From:	Karen Wood
To:	Major, Erica (BOS); MelgarStaff; Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Cc:	PrestonStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Attn: Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee_Parnassus Heights Expansion Plan_Agenda Item 210017
Date:	Monday, January 11, 2021 10:56:44 AM

Dear Supervisors Melgar and Peskin:

I'm writing in support of Supervisor Preston's Resolution urging the University of California Board of Regents "to move consideration of the proposed University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) Parnassus Expansion Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from their January 2021 meeting to their March 2021 meeting."

I am a UCSF patient and donor and support upgrades to UCSF for the purpose of maintaining UCSF as a premier medical institution. But upgrades with the potential to violate the integrity of surrounding residential areas and open spaces merit full consideration involving the public. It is imperative that expansion projects' contribution to global warming and their impact on infrastructure and public services be diligently and conscientiously considered. For this reason, to permit needed consideration of the UCSF Expansion Plan, I urge you to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt Supervisor Preston's Resolution.

Sincerely,

Karen Wood
District 7

From:	Ariane Eroy
To:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Cc:	Preston, Dean (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.chiu@assembly.ca.gov; connie.chan@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Written Comment Protesting all Future Incursions into Mt. Sutro Forest
Date:	Monday, January 11, 2021 12:30:20 AM
Attachments:	1976 regents" resolution.pdf

Thank you for your efforts Erica. Please include the attached supporting document as well for January 11th Land Use Committee meeting, and the January 12th Board of Supervisors meeting.

The document is for the Board of Supervisors' perusal as it re-iterates San Franciscans' claims at last week's MOU meeting that UCSF had promised not to expand the size of its present building space in its Parnassus Campus, including in Mount Sutro Forest. (This certainly does not preclude UCSF's modernizing or altering its buildings, but it does prohibit the University's increasing the size of its buildings anywhere in the Inner Sunset.)

As evidence for my arguments, I am attaching this legally binding contract instated by the Board of Regents itself in 1976, in which the Board of Regents promised to protect Mount Sutro Reserve (a.k.a. Mount Sutro Forest) in perpetuity.

As you know, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors is required to abide by the law, as well as to enforce the law. San Francisco's elected officials are sworn to protect its 3.3 million residents--which includes their guarding the safety of city residents against the Climate Emergency moving forward. (N.B. The Board has sworn to abide by the Precautionary Principle).

I believe all involved will soon recognize how important it is for our nation to curb its carbon dioxide levels. Mount Sutro Reserve's 45,000 trees performs this duty better than anywhere else in the City, so it is unjustifiable that it be razed merely to augment the City's limited housing stock.

Thank you again.
Ariane Eroy, Ph. D.

On Friday, January 8, 2021, 03:54:04 PM PST, Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org> wrote:

Thank you, confirming receipt and inclusion to Board File Nos. 201429 and 210017.

ERICA MAJOR

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Ariane Eroy <ariane_ahimsa@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 2:39 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.chiu@assembly.ca.gov; connie.chan@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Written Comment Protesting all Future Incursions into Mt. Sutro Forest

> untrusted sources.

The Climate Emergency threatens all of us with not only the zoonotic, covid virus, but also economic collapse, widespread displacement, and massive ecocide.

The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports that we have only 7 years to severely limit our carbon footprint, or irreparably damage our planet. Humanity, itself, is endangered with extinction.

The Government cannot state that it is committed to reversing climate change and simultaneously raze forests located on Public lands.

Yet UCSF and the Board of Regents attempt to convince the San Francisco Board of Supervisors that Mount Sutro should be sacrificed to quickly augment San Francisco's limited housing stock.

UCSF's proposed expanded housing development into Mount Sutro would release tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, while severely compromising the City's capacity to sequester carbon dioxide both now and into the future, as the century-old trees tower 200 feet, are drought resistant, and can live to be 500 years old. Moreover the Eucalyptus provides extremely limited animal habitat and protects the homes below from landslides, as Climate Disruption ushers in increasingly sudden and ferocious storms.

