Future of the UCSF Parnassus Heights Campus
Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Tuesday, November 19, 2019

SUMMARY NOTES

Advisory Committee Members/Designated Alternates Present:
Kelly Akemi-Groth, Inner Sunset Resident
Dennis Antenore, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Charles Canepa, UCSF CAG, Cole Valley Improvement Association
Walter Caplan, Forest Knolls Resident, Forest Knolls Neighborhood Organization
Kevin Hart, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Sarah Jones, Cole Valley Resident, SFMTA
Erica Kajdasz, Cole Valley Merchant, Cole Valley Fair
Susan Maerki, Inner Sunset Resident, UCSF CAG
Jeanne Myerson, Cole Valley Resident, SPUR
Dan Sider, Inner Sunset Resident
Maria Wabl, Inner Sunset Resident
Bob Walsh, Cole Valley Resident
Calvin Welch, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Tes Welborn, UCSF CAG, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Susannah Wise, Cole Valley Resident, Inner Sunset Merchants Association

Advisory Committee Members/Designated Alternates Absent:
Martha Ehrenfeld, UCSF CAG, Inner Sunset Park Neighbors
Andrea Jadwin, Inner Sunset Resident
Benji Jasik, Inner Sunset Resident
Caleb Krywenko, Inner Sunset Resident
Beatrice Laws, Cole Valley Resident, UCSF CAG
Debbie Lee, Forest Knolls Resident
Donald Luu, Forest Hill Resident, Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Robert Ogilvie, Inner Sunset Resident, SPUR

Subject Matter Experts Present:
Kevin Beauchamp, Director, Physical Planning, Real Estate
Tammy Chan, Senior Planner, Real Estate
Stuart Eckblad, Vice President, Major Capital Projects, UCSF Health  
Barbara French, Strategic Advisor, Office of Senior Vice Chancellor  
Christine Gasparac, Senior Director, Community Relations  
Alicia Murasaki, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning, Real Estate  
Brian Newman, Sr. Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Real Estate & Vice President, UCSF Health  
Elizabeth Polek, Vice President, New Hospital Planning and Optimization, UCSF Health  
Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, Community and Government Relations  
Diane Wong, Principal Planner/Environmental Coordinator, Real Estate

**Subject Matter Experts Absent:**  
Jorge Rivas, Deputy Director, SF Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)  
Joshua Switzky, Planner, SF Planning Department

**Opening Remarks from Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, Community and Government Relations**  
Francesca provided an overview of the community input process and timeline.  
Outcomes for the Advisory Committee include:  
1) assessment of neighborhood impacts that may result from the CPHP;  
2) identification of potential community investments to offset any such impacts.

Once this Advisory Committee concludes, UCSF will organize subsequent community meetings to receive feedback on the environmental review process and project design. Neighbors will also have an opportunity to provide feedback on individual projects as they arise in the future.

**Advisory Committee Process, reviewed by Andrea Baker, En2Action**  
Andrea Baker reviewed the purpose and goal of the Advisory Committee and shared an updated timeline that includes two additional meetings to allow for additional time to consider community investments.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that although there has been resistance from some committee members to continue to debate the space ceiling issues, he feels it’s integral to the discussion. He believes that there wasn’t sufficient dialogue between the Advisory Committee and the “decision-makers.” He stated that there was no financial feasibility included in the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that in the past, the space ceiling had served as the growth cap and management plan for community impacts. What will UCSF use to measure its impacts in place of a space ceiling cap?

Andrea Baker reviewed the Environmental Impact Report timeline. The Initial Study will be published in January 2020 and the final EIR Certification by Regents is projected for fall 2020.
An Advisory Committee Member expressed concern over the timeline for the EIR and commented that it is too short to allow for sufficient evaluation.

Kevin Beauchamp noted that the timeline is an estimate and is subject to change depending on the comments and feedback the university receives from the community.

