Future of the UCSF Parnassus Heights Campus
Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Tuesday, October 22, 2019

SUMMARY NOTES

Advisory Committee Members/Designated Alternates Present:
Andrea Jadwin, Inner Sunset Resident
Benji Jasik, Inner Sunset Resident
Bob Walsh, Cole Valley Resident
Caleb Krywenko, Inner Sunset Resident
Charles Canepa, UCSF CAG, Cole Valley Improvement Association
Dan Sider, Inner Sunset Resident
Dennis Antenore, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Donald Luu, Forest Hill Resident, Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Erica Kajdasz, Cole Valley Merchant, Cole Valley Fair
Jeanne Myerson, Cole Valley Resident, SPUR
Kelly Akemi-Groth, Inner Sunset Resident
Kevin Hart, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Maria Wabl, Inner Sunset Resident
Martha Ehrenfeld, UCSF CAG, Inner Sunset Park Neighbors
Robert Ogilvie, Inner Sunset Resident, SPUR
Sarah Jones, Cole Valley Resident, SFMTA
Susan Maerki, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Susannah Wise, Cole Valley Resident, Inner Sunset Merchants Association
Tes Welborn, UCSF CAG, Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Walter Caplan, Forest Knolls Resident, Forest Knolls Neighborhood Organization

Advisory Committee Members/Designated Alternates Absent:
Beatrice Laws, Cole Valley Resident, Kezar Stadium Citizen Advisory
Calvin Welch, Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Subject Matter Experts Present:
Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, Community and Government Relations
Christine Gasparac, Senior Director, Community Relations
Barbara French, Strategic Advisor, Office of Senior Vice Chancellor
Alicia Murasaki, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning, Real Estate
Welcome Remarks from Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, Community and Government Relations

Vice Chancellor Vega encouraged discussion of the article titled, “UCSF’s secret plans to expand dramatically in Parnassus Heights” written by Dennis Antenore, an Advisory Committee Member.

An Advisory Committee Member stated that failing to honor the space ceiling is a significant factor and expressed that he felt it was being swept under the rug.

An Advisory Committee Member reminded the group of a comment from a member of the public who asked the Advisory Committee to stop focusing on the space ceiling and to instead focus on having the best hospital for our neighborhood. The member stated population growth is not catastrophic. It is something we need to deal with, and this group has an opportunity to give feedback. The member would like to see more openness to the project and its possibilities, how to get the hospital built and how the university could look over the next twenty years. This city is not what it was in 1972. It’s a very different city, there are a lot of people coming here, and we are going to have to face that. We do need a great hospital. The member advised shelving the space ceiling comment, and those who want to discuss further can have a separate conversation around the space ceiling.

Francesca stated that there has been no decision made by the UC Regents about the proposed 1.5 million gsf addition to the space ceiling.

An Advisory Committee Member responded that the last LRDP, completed in 2014, outlined compliance with the space ceiling. In that document, the future of UCSF was to add certain elements and research, but it also said the goal was to decompress Parnassus by demolishing buildings over time. The LRDP was determined after a long series of meetings and discussions with a large group of people. The member stated that the space ceiling was never discussed until the final meeting of the process. The member also acknowledged the need to replace the hospital and to start the planning
and process for the hospital immediately. The member stated that he would like to have a real discussion of the space ceiling: what it means and what can be done about it. He stated that it is a primary issue for the process, not a side issue. The member asked for the committee to review and discuss the space ceiling in a thoughtful way.

An Advisory Committee Member stated that it felt like this group has been talking about the same thing over and over again with regards to the space ceiling, and it’s time to move forward. The member stated that it didn’t mean that the group was agreeing to a breaking of the space ceiling, but that they’d like to move forward and learn what the impacts will be and get to the point in order to actually have data to talk about.

An Advisory Committee Member said the space ceiling has been brought up a lot and that it’s time to move on to whatever is next.