Should the Board of Supervisors not hold The Board of Regents to its promise not to expand its Parnassus campus buildings beyond its 1976 limits, it ignores the long term interests of all San Franciscans. The plans to raze large portions of Mount Sutro and radically thin the remainder by 71% assault informed individuals' sensibility and signifies that the Board of Regents not only rubber stamps all university projects but is also willing to sacrifice its credibility.

Should the Board of Supervisors fail to protect the Forest—and the future of San Franciscans and all Californians—it will have broken its commitment to abide by the Precautionary Principle.

I end with this quote from Benjamin Creme's teacher:

"When men realize how close to self-destruction they have come, they will shudder to think of the consequences of their actions. Seldom has there been a time when men faced such danger. Even in the worst adversity they have fought and tested themselves against fate. In recent times, however, men have so lost a sense of their direction that they have seemed oblivious to the danger facing them. That this danger and trial are largely of their own making is no doubt responsible for their equanimity and apparent indifference. When men know this, they will be astonished to learn how close to annhilation have their actions brought them. They have diced with death...Men continue blithely on their path. That this path leads only to a desert wasteland they have yet to understand, so steeped are they in materialistic ambition."

Carpe Diem,

Ariane Eroy, Ph. D.

P.S.

Erica,

Please submit these written comments to the minutes of both:

The Land Use and Transportation Committee

Meeting January 11, 2021, Monday 1:30

and

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors larger

Meeting scheduled for January 12, 2021, Tuesday, 2:00 pm (as I cannot attend this, as these meetings

must occur during ordinary working hours).

Thank you,

Ariane Eroy, Ph. D.

APPENDIX F: 1976 REGENTS' RESOLUTION

"DESIGNATION OF OPEN SPACE RESERVE, ALTERATION OF CAMPUS BOUNDARIES, COMMITMENT OF HOUSES TO RESIDENTIAL USE, AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE SALE OF PROPERTIES AND COMMITMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STUDIES."

The following recommendations were approved by the Board of Regents on May 21, 1976:

1. That the reserve on Mount Sutro, which was designated as open space for a twenty-five year period by The Regents in October, 1975, be increased from fifty-two to approximately fifty-eight acres, and that the designation be made permanent.

2. That the boundaries of the San Francisco campus be altered to exclude properties on the west side of Third Avenue from 1309-11 Third Avenue to and including 1379 Third Avenue, and that the new boundaries be made permanent. The total structures within the campus boundaries shall not exceed 3.55 million gross square feet (not including space committed to residential use on Third, Fourth, Fifth and Parnassus Avenues and Kirkham and Irving Streets) and this limit shall be permanent. These restrictions prohibit expansion by UCSF by purchase or condemnation or gift of any property or lease of private residential property not only contiguous with the new campus boundaries, but anywhere within the surrounding area bounded by Golden Gate Park, Oak Street, Ninth Avenue, Clayton and Clarendon. This does not prohibit the use of commercial properties or the affiliation with other public agencies within the area described.

3. That the Regents redefine their commitment, made as part of the October, 1975, approval of the Long Range Development Plan, to return certain existing houses to residential use as alternative campus space and funds for rehabilitation and relocation become available for the activities now housed therein, and that as part of this commitment: The ten houses on Third Avenue, outside the campus boundaries revised as recommended in 2. above, be sold subject to the provisions set forth in 4. below; the thirty-four houses on Third, Fifth, and Parnassus Avenues and on Irving and Kirkham Streets be rehabilitated as required and leased for residential purposes, with priority given to University students, faculty, and staff; and the seven houses on Fourth Avenue remaining after clearance of the site for the School of Dentistry Building project be retained for non-residential campus use.

