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Welcome Remarks from Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, Community and Government Relations

Review of Long Range Development Plan: Questions and Answers
Presented by Kevin Beauchamp, Director of Physical Planning, UCSF Real Estate

An Advisory Committee Member requests sufficient lead time to review materials in advance of the scoping meeting for the Environmental Impact Report.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that waiting to discuss mitigation until the final meeting, as outlined in the community process timeline, is too late to permit a sufficient discussion. The member requested an amendment to the timeline to allow this discussion to take place earlier to grant more time for back and forth between the university and the community.

An Advisory Committee Member asked for clarification on whether or not the university has broken the space ceiling in the past and how the group could create a future resolution that won’t be broken.

Kevin explained that the space ceiling was adopted in 1976 by the UC Board of Regents. In 1976, the university comprised 3.07 million gsf of the 3.55 million gsf that became the limit. Development of the library and subterranean parking took place in the 80s and 90s. During this development, it wasn’t clear to the university that parking would count towards the space ceiling. After a review, the university determined that it met and exceeded the space ceiling. Kevin noted that the space ceiling continues to be exceeded to this day.

An Advisory Committee Member expressed uncertainty about the university exceeding the space ceiling in the past without facing any repercussions and asked what assurances there would be to stop the university from exceeding the space ceiling again in the future.
Kevin said the university has been very transparent about the space ceiling and has engaged in dialogue with the community each time it has proposed a new building project.

An Advisory Committee Member responded to Kevin’s remarks by saying the reason UCSF has consistently engaged in conversation with the community isn’t “out of the good graces” of the university, but rather because the community pressed it to during the lawsuit over the dentistry school. The settlement around the dentistry school included the space ceiling limits, the university selling back single family homes it had purchased and the promise that UCSF would engage in ongoing dialogue with the surrounding community. The Advisory Committee Member commented that UCSF is not subject to the will of the voters of San Francisco and that the City cannot impose an annual limit on the university. Instead, the university and the community need to engage in a dialogue, based upon an assumed good will on both sides.

An Advisory Committee Member said it felt like the discussions the university has had with the community about the space ceiling limits in the past did not take place this time. The member commented that this is a huge proposal with huge impacts and it appears like it’s already been decided.

Kevin reminded members that the purpose of this process is to discuss the space ceiling and that no decisions have been made. The university still needs to complete a full environmental impact report and hear feedback from the Advisory Committee Group before moving forward with this plan.

An Advisory Committee Member asked why housing is not included in the space ceiling.

Kevin explained that in the 1976 resolution, most residential space was not counted under the limitation, however Aldea was included. He explained that during the 2014 LRDP process, it was recognized that the university needed to do more to provide housing to employees and faculty, due to the housing crisis in San Francisco. As a result, it was collectively decided that housing was something to be encouraged because it helps alleviate transportation impacts and it prevents some faculty from competing for housing in the community.

An Advisory Committee Member asked about population estimates under the new plan.

Kevin responded that the university has decreased its population since the 2014 LRDP, but is working on new population projections for the CPHP.

An Advisory Committee Member asked the university to share information about the approximate size of Mission Bay and its population.

Kevin said that the population at Mission Bay was approximately 9,000 and said he would get back to the group with information on the exact size of Mission Bay. [The size of Mission Bay is 60.1 acres]
An Advisory Committee Member asked for a definition of the types of research: basic, quantitative and clinical.

Tamara explained that basic research is the kind of work that happens in a lab, involving cells and molecules and is very equipment-intensive. Clinical research involves working with a patient. This area of research has expanded dramatically over the last two years at UCSF, yet the campus doesn’t have any clinical research infrastructure. Quantitative research is data science, AI, machine learning. This type of research is primarily computational.

An Advisory Committee Member asked why the university isn’t completely renovating the health sciences towers?

Tamara explained that the university currently has 550 sq ft of research space and if it remodels the towers, that will help, but it’s been really challenging to remodel floor by floor because it’s very expensive.

An Advisory Committee Member asked if it’s possible housing prices are more heavily impacting the university’s ability to hire as opposed to just infrastructure affecting the ability to hire.

Tamara referenced Mission Bay, where housing prices are also an issue, but there is more junior faculty. Tamara maintained that difficulty with hiring is disproportionately affecting Parnassus.

An Advisory Committee Member referenced Tamara’s statement about the process to propose new research space under the new plan being data-driven and asked if the existing space ceiling was part of the data used to drive the decisions the group came up with and if so, how.

Tamara said her research group absolutely factored the type of site and essential activities into their plan. She explained that they were a working group charged with going through a lot of data to provide some suggestions and these suggestions were then integrated into the larger working group conclusions.

