UCSF LRDP—Parnassus Community Workshop #3

February 11, 2014
Summary Report
INTRODUCTION
UCSF hosted a third community workshop on February 11, 2014 to present final LRDP proposals for the Parnassus campus and to solicit feedback from neighbors. The workshop was held from 6:30 to 9:00 p.m. at Millberry Union on the UCSF Parnassus Campus and was attended by approximately fifty people.

Outreach for the meeting included an ad in the Sunset Beacon, an Inner Sunset neighborhood newspaper (circulation 25,000); a postcard mailing to approximately 4,700 Parnassus neighbors; emails to UCSF’s email distribution list for Parnassus neighbors; postings and meeting information in the Inner Sunset Park Neighbors newsletter and facebook page; postings in the Cole Valley Improvement Association’s web calendar and facebook page; and notification on the UCSF LRDP website.

Barbara Bagot-López, Community Relations Director, opened the workshop by welcoming participants and thanking the group for attending these important community workshops to share their ideas related to the Long Range Development Plan. Daniel Iacofano of MIG, Inc., was introduced as meeting facilitator, and he gave an overview of the evening’s agenda, which can be found on our website at: www.ucsf.edu/ldr.

PRESENTATIONS
Kevin Beauchamp, UCSF’s Director of Physical Planning, provided a recap of the Long Range Development Plan proposals presented at prior workshops, highlighting proposed building demolitions and new initiatives. Daniel Iacofano gave a brief overview of the major feedback themes from the first two community workshops held in October 2012 and January 2013.

Eric Womeldorff, transportation consultant from Fehr & Peers, gave an update on proposed improvements to the Parnassus streetscape. He also provided an overview of the results of an extensive traffic and loading analysis undertaken by the University. Finally, he discussed proposals related to traffic, loading, circulation and parking.

Barbara Bagot-Lopez discussed community investment.

Kevin Beauchamp talked about housing and proposed modifications to the space ceiling. This was followed by new commitments to the community regarding measurement and accountability.

A link to the presentation can be found on UCSF’s LRDP website at: www.ucsf.edu/ldr.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
Questions and comments from members of the public were submitted orally at the meeting and later via written comment forms and by email. These are summarized below, organized by discussion topic (with any responses from UCSF staff and consultants at the meeting or subsequently shown in italics):

PHYSICAL PLAN
Space Ceiling
Several people expressed that UCSF should conform to the existing space ceiling. Others agreed that it makes sense for UCSF to take all of housing out of the space ceiling calculation. A neighbor asserted that when Mission Bay was developed, Parnassus was supposed to reduce space. Another felt that UCSF should include University House in the space ceiling calculation because it is not currently being used as housing. Another neighbor commented that there’s too much emphasis on the agreement made in the 1970s and that UCSF has grown at a slower pace than the rest of the city.
UC Hall, Clinical Sciences Building and Nearby Area
A few people felt that there should be more housing at the UC Hall site. One neighbor felt that UCSF has broken its promise to demolish the UC Hall building. *(UCSF altered its proposal for UC Hall after a lengthy community process including study groups and public meetings in 2011 and 2012.)*

Proctor & Koret Buildings
One neighbor commented that UCSF should consider housing at Koret. *(UCSF performed analysis of this site for future housing and deemed it infeasible.)* Another neighbor commented that if housing is built on the Proctor site, it should be faculty housing and include parking.

Aldea Housing
Several people commented that they would like UCSF to remove Aldea Housing. Some of the reasons expressed: the housing is too remote, has negative impacts on the Reserve and is automobile-dependent. A couple of people commented that if Aldea Housing were removed, UCSF could expand the Reserve. Others commented that UCSF should not eliminate housing at Aldea because a lack of housing is a critical issue in San Francisco. One commenter noted that removing Aldea Housing from being counted in the space limit is just a sleight of hand to appear as if the University is complying with the space ceiling. *(All Parnassus housing except for Aldea Housing has always been exempt from the space ceiling calculation. UCSF is making a concerted effort to comply with the space ceiling. Before breaking ground on a new hospital at Parnassus, the LRDP proposes the demolition of six campus buildings to help bring UCSF closer to the space ceiling.)*

Housing
One commenter expressed that housing built on the Parnassus campus should be limited to UCSF staff and students. A few people requested that any housing built without parking not be eligible for a Residential Parking Permit. Some of the concerns about new housing on campus were about increased number of vehicles and traffic congestion.

Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve
Many speakers expressed thanks to UCSF for changing its forest management plan. Many speakers expressed support for forest management plans developed through a community process in 2001 and again in 2009. Several speakers commented that UCSF needs to base its plans on science and maintain biodiversity. Several speakers expressed thanks to UCSF for agreeing to not use herbicides in the forest. One commenter asked if the 2001 plan will be evaluated in the EIR as an alternative. *(UCSF currently has no plans to analyze the 2001 forest management plan in the revised DEIR.)* Many commenters talked about Mount Sutro as a great resource for the entire city. Other commenters express concern about the decline in the health of the forest caused by disease and drought. Several commenters asked UCSF to include Mount Sutro in the LRDP and commit to long-term funding to manage it. *(UCSF will include Mount Sutro management in the draft LRDP, which is scheduled to be published in May. We expect it to address the Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve, including the commitment to preserve it as permanent open space, and the addition of new trails. However, the Reserve is undergoing environmental review at this time, and so will not be analyzed in the LRDP’s Environmental Impact Report, with the exception of those additional trails.)* One commenter asked UCSF to identify the source of funding for Mount Sutro. *(UCSF pays for forest management with its own facilities management funds.)* Other commenters expressed concern for the birds in the forest that nest in the understory.

Parnassus Avenue
One neighbor asked for a more detailed description of the proposed changes to the streetscape. Other commenters expressed concern about pedestrian safety on Parnassus and around the campus.
TRANSPORTATION

Bicycles/MUNI
One commenter said that the #43 Parnassus is greatly impacted by UCSF traffic and UCSF staff who use the #43 for transportation and asked UCSF to contribute funds to SFMTA.

Loading Docks/Deliveries/Parking
Commenters asked that UCSF clarify its loading plan and ensure enforcement of loading procedures. Others expressed that trucks have major impacts on the neighborhood. One commenter said that faculty and staff should pay market rate for parking.

Shuttles
Some commenters asked UCSF to provide more information on increases to the shuttle service. Other commenters asked for better traffic control at areas where passengers are unloaded and a reduction in the number of shuttles. Other commenters expressed support for the shuttle system and want it to evolve to serve more users with better vehicles.

MEETING FORMAT
Some commenters asked us to slow down the presentations, and one commenter asked UCSF to provide copies to the public in advance. Several commenters were disappointed that the meeting was dominated by people focused on Mount Sutro management and asked UCSF to limit comment time and come up with a better way of engaging neighbors in the process.

GENERAL/OTHER COMMENTS
One commenter asked UCSF to commemorate Ishi (last of the Yahi people who resided at what is now UCSF from 1911 to 1916). Other commenters talked about specific issues affecting neighbors, including smoking in front of neighbors’ houses and issues with the ammonia shed, including the lights and upkeep of the property. One commenter asked UCSF to take a stand on climate change.