4. That the Treasurer be authorized to negotiate the sale of the lots and structures, and other improvements thereon, located at 1309-11, 1319, 1325, 1337, 1343, 1355, 1361-63, 1367-69, 1373, and 1379 Third Avenue; the lot between 1355 and 1343 Third Avenue; and the lot between 1309-11 and 1319 Third Avenue, subject to the provisions listed in 4(a) through 4(e) below and that the results of said negotiations be presented to The Regents for final approval and authority to sell based on offers acceptable to The Regents:

    (a) The offer for sale of the two vacant lots shall commence within six months and the offer for sale of all remaining properties shall commence within thirty-six months, except that no relocation of University activities or tenants or conversion of houses for residential uses shall

be initiated until funds for such purpose are on hand as specified in 4(b) below and until space into which activities or tenants can be relocated is available;

(b) A special fund shall be established to fund projects within the Capital Improvement Program for the purpose of, first, providing accommodation for activities displaced by sale of houses, second, providing accommodation for campus activities displaced by conversion of the structures retained for residential use, and, third, converting and rehabilitating the structures retained for residential use, said fund to be funded from proceeds of the sale of the properties, except as noted in 4(c) below, and, if funds are not on hand from the sale of properties, from an advance, as needed, of not to exceed $50,000 from the University Opportunity Fund, such advance to be on a revolving basis and to be repaid with proceeds, as received, from subsequent sale of properties, it being understood that, at the completion of the sale of the properties, any part of the advance not repaid shall be converted to an appropriation;

(c) The portions of the proceeds of the sales of the lots between 1309-11 and 1319, and between 1343 and 1355 Third Avenue, attributable to the eighteen parking spaces currently located thereon, shall be deposited in the Net Revenue Account of the University of California Parking System;

(d) Funds not to exceed $10,000 shall be allocated by the President obtain an appraisal of market value of the properties for use as residences; and

(e) All properties shall be sold in the then existing condition, it being made clear to the buyer that he or she may be required to conform to all applicable State and City and County of San Francisco codes in converting the structures to residential use;

5. That funds not to exceed $25,000 be allocated to the San Francisco campus from the University Opportunity Fund for the purpose of retaining an independent consultant firm to develop additional plans for the alleviation of transportation problems such as traffic, parking congestion, and availability of public transit, it being the intent that such plans be implemented to the extend feasible within resources normally available to the campus for such purposes or within additional State appropriations that might be made available for such purposes;

6. That the Long Range Development Plan for the San Francisco campus, as approved by The Regents in October, 1975, be amended to reflect the described changes in designation of open space, boundaries, and use of housing;

7. That The Regents recognize the principle that the San Francisco campus will be administered so that the annual average of the daily campus population at the Parnassus site will remain substantially in accordance with the projections set forth in the Environmental Impact Report related to the Long Range Development Plan for the campus, approved by The Regents in October 1975.

From: Rohan Kalyani
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment: UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan
Date: Monday, January 11, 2021 5:17:36 AM

Hello,

I am writing this email to express my sincere support for the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan. I believe it is in the City's best interest to proceed with the expansion plan as quickly as possible, and *not* delay it any further, as proposed by Supervisor Dean Preston. The reason is quite simply that this project will bring much needed housing, transit improvements and new hospital to a city that is desperately in need of all of those things.

The CPHP is a plan created with a huge amount of good-faith community input and has popular and political support from all parts of the community. With climate change accelerating faster than we can control it, it's now more important than ever to make good on our commitments and to build more housing in transit-rich neighborhoods. And with the COVID-19 pandemic and political turmoil dismantling our economy, the CPHP is an excellent way to stimulate the economy, create thousands of good jobs, and expand access to healthcare.

I urge you to support this plan and to do everything you can to ensure its success, so that San Francisco can reap the benefits of this investment for decades to come.

Sincerely,

Rohan S. Kalyani
San Francisco, CA 94122
(951) 427-9101

From: SF Forest
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Forest Alliance's Position on Mount Sutro Reserve (a.k.a. Mount Sutro Forest)
Date: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:58:36 AM

For inclusion in:
January 11th, Land Use Committee
&
January 12, Full SF Board of Supervisors meeting

San Francisco Forest Alliance's
Position on Mount Sutro Reserve (a.k.a. Mount Sutro Forest)

In recent years, UCSF has removed hundreds of trees from Mount Sutro Forest. These projects are likely to cost San Francisco even more trees.

The cumulative effect of tree removals on San Francisco's shrinking tree cover is dismal. At 13.7%, San Francisco has the smallest tree canopy cover of any major city. (This percentage was calculated in 2013, and is likely even lower now with the continuing destruction of trees in Sutro Forest and elsewhere in San Francisco.)

