A. Ex Comm
 - B. Bylaws
 - C. LU&TC
 - D. G&E
 - E. Media
 - F. Nominations
 - G. Events
- VIII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
 - A. Bylaws Amendments (See page 13)
 - B. Election of Officers (Unless vote by acclamation)
 - C. The Conversation Continues...
- IX. **ADJOURN**

Charles Head, President CSFN



CSFN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, April 29, 2020 / 5:30 PM / ZOOM MEETING

Charles Head, Glenn Rogers, Greg Scott, Cindy Beckman, Maurice Franco, Richard Frisbie, Claire Zvanski and guests Lori Brooke, Mary Harris, Carolyn Kenady and Mark Nagel.

- 5:40 pm I **Call to Order** / Quorum Met
- 5:41 pm II **Officers Reports**
 - A. President: Charles has been learning the ZOOM program.
 - B. Vice President: Using the Commonwealth 's Club donation system for income after Speakers was suggested.
 - C. Recording Secretary:
 - D. Corresponding Secretary: No report.
 - E. Treasurer: Provided a spread sheet of financials.
- 5:45 pm III **New Business**
 - A. Resolution from CHNA discussed.
 - B. Article by Kathy Howard on SER.
 - C. Article from Christopher Bowman both.
- 6:26 pm IV **Committee Reports**
 - A. Open Space - Schools could open in July. Parkmerced is asking for loan forbearance & denying they asked for it simultaneously.
 - B. Land Use and Transportation: No meeting.
 - C. Government and Elections: No meeting
 - D. Media Outreach/Membership Committee: No report. Logo presentation to occur Monday, May 3, 2020 at 4 pm.
 - F. Event Committee : No report
 - G. Nominating Committee report: Slate determined.
- 6:30 pm V **Unfinished Business**
 - A. Peter Cohen of the Council of Community Housing Organization (CCHO) is presenting in the future.
 - B. The Conversation Continues....
- 6:38 pm VI **Adjourn**

Glenn Rogers, CSFN Vice President



TREASURE ISLAND BUILDING MORATORIUM RESOLUTION

Whereas, in the new report, *Adapting to Rising Tides Bay Area*, the waters in the San Francisco Bay will be 4 feet higher in the year 2060 which will be equal to the amount of fill to be added for new construction at Treasure Island;

Whereas, Treasure Island was the site where battleships were cleaned after a nuclear blast at the Bikini Atoll leaving radioactivity on site;

Whereas, the Navy deposited radium-dipped devices in landfills on Treasure Island in the past;

Whereas, in 2006 the Navy published an account of radioactivity on Treasure Island, however, since that publication, new locations of radioactivity have been found in areas where it was not supposed to be;

Whereas, in 2008 contractors found and removed almost 1,300 small radioactive objects on Site 12 beside housing areas;

Whereas, in 2011 state technicians tested Treasure Island's roads with gamma scanners and found 5 areas of "significantly elevated radiation levels" in places accessible to the public;

Whereas, cesium-137 was found close to a building where this substance was stored, when experts reported further tests were needed to be done, the Navy and the City's development authority said there was no need for action and the health department did not comment;

Therefore be it Resolved, that all parties involved in the cleanup of Treasure Island, including the City Attorney, the Navy, the City development authority on Treasure Island, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the SF Health Department, the Treasure Island Homeless Initiative, Lennar and FivePoint Holding LLC construction companies and the John Stewart Co. which manages leases on Treasure Island, halt construction on Treasure Island until these relevant agencies consider it safe and free of radioactivity or any other toxic waste and the fear of rising water has subsided.

Charles Head, President CSFN



RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SAFE SLEEPING SITES

From Dolores Heights Improvement Club - Carolyn Kenady on April 29, 2020

Whereas, the COVID-19 crisis and the Shelter in Place order have created suffering for the Unsheltered, and

Whereas, among the 8,035 people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, 5,180 are unsheltered, with 65% of these individuals sleeping outdoors in streets, parks or tents (San Francisco Homeless Point in Time Count, January 24, 2019); and

Whereas, the City of SF is not acting fast enough to put them in available hotel rooms, and

Whereas, the city’s healthy streets operations center (HSOC) has refocused its efforts on COVID-19 response including keeping areas clean, ensuring sidewalks are kept clear, asking people to stay one person per tent and keeping tents at least 6 feet apart ; and

Whereas, notwithstanding such efforts, encampments on sidewalks throughout the city have grown, largely without adequate physical distancing and without adequate sanitation and hygiene, posing a challenge to COVID-19 mitigation efforts; and

Whereas, due to San Francisco’s Shelter in Place Order many publicly and privately owned parking garages and lots are currently unoccupied; and

Whereas, on Tuesday, April 28, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed the Safe Sleeping Sites Resolution (sponsored by Supervisor Mandelman, Preston, Stefani, Fewer, & Mar) as an alternative to protect those sleeping on the streets, and,