An Advisory Committee Member asked if in the working group’s process they looked at other medical schools of similar type like Stanford to try to weigh their conclusions against other places doing similar work in urban spaces.
Tamara said yes, the group weighed their assumptions and conclusions against places that have both larger and smaller footprints. Their conclusions were aligned with being very space efficient and using vertical growth.

An Advisory Committee Member asked why it’s necessary for computational research to take place at Parnassus.

Tamara responded that computational research can happen at other places and would be more flexible to relocate than other research groups, but computational research is becoming more deeply integrated into all of UCSF’s research and there is a growing necessity for those experts to be on campus alongside other research groups to facilitate discovery.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that there are too many distracting questions asked in the middle of the presentation and suggested to fellow committee members that they let the presenter speak and ask questions at the end.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that “the space ceiling is dead” and instead of dwelling on the space ceiling, the group should focus on mitigation factors.

An Advisory Committee Member asked how the space ceiling was arrived at and what assumptions were made.

Kevin responded that it predated him so he can’t speculate, but he thinks it was a best guess by the planners at the time.

Research Spotlight
Presented by Karsyn Bailey, MD/Ph.D. Candidate and Tamara Alliston

Karsyn and Tamara talked about their research on osteoarthritis and showed that bringing researchers and clinicians together to work in closer proximity can help further innovative research and health discoveries.

UCSF Listening Session

Below is a high-level summary of topics brought up during the listening session breakout groups. Advisory Committee members and the general public expressed interest in more transparency from UCSF and a commitment to address the impacts of further development of the Parnassus Heights campus.

General Questions/Comments
• How will the expansion impact the community?
• How many additional people will be at Parnassus as a result of the CPHP?
• Has UCSF considered other services to the neighborhood, versus amenities for its campus population?
• Carbon footprint of the campus development
• UCSF’s research and mission in locations other than Parnassus. Can UCSF move programs to other campus locations and keep Parnassus small?
• Interest in keeping an emergency department and hospital on the west side.

Accountability
• Space ceiling is a concern for some and is unclear for others. General agreement that there should be some accountability measures.
• Other than the space ceiling, are there other mitigation measures that are tied to the population?
• Lack of clarity of where the “need” for the space came from and whether it can be reduced.

Transportation
• Traffic impacts/gridlock in the surrounding neighborhoods, especially around 7th Avenue.
• Ride-hailing services and their impacts on the campus and neighborhood
• Impacts on the Muni lines
• Impacts on parking and traffic in the neighborhood.

Housing
• What are the size, scope, and rental costs of the units proposed at Aldea?
• Concerns that Aldea is not the most ideal location, given its isolation to nearby transit. How will this development impact nearby housing?

Near-Term Projects Overview
Presented by Brian Newman, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Real Estate, and Vice President, UCSF Health

An Advisory Committee Member asked if the university’s plans included an investment in transit along the Irving Street Corridor.

Brian responded that as part of the environmental review process, UCSF is looking at ways to mitigate transportation issues, and the next meeting will be dedicated to discussing transportation.

An Advisory Committee Member asked if the Irving Street project involves any reduction in car parking.

Brian answered that he thinks it will and that there could be some additional parking added to the housing project.
A member of the public asked if the university could be more specific about the location of inpatient services at Langley Porter.

A member of the public asked how the university was going to protect or preserve murals and historic artifacts in the existing buildings.

An Advisory Committee Member asked what real strong efforts UCSF can make to avoid exacerbating the housing crisis.

An Advisory Committee Member asked what the university’s housing strategy was at Parnassus and throughout the city.

An Advisory Committee Member asked for a transportation map detailing how people get to campus today and how UCSF expects that to change in the future.

Public Comment

A member of the public talked about UCSF’s maintenance of Mount Sutro, particularly the removal of eucalyptus trees in favor of native plants. The member of the public expressed the opinion that UCSF is wasting resources and destroying a living ecosystem when we are on the brink of extinction as a species.

Christine Gasparac commented that UCSF had a three-year process for the Mount Sutro vegetation management plan in which UCSF convened a technical advisory committee that advised on the plan, and there was an extensive community process. After four years of drought, about 25% of trees were standing dead. UCSF had to take action to mitigate the hazards of so many dead trees. UCSF began implementation of the 20-year plan last year, with removal of a few hundred dead trees and replanted about 400 new trees. UCSF is preserving eucalyptus groves, replanting some eucalyptus and also replanting native species. The key to regenerating the forest is to bring in more native plants to diversify the Reserve and allow for a healthy ecosystem. UCSF is committed to maintaining Mount Sutro as permanent open space.