In these times of climate change, removing trees is an environmental hazard. Furthermore, the cumulative effect on Sutro Forest is to make it drier and less self-sustaining, and thus, riskier - especially as climate change hits California harder each year. It also sacrifices all the ecosystem services provided by the trees.

San Francisco Forest Alliance asks that all UCSF projects be revised to protect the trees.

Thank you,
San Francisco Forest Alliance

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Testimony on Agenda Item #2, Proposed UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan
Date:	Sunday, January 10, 2021 7:53:13 PM

From: pmonette-shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2021 7:47 PM
To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Fregosi, Ian (BOS) <ian.fregosi@sfgov.org>; Chelsea.Boilard@sfgov.org; Herzstein, Daniel (BOS) <daniel.herzstein@sfgov.org>; Bennett, Samuel (BOS) <samuel.bennett@sfgov.org>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <andrew.mullan@sfgov.org>; Falzon, Frankie (BOS) <frankie.falzon@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>; Quan, Daisy (BOS) <daisy.quan@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong1@sfgov.org>; Wright, Edward (BOS) <edward.w.wright@sfgov.org>; RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS) <abigail.rivamontemesa@sfgov.org>; Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>; Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (BOS) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Maybaum, Erica (BOS) <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; Vejby, Caitlin (BOS) <caitlin.vejby@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Temprano, Tom (BOS) <tom.temprano@sfgov.org>; Mundy, Erin (BOS) <erin.mundy@sfgov.org>; Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>; Goossen, Carolyn (PDR) <carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org>; Monge, Paul (BOS) <paul.monge@sfgov.org>; Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>; Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Evans, Abe (BOS) <abe.evans@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Ho, Tim (BOS) <tim.h.ho@sfgov.org>; Chinchilla, Monica (BOS) <monica.chinchilla@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Kilgore, Preston (BOS) <preston.kilgore@sfgov.org>; Yu, Avery (BOS) <avery.yu@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Subject: Testimony on Agenda Item #2, Proposed UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail:
pmonette-shaw@eartlink.net

January 10, 2021
Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
The Honorable Aaron Peskin,m LUT Committee Chairperson
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, LUT Committee Member
The Honorable Dean Preston, LUT Committee Member
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Testimony on Agenda Item #2,**
Proposed UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan

Dear Chairperson Peskin and Land Use Committee Members,

I fully support this Resolution urging the California Regents to move consideration of the proposed UCSF *Parnassus Expansion Plan* EIR from the Regents' January 2021 meeting to its March 2021 meeting.

Back in 2017 and 2018, San Francisco's Department of Public Health collaborated with the Hospital Council of Northern and Central California in exploring options for post-acute care facilities in our City following CMPC's closeure of its sub-acute SNF at St. Luke's hospital. The so-called Post-Acute Care Collaborative (PACC) led by the Hospital Council dragged its feet, but eventually issued recommendations that amount to untenable long-term care solutions.

To this day, after CPMC did close St. Luke's sub-acute unit, San Francisco has been without any sub-acute SNF's co-located on a hospital campus having an ICU — which is an absolute necessity for this level of patient care. Obviously, since LHH does not have an ICU, a sub-acute SNF can simply not be placed there.

At the time in 2017, the Department of Public Health requested that private-sector hospitals submit data on their out-of-county discharge data. Only UCSF and CPMC provided data on out-of-county discharges to DPH's Sneha Patil, and then only for calendar year 2016 (CPMC) and FY 2016–2017 (UCSF). Chinese Hospital, St. Mary's, St. Francis, and Kaiser failed to provide Ms. Patil with any out-of-county discharge data.

UCSF admitted to Ms. Patil that it had discharged 137 folks to out-of-county facilities during FY 16-17 alone. We have no idea how many more patients UCSF has discharged out-of-county either before FY 2016–2017, or in the years following FY 2016–2017.

We do know that across the years, a bare minimum of 1,722 patients have been discharged out-of-county, over half of which were discharged from SFGH and LHH, partly because CPMC would not accept admissions to its sub-acute SNF from non-CPMC facilities.

At one point, it was thought that Supervisor Hillary Ronen was going to introduce legislation requiring each hospital in San Francisco to report annually their out-of-county discharge data, but to date, no such legislation has been introduced to the Board of Supervisors.