An Advisory Committee Member referenced the article and asked if the University has a secret process going on and if any plans have been hidden from the committee.

Francesca responded that there is no secret process, and there are clear milestones for moving forward. There will be an initial study published outlining what is being studied in the EIR. Francesca stated that when the EIR process starts, there will be a community scoping meeting, and the committee can be involved in the process.

An Advisory Committee Member said that one thing learned from past processes is that once something is there, it’s there. So, if we don’t want talk about the space ceiling, then we basically accept this document.

An Advisory Committee Member asked fellow committee members to not pre-judge the space ceiling. He would like to talk about it and discuss it, rather than putting it to the side. The committee member also stated that there are a lot of people in this neighborhood who are very concerned. The member said that he thinks that the process happened without community knowledge.

An Advisory Committee Member stated that while UCSF might not have explicitly talked about the space ceiling, it was very obvious during the previous process that the campus and buildings were going to be larger. The member stated that she got the sense the entire time. The member also stated that people are supportive of what UCSF is doing, even after the article was released.

Introduction to CPHP by Brian Newman, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Real Estate and Vice President, UCSF Health

Brian reiterated that this community process is not the beginning of the conversation and will not be the end and that the plan proposes an increase in the space ceiling, which has not yet been approved.

Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan: Overview/Questions and Answers
Kevin reviewed the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (slides 7-29)
Six Big Ideas: 1) Form complementary districts, 2) Irving St. connects to the community,
3) Emphasize connections for convergence, 4) Park-to-Peak, a vertical campus, 5) Create the “campus heart,” 6) Parnassus Ave. is the campus “main street”

Proposed Near-Term Projects: 1) Irving Street Arrival improvements, 2) New Hospital,
3) New Research and Academic Building, 4) Aldea Housing improvements

An Advisory Committee Member said the EIR process analyzes a very limited scope of impacts, it doesn't deal with a lot of issues, so how are we going to integrate discussions around impacts that are not covered in the EIR?

Kevin responded that once the draft EIR is published, there will be an opportunity to discuss the details in the document.

Barbara French added that impacts are in three categories: CEQA, design and “cushioning”. Barbara suggested everyone think about impacts that emerge during this process based on these three buckets.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that EIRs are very technical and an EIR is a prescribed document that does not capture the things that are largely of interest to this group and other neighbors. Something that is bothersome or undesired might not actually be addressed during CEQA. Cushioning is where this group has the most impact and where the concerns of this group might be most helpful and addressed.

An Advisory Committee Member replied that cushioning and mitigation signify an acceptance of the plan and neighbors trying to reap a few benefits. She would instead like the group to think about how to influence UCSF to remove some of aspects of the plan to make the plan more tolerable and palatable to the neighborhood.

An Advisory Committee Member asked that the rest of the meetings be spent discussing cushioning.

An Advisory Committee Member said that she wants more housing, even at Aldea. She also stated that she was part of forming the Green Benefit District in Dogpatch and wanted to clarify that UCSF wasn't responsible for the formation of the Green Benefit District in Dogpatch.

5-minute break

Welcome, Recap of Last Meeting and Agenda presented by Andrea Baker, CEO En2Action
Claire Shinnerl, Sr. Ass. Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services and Amit Kothari, Interim Director, UCSF Transportation Services

Claire shared the current commuter profile, how UCSF employees come to campus, parking at the Parnassus campus, permit eligibility requirements, on-campus amenities, and trends in mobility.

An Advisory Committee member asked if UCSF could break down who is satisfied with their commute, versus their commute time, who takes public transit versus who drives.

Claire responded that they haven’t sliced that data yet, but many drive because it is faster versus taking public transit.

An Advisory Committee member asked about students using 90% of sustainable modes and asked whether it means 42% use ride-hailing services. She questioned whether Uber/Lyft should be considered sustainable transportation.