An Advisory Committee Member said there is a scoping meeting coming up on February 10th, 2020, but the committee doesn’t know what they will be scoping yet and to receive that information just prior to the scoping meeting does not offer them adequate time to provide input.

Kevin said that the Initial Study will be published on January 14, 2020, and the public will have 30 days for public review and comment. A scoping meeting will be held within those 30 days for members of the community to share their feedback in person regarding topics they want to be sure the university is addressing. The scoping meeting and comments submitted during the public comment period will inform the draft EIR. The draft EIR publication is scheduled for the spring, but could be pushed back based on community input.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that UCSF is the lead agency for the EIR and is self-certifying it. The member suggested the committee should look at this as an informational document and a place to memorialize big picture strategies to deal with impacts. He noted that for most other projects, the EIR is the only public process. He encouraged the committee to use this community process UCSF has offered to vet issues and concerns and to come up with a plan that is workable for the neighborhood. The Advisory Committee Member also stated that the schedule was aggressive and perhaps optimistic.

An Advisory Committee Member asked what information the individuals who are drafting the EIR receive to inform their report and if they’ve been privy to information that the Advisory Committee hasn’t, like the projected size of the hospital and staffing projections.

Kevin said the EIR is based on the CPHP, and the consultants who are preparing the EIR do not yet have information about population estimates because those numbers have not yet been fully determined. He said that the consultants are making reasonable assumptions regarding population numbers to begin drafting the EIR, as is standard in EIR processes.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that UCSF is both the developer and certifier of the completeness and accuracy of the EIR. Is there an appeal process that the public will be able to use?
Kevin said that the appeal process would be a legal process. There are plenty of opportunities for public disclosure and input along the way, including this Advisory Committee.

An Advisory Committee Member commented there are significant impacts that will not covered in the EIR and should be dealt with prior to the EIR.

Kevin noted that is why UCSF has the conversation about community investments queued up for the spring.

Welcome, Recap of Last Meeting, and Agenda presented by Andrea Baker, CEO En2Action (reference slides 11-17)
Andrea reviewed questions raised by the Advisory Committee Members in past meetings and information that UCSF has provided to answer these questions.

New Hospital at the Helen Diller Medical Center presented by Mark R. Laret, President and CEO, UCSF Health
Mark explained that UCSF serves a diverse set of patients: half of UCSF’s patients live in San Francisco and half use Medi-Cal insurance. Mark reminded attendees that the hospital will be seismically unfit to operate by 2030.

Mark stated that the university shares the community’s concerns and is committed to cushioning the impacts of the CPHP as much as possible.

An Advisory Committee Member asked if the remodeling of the hospital could be accomplished without breaking the space ceiling by 40%.

Mark stated that if UCSF is to remain a top medical center, an economic driver, a leading research facility, and an asset to the community, it would require enough space to do so.

An Advisory Committee Member stated that the growth of the campus and this process need to allow for sufficient consideration of impacts around transportation and housing.

Mark agreed that we’re facing a housing crisis and stated that housing is a priority for the university. He said the university needs to think creatively about various approaches to address housing needs.

An Advisory Committee Member said that some of them have a problem with the university doubling in size (at Mission Bay) and now asking for a 40% increase at the Parnassus campus. Is the group being presented with a plan and funneled into discussing impacts instead of discussing the assumptions of the plan?
An Advisory Committee Member stated that four years ago, CPMC cut its proposed medical center [at Van Ness] in half in order to respond to criticisms from the community and the City and County of San Francisco. He said that last month, Stanford University dropped an expansion plan because the San Mateo Board of Supervisors required them to do massive mitigation of their housing impacts, and Stanford was unable or unwilling to do that. Is it possible that UCSF might come to the same conclusion? If you could not mitigate the impact of the growth are you willing to reduce the scope of your plan?