UCSF's intention of providing only behavioral health services as the focus of its draft *Parnassus Expansion Plan* MOU between the City and UCSF is wholly inadequate.

The latest Health Care Services Master Plan put out by SFDPH and the Planning Department acknowledges the need for long-term care facilities in the City, but doesn't adequately address how those facilities will be provided as San Franciscans age.

The proposed UCSF *Parnassus Expansion Plan* must be delayed from the UC Regents' January 2021 meeting to its March 2021 meeting in order to provide time to address including sub-acute SNF services, at minimum, in the MOU.
The City cannot afford to make the same kind of mistakes in an MOU with UCSF that mirror similar mistakes discovered in CPMC's Cathedral Hill Hospital MOU.
Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw
Columnist,
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Shamann Walton, Board President
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Matt Haney, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Rafel Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Erica Major, Board of Supervisors Clerk to the Land Use and Transportation Committee

From:	Ariane Eroy
To:	Major, Erica (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS)
Cc:	Preston, Dean (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.chiu@assembly.ca.gov; connie.chan@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Subject:	Written Comment Protesting all Future Incursions into Mt. Sutro Forest
Date:	Friday, January 8, 2021 2:39:34 PM

The Climate Emergency threatens all of us with not only the zoonotic, covid virus, but also economic collapse, widespread displacement, and massive ecocide.

The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports that we have only 7 years to severely limit our carbon footprint, or irreparably damage our planet. Humanity, itself, is endangered with extinction.

The Government cannot state that it is committed to reversing climate change and simultaneously raze forests located on Public lands.

Yet UCSF and the Board of Regents attempt to convince the San Francisco Board of Supervisors that Mount Sutro should be sacrificed to quickly augment San Francisco's limited housing stock.

UCSF's proposed expanded housing development into Mount Sutro would release tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, while severely compromising the City's capacity to sequester carbon dioxide both now and into the future, as the century-old trees tower 200 feet, are drought resistant, and can live to be 500 years old. Moreover the Eucalyptus provides extremely limited animal habitat and protects the homes below from landslides, as Climate Disruption ushers in increasingly sudden and ferocious storms.

Should the Board of Supervisors not hold The Board of Regents to its promise not to expand its Parnassus campus buildings beyond its 1976 limits, it ignores the long term interests of all San Franciscans. The plans to raze large portions of Mount Sutro and radically thin the remainder by 71% assault informed individuals' sensibility and signifies that the Board of Regents not only rubber stamps all university projects but is also willing to sacrifice its credibility.

Should the Board of Supervisors fail to protect the Forest—and the future of San Franciscans and all Californians—it will have broken its commitment to abide by the Precautionary Principle.

I end with this quote from Benjamin Creme's teacher:

"When men realize how close to self-destruction they have come, they will shudder to

think of the consequences of their actions. Seldom has there been a time when men faced such danger. Even in the worst adversity they have fought and tested themselves against fate. In recent times, however, men have so lost a sense of their direction that they have seemed oblivious to the danger facing them. That this danger and trial are largely of their own making is no doubt responsible for their equanimity and apparent indifference. When men know this, they will be astonished to learn how close to annhilation have their actions brought them. They have diced with death...Men continue blithely on their path. That this path leads only to a desert wasteland they have yet to understand, so steeped are they in materialistic ambition."

Carpe Diem,
Ariane Eroy, Ph. D.

P.S.
Erica,
Please submit these written comments to the minutes of both:

The Land Use and Transportation Committee
Meeting January 11, 2021, Monday 1:30

and

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors larger
Meeting scheduled for January 12, 2021, Tuesday, 2:00 pm (as I cannot attend this, as these meetings
must occur during ordinary working hours).

Thank you,
Ariane Eroy, Ph. D.

From:	Nancy Wuerfel
To:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	Fwd: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay
Date:	Friday, January 8, 2021 3:42:06 PM

Hi Erica,

Please let me know that you received this email, since I am having a problem with city IT issues that are erasing the content of my emails.
Please include my comments below in the packet for the Land Use Committee supervisors and be part of the public record.