Whereas, Safe Sleeping Sites include marked-off space for each tent for adequate social distancing, bathrooms, hand washing stations, meals, drinking water, and garbage disposal, consistent with Department of Public Health guidance and best practices; and,

Whereas, each Safe Sleeping Site will have a safety plan and be staffed 24/7 and include janitorial services and such other services practically feasible to maintain the health and safety of those at the site and the surrounding neighborhood, consistent with Department of Public Health guidance and best practices;

Therefore, be it Resolved that CSFN supports the establishment of safe sleeping sites -- with priority given to neighborhoods that are currently home to high numbers of unsheltered people, and

Be it further Resolved, that CSFN urges City officials and Supervisors to involve neighborhood associations and to seek input from adjacent neighbors whenever a Safe Sleeping Site is being proposed for their area.

Carolyn Kenady, Chair DHIC



PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENT: Electronic meetings:

This organization may conduct electronic meetings in part or whole for the general assembly, standing committees, special committees, sub-committees, ad hoc committees, or any other variation of meetings that involve and include members, delegates and alternate delegates where a quorum is present. All attendees and participants must be able to be heard and/or seen so that they can fully participate and be able to vote, when necessary. The electronic meeting or combination, thereof, constitutes a valid meeting such that all attendees are able to hear and be heard simultaneously as if all were present at a regular meeting in one room at one time. The secretary and/or chair must be able to determine if a quorum is present which includes those attending meetings electronically. An invitation with full participation access information must be provided for all meetings including a telephone option.

The software application used must allow each participant to hear and be heard and/or seen and the equipment used may belong to each participant which includes the meeting convener's equipment. The organization is under no obligation to own or purchase the equipment used. The organization should purchase the electronic software application that allows for the electronic meeting process.

This electronic option is for full and/or partial attendance so that a quorum may be achieved. It must allow members/delegates the option to attend when they might be unable to attend a regular meeting. All attendees must be fully heard and recognized by all present so that a combined meeting may constitute a valid assembly. The chair must be able to see/hear all electronic attendees. It is not required for all attendees to see all electronic participants during a general assembly meeting, but, it would be helpful if possible. This might require additional equipment which is the purview of the organization to purchase.

Rules for participation must be the same as the rules for participation in meetings that are not electronic, including raising hands for recognition, raising a point of order or making motions. Motions may also be submitted in writing in advance or through a written discussion process provided through the software application.

Roll call votes may be taken that include delegates participating electronically. As provided in the bylaws, the chair shall determine methods for voting.

Under no circumstances shall an electronic meeting mean a meeting via email, postal mail, "chat rooms" or fax or any other process that does not meet the basic requirement of being heard and/or seen simultaneously as defined herein.

Such meetings are not valid under any circumstances as they do not constitute a deliberative assembly.

Claire Zvanski, CSFN Parliamentarian



Member Renewal

Name of Organization _____

Mailing Address _____ SF 941 _____ Contact E-mail _____

Current Officers

Name	Office	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

CSFN Delegate

Name	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone
_____	_____	_____	_____

If your organization has alternate CSFN delegates:

Name	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

NEWSLETTER MAILING LIST - Each member is entitled to receive two copies of CSFN's monthly newsletter Neighborhood Views as part of their membership fee. The first copy goes to the delegate and the second to a person designated by the organization. A member of an organization's Board of Directors may subscribe to the CSFN newsletter at a rate of \$10 per year. Other persons may subscribe at \$15 per year. If you prefer to view the newsletter online or download it from the website www.csfn.net/newsletter check the box below and leave the following lines blank. Additional paid copies: use the back of this page. Include address and zip codes.

- Email us the newsletter to following email address(es): _____
- Do **not** send us a hard copy.
- Send a hard copy to: _____

Name	Office	Address (with ZIP)	Phone
_____	_____	_____	_____

DUES, DONATIONS AND NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTIONS

CSFN Annual Membership dues are \$45. Organizations wishing to include an additional donation to CSFN are encouraged to do so. Please add \$10 for each additional newsletter subscription for your organization's board members and \$15 for other members. Make check payable to CSFN and mail to CSFN POBox 320098 SF CA 94132.

Annual Membership Dues: \$45.	_____
Newsletter Subscriptions: @ \$10.	_____
Newsletter Subscriptions: @ \$15.	_____
Additional Donation	_____
Total to CSFN	_____
Thank You!	

CSFN Membership Certification
 CSFN Bylaws (Article II, Section A-G) require each voting member organization to certify that it has a membership of 35 or more in order to maintain voting privileges. Organizations not having the required membership are encouraged to join or retain membership as associate members without voting privileges.

Member Organization (35 or more members) _____

Associate (non-voting) Member Organization _____

Certifying Signature _____

Address if not listed above _____

CSFN Annual Membership Fee is Due in January. If not received by March 1, voting rights will be withdrawn.