Claire responded that student population is small, and that the categories are similar. She stated that Amit would address Uber/Lyft later in the presentation.

Amit discussed mobility trends – ride-hailing services (slides 47-50)

An Advisory Committee Member commented that public transit should be the primary mode of transportation and the others should be supplemental. Does UCSF have data on the number of people associated with the campus who have private vehicles that don’t drive to the campus, but drive to other locations in SF, etc.?

Amit stated that they don’t have data on ownership, but on commute behavior.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that cars are not sustainable and asked how many cars are coming here, what percent are gas-burning vehicles, how many miles are they traveling to get here, how many alternative fuel vehicles are coming, how many curb spaces are we taking up in neighborhood with people parking off campus? He also commented that EVs are for the wealthy, and hence we are encouraging the wealthy class to drive their cars.

A member of the public commented that Uber/Lyft have 46,000 vehicles in San Francisco a day and how that affects the future.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that a few years ago there was not a problem for members of the public to take shuttles across San Francisco. She asked whether it would make sense to open the shuttles up a little more to residents of the neighborhood and if this could be a part of UCSF giving back to the community.

Claire responded that patients are allowed on the shuttles.
The Advisory Committee Member responded that that is not the case. It may have been in the past, but now the shuttle drivers are strict.

An Advisory Committee Member said that developing housing at Aldea is forcing people into cars. There’s no transportation, there’s no neighborhood. If you triple housing at Aldea, you are going to triple cars coming off that hill and that it is not an ideal vision.

Amit responded that UCSF would consider expanding or exploring alternative modes of transportation at Aldea.

A member of the public inquired why bikes are overlooked and suggested opening more lanes for bikes and an overpass for pedestrians. Motor bikes can only go up to 35 mph. There should be more express lanes for bikes.

Amit responded that UCSF is committed to improving and increasing bike usage. UCSF is working with SFMTA on infrastructure and bike lanes.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that SFMTA and UCSF have started talking about the planning process. She wanted to challenge the notion of complementing versus competing with public transportation. She urged the group to come up with a plan for transportation that is best for people and get to a place where we are complementing each other. She further commented that as UCSF is thinking about how populations get around, it should be built around thinking about what the transportation needs are for populations at different income levels (equity).

Kevin Beauchamp shared traffic-calming measures that UCSF has undertaken in the past.

Draft Transportation Vision and Goals presented by Barbara French, Strategic Communication Advisor, Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor and Jeff Tumlin, Principal and Director of Strategy, Nelson/Nygaard

Barbara and Jeff walked through the goals and stressed that the goals are a draft and we are looking for feedback from the group.

UCSF Listening Session
Attendees broke out into small groups to provide feedback on the transportation vision and goals. Below is a summary of what was brought up during the listening session breakout groups.

- Interest in UCSF playing a bigger role in neighborhood public transportation and working with SFMTA to improve Muni in the neighborhood, especially near the Aldea Center. N-Judah needs to increase in frequency and capacity.
- General appreciation for the shuttles, but mixed feelings regarding increasing shuttles. High interest in encouraging patients to ride the shuttles.
• Congestion and traffic in the neighborhood, especially near 7th Avenue, 17th Street, and Parnassus.
• Pedestrian safety in areas such as 3rd and Parnassus, Irving and Arguello, especially for children, elders, and disabled pedestrians.
• Parking is a big concern, but there are mixed feelings about adding more parking on campus versus limiting parking to encourage alternative transportation.
• Looking at transportation from an equity lens. Lower income communities commute in different ways. Example: incentivizing electric vehicles and other expensive luxury vehicles excludes lower income communities.
• Interest in having terminals for buses and ride-hailing drop-offs. Think creatively about ride-hailing and how to manage it effectively.
• Interest in infrastructure for alternative modes of transportation, such as bikes and scooters.

Public Comment

Members of the public did not add additional comment at this time.

Recap and Next Steps

Next meeting will be on November 19, 2019