Thanks for your help,
Nancy Wuerfel

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; chanstaff@sfgov.org <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Matt.Haney@sfgov.org <Matt.Haney@sfgov.org>; Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>; melgarstaff@sfgov.org <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>; Dean.Preston@sfgov.org <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>; Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>; Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>; Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>; Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>
Sent: Fri, Jan 8, 2021 3:34 pm
Subject: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay

January 8, 2021

RE: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay

Dear Supervisors:

The Land Use Committee will have a hearing on File 201429 and File 210017 on January 11, 2021. The Board will consider File 201429, item 15 on the agenda, for the meeting on January 12, 2021. I ask that my comments on both these files be considered at both the Land Use Committee hearing and at the full Board meeting for item 15.

(1) My comments for **File 201429** relate only to the UCSF-CCSF MOU, not to the CPHP plan. I responded on October 13, 2020 to Planning's request to the public for suggested topics to be added to the MOU developed for the CPHP. I submitted my written comments on the scope of MOU to Planning staff. Receipt of my timely comments was acknowledged, but they were never presented at the community meetings nor were any of my requests incorporated in the MOU. The following are the three requests I asked for:

REQUEST #1 to add a topic to the MOU - "UCSF should require the City to prioritize its responsibility to protect the existing and proposed developments at the Parnassus Campus from fires following a major earthquake by expanding the dedicated-to-fire-suppression Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) of high-pressure pipelines and hydrants into the unprotected western and southern neighborhoods, and by providing an unlimited volume of saltwater pumped from the ocean for fire suppression, instead of using the limited amount of potable water stored in the Sunset Reservoir which is the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) current plan, and to comply with the Board of Supervisors resolution declaring a State of Urgency requiring improvements to be completed by 2034."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 1

As UCSF embarks on implementing its Long Range Development Plan, it is reasonable for UCSF to expect that the City will fulfill its obligations to be fully prepared to protect lives and property at the Parnassus Campus from catastrophic fires following a major earthquake. The backup to the drinking water delivery system is the AWSS infrastructure that now protects the eastern and central areas of the City by supplying unlimited volumes of saltwater, but the AWSS has not been expanded to the western and southern areas that need the same fire protection. UCSF has an opportunity in negotiating a new MOU to raise its concerns over the City's failure to build the promised AWSS expansion and auxiliary water supply that could protect the campus. This failure directly places all of UCSF's structures and population in jeopardy from uncontrolled fires following an earthquake.

REQUEST #2 to add a topic to the MOU - "The City should require UCSF to contribute funds to facilitate the City's completion by 2034 of both the expansion of the dedicated-to-fire-suppression Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) of high-pressure pipelines and hydrants and the development of a saltwater delivery system from the ocean, both of which are both essential to protecting the entire Parnassus Campus complex from fires following a major earthquake, and the City should negotiate with UCSF an offset to the currently unreimbursed City costs for the Fire Department's services and for increases in other City services as a result of UCSF's proposed expansion plans."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 2

The City is <u>legally required</u> by the California Constitution Sec. 35 (a)(2) to provide the protection of public safety as local government's *first responsibility* and the local officials have an obligation to give priority to the provision of adequate public safety services. The legislature has also impowered the City in Government Code, Chapter 13.7, Section 54999.3 (b) and (c) to impose fees on a public agency (this includes the Regents of the University of California) to help fund capital facilities construction, and may do so after agreement has been reached between the two agencies through negotiations entered into by both parties. The Mayor points out in her January 16, 2020 letter to Chancellor Hawgood that the city looks forward to working collaboratively with UCSF and supporting the growth plans. Therefore, it is reasonable for the City to expect that UCSF will participate in funding the AWSS infrastructure expansion and the oceanside pump station vital to preserving the campus from catastrophic fires, just as it is reasonable for UCSF to expect that the City will prioritize fulfilling its fire protection obligations.