Mark acknowledged the questions and said that UCSF starts with putting patient care first and looking at what it means for the number of employees needed and where they are going to live. UCSF is actively discussing approaches to housing and whether it will be enough. It’s a crisis facing the whole city, and the problem needs to be addressed holistically and collectively.

An Advisory Committee Member said that the City has just passed a $600 million bond and asked what UCSF has done to reduce the housing crisis in the City.

Mark said housing is a top priority for UCSF, and we are focused on coming up with creative solutions for housing our employees. UCSF recently completed a student housing project with 595 below-market units.

A member of the public asked why Mount Zion is not better integrated into the CPHP.

Mark said the Mount Zion campus is being evaluated for Langley Porter inpatient care.

Stuart Eckblad, Vice President, Major Capital Projects, UCSF Health, and Elizabeth Polek, Vice President, New Hospital Planning and Optimization, UCSF Health (reference slides 19-37)

Elizabeth shared why UCSF needs to build a new hospital, including the current hospital’s escalating patient demand, its outdated and undersized facilities, and the need to recruit and retain top-tier clinicians, staff, researchers and students.

Stuart shared the university’s goal to facilitate greater interaction with the community as part of the CPHP, including being a destination for classes, dining, wellness amenities, retail, etc.

An Advisory Committee Member asked for clarification about the total number of beds on Parnassus.

Elizabeth said that there will be 675 total beds on Parnassus under the CPHP (there are currently 475).
An Advisory Committee Member expressed hope that we can all stop calling UCSF a “campus” and instead think of it as part of our neighborhood. There should be a focus on design and making it a true amenity in the neighborhood that UCSF and the community can be proud of.

An Advisory Committee Member asked for a building that fits in this neighborhood and is an asset to it. Maybe taking a tour of the Mission Bay hospital would help committee members understand hospital requirements, etc.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that the community was very involved in the design of Mission Bay and asked that the community also be involved in the design of the Parnassus campus. UCSF should consider demolishing Moffitt and transitioning UC Hall to housing to limit the breaking of the space ceiling.

An Advisory Committee Member commented that patients are not making a free will choice to come to UCSF and must be admitted by a doctor. UCSF’s projections are based upon how healthcare is paid for now.

Elizabeth said that anyone can be admitted to the emergency room and that the information shared today was not based on how healthcare will be financed. She said their projections were based on patient needs.

An Advisory Committee Member asked about the current number of licensed vs. staffed beds on Parnassus.

Elizabeth responded that 475 is the number of staffed beds and that only rooms that are suitable for patient care are being used.

UCSF Listening Session - Small Break-Out Group Questions
1. What community considerations do you think UCSF should have at the forefront when planning for the hospital?

Overarching Themes:
○ Community members expressed a desire to build a more holistic relationship with UCSF.

○ Community members requested open and clear communication with UCSF and its leadership throughout the community planning and development process.

○ Community members expressed desire for a comprehensive transportation plan that allows for better access to campus, ease of congestion, and parking solutions.
○ Community members asked UCSF to proactively leverage its resources and create housing solutions that mitigate the city’s housing crisis.

○ Community members expressed a desire for a world-class medical facility and research institution (exemplifying great architecture) without excessive or noncritical growth.

2. What additional information would be helpful to you?
   ○ Plan for housing, especially affordable housing
   ○ Population projections for staff, patients, employees
   ○ UCSF’s plan to provide services to underserved communities
   ○ EIR process explanation
   ○ Information on urgent/outpatient care at the new hospital
   ○ Impact of homeless and psych patients on ED and usage of beds
   ○ How UCSF is addressing the needs of mental health patients
   ○ How Moffitt Hospital will impact the new hospital
   ○ How the vision of the new hospital connects to the campus/university at large
   ○ Information on designing of rooms: sustainability, safety, quality
   ○ Information about a plan for housing
   ○ Information on the affordability of UCSF services
   ○ Family housing for patient families and understanding the demand
   ○ Dialogue with decision-makers
   ○ Information on any changes to Mount Sutro