REQUEST # 3 to add topic to the MOU - "Both UCSF and the City should engage in a

dialogue through
the MOU to explicitly address UCSF's water needs and the City's responsibility to fulfill those needs, so
that appropriate *planning for all water needs* including saltwater can take place by each party."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 3

A comprehensive review of all of the City's water needs has never taken place and is long overdue. There are department-level decisions about water at the SFPUC, Planning Department, Fire Department, Public Works, and Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, but there is no across-the-board compilation report totaling the City's water needs and how the City plans to supply this water. The City must provide adequate water to serve the needs of its citizens and for public safety. The current bifurcated way the City understands its water needs through individual departmental assessments does not provide the comprehensive knowledge the City must have when advising City leaders who are making decisions about citywide planning issues, capital plans, and funding. Therefore, I recommend that the Mayor appoint a standing committee to analyze data and produce a single report on the City's current and long range water requirements each year to be heard before the Board of Supervisors.

MY CONCLUSION

UCSF can no longer take it for granted that the City will be able to protect the Parnassus Campus
from the fires that follow an earthquake. The City does not have this capability in place now, so the City
can no longer postpone prioritizing and funding citywide expansion of the independent AWSS along with
providing unlimited saltwater, both of which are essential for protecting UCSF from fires. Acknowledging
these issues in the MOU leads to resolving problems. If the lessons learned from the 1906 and 1989
earthquake fires are not enough to mandate fire preparedness for the whole City now, then we need look
no further than the devastation that conflagrations are causing in the North Bay counties to see that this
could be our future. We CAN choose to protect all of San Francisco from uncontrollable fires because we
know HOW to do this with our proven Auxiliary Water Supply System. UCSF should lend its voice and
financial support to this solution.

(2) My comments for **file 210017** fully support the resolution and especially the "RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges The Regents to consider the proposed CPHP EIR at their March 2021 meeting in order to allow the residents of the City and County of San Francisco to better understand, consider, and comment upon the project including the draft MOU between their local representatives and UCSF." The proposed MOU has not been presented for approval, or approved, by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. *No elected public official will be a signatory to the MOU, even though legally binding financial commitments for over $20 million are part of the Agreement.* It is clear that the current draft MOU is a premature document, so I request that the draft MOU not be

submitted to the Regents of the University of California as a supporting document to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). I support postponing the Regents' consideration for approval of the EIR on the LRDP until their March 2021 meeting.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Nancy Wuerfel

From:	pmonette-shaw
To:	Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); ChanStaff; MelgarStaff
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Chelsea.Boilard@sfgov.org; Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); Vejby, Caitlin (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Goossen, Carolyn (PDR); Monge, Paul (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Yu, Avery (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	Testimony on Agenda Item #2, Proposed UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan
Date:	Sunday, January 10, 2021 7:47:19 PM

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail:
pmonette-shaw@eartlink.net

January 10, 2021

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
The Honorable Aaron Peskin,m LUT Committee Chairperson
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, LUT Committee Member
The Honorable Dean Preston, LUT Committee Member
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Testimony on Agenda Item #2, *Proposed UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan***

Dear Chairperson Peskin and Land Use Committee Members,

I fully support this Resolution urging the California Regents to move consideration of the proposed UCSF *Parnassus Expansion Plan* EIR from the Regents' January 2021 meeting to its March 2021 meeting.

Back in 2017 and 2018, San Francisco's Department of Public Health collaborated with the Hospital Council of Northern and Central California in exploring options for post-acute care facilities in our City following CMPC's closeure of its sub-acute SNF at St. Luke's hospital. The so-called Post-Acute Care Collaborative (PACC) led by the Hospital Council dragged its feet, but eventually issued recommendations that amount to untenable long-term care solutions.

To this day, after CPMC did close St. Luke's sub-acute unit, San Francisco has been without any sub-acute SNF's co-located on a hospital campus having an ICU — which is an absolute

necessity for this level of patient care. Obviously, since LHH does not have an ICU, a sub-acute SNF can simply not be placed there.

At the time in 2017, the Department of Public Health requested that private-sector hospitals submit data on their out-of-county discharge data. Only UCSF and CPMC provided data on out-of-county discharges to DPH's Sneha Patil, and then only for calendar year 2016 (CPMC) and FY 2016–2017 (UCSF). Chinese Hospital, St. Mary's, St. Francis, and Kaiser failed to provide Ms. Patil with any out-of-county discharge data.

UCSF admitted to Ms. Patil that it had discharged 137 folks to out-of-county facilities during FY 16-17 alone. We have no idea how many more patients UCSF has discharged out-of-county either before FY 2016–2017, or in the years following FY 2016–2017.

We do know that across the years, a bare minimum of 1,722 patients have been discharged out-of-county, over half of which were discharged from SFGH and LHH, partly because CPMC would not accept admissions to its sub-acute SNF from non-CPMC facilities.

At one point, it was thought that Supervisor Hillary Ronen was going to introduce legislation requiring each hospital in San Francisco to report annually their out-of-county discharge data, but to date, no such legislation has been introduced to the Board of Supervisors.

UCSF's intention of providing only behavioral health services as the focus of its draft *Parnassus Expansion Plan* MOU between the City and UCSF is wholly inadequate.

The latest Health Care Services Master Plan put out by SFDPH and the Planning Department acknowledges the need for long-term care facilities in the City, but doesn't adequately address how those facilities will be provided as San Franciscans age.

The proposed UCSF *Parnassus Expansion Plan* must be delayed from the UC Regents' January 2021 meeting to its March 2021 meeting in order to provide time to address including sub-acute SNF services, at minimum, in the MOU.

The City cannot afford to make the same kind of mistakes in an MOU with UCSF that mirror similar mistakes discovered in CPMC's Cathedral Hill Hospital MOU.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw
Columnist,
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Shamann Walton, Board President
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Matt Haney, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Rafel Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Erica Major, Board of Supervisors Clerk to the Land Use and Transportation Committee

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay
Date:	Sunday, January 10, 2021 7:35:51 PM

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 3:53 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 3:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay

January 8, 2021

RE: Comments on file 201429 UCSF MOU and support for file 210017 Resolution for Regents delay

Dear Supervisors:

The Land Use Committee will have a hearing on File 201429 and File 210017 on January 11, 2021. The Board will consider File 201429, item 15 on the agenda, for the meeting on January 12, 2021. I ask that my comments on both these files be considered at both the Land Use Committee hearing and at the full Board meeting for item 15.

(1) My comments for **File 201429** relate only to the UCSF-CCSF MOU, not to the CPHP plan. I responded on October 13, 2020 to Planning's request to the public for suggested topics to be added to the MOU developed for the CPHP. I submitted my written comments on the scope of MOU to Planning staff. Receipt of my timely

comments was acknowledged, but they were never presented at the community meetings nor were any of my requests incorporated in the MOU. The following are the three requests I asked for:

REQUEST #1 to add a topic to the MOU - "UCSF should require the City to prioritize its responsibility to protect the existing and proposed developments at the Parnassus Campus from fires following a major earthquake by expanding the dedicated-to-fire-suppression Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) of high-pressure pipelines and hydrants into the unprotected western and southern neighborhoods, and by providing an unlimited volume of saltwater pumped from the ocean for fire suppression, instead of using the limited amount of potable water stored in the Sunset Reservoir which is the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) current plan, and to comply with the Board of Supervisors resolution declaring a State of Urgency requiring improvements to be completed by 2034."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 1

As UCSF embarks on implementing its Long Range Development Plan, it is reasonable for UCSF
to expect that the City will fulfill its obligations to be fully prepared to protect lives and property at the
Parnassus Campus from catastrophic fires following a major earthquake. The backup to the drinking water delivery system is the AWSS infrastructure that now protects the eastern and central areas of the City by supplying unlimited volumes of saltwater, but the AWSS has not been expanded to the western and southern areas that need the same fire protection. UCSF has an opportunity in negotiating a new MOU to raise its concerns over the City's failure to build the promised AWSS expansion and auxiliary water supply that could protect the campus. This failure directly places all of UCSF's structures and population in jeopardy from uncontrolled fires following an earthquake.

REQUEST #2 to add a topic to the MOU - "The City should require UCSF to contribute funds to facilitate the City's completion by 2034 of both the expansion of the dedicated-to-fire-suppression Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) of high-pressure pipelines and hydrants and the development of a saltwater delivery system from the ocean, both of which are both essential to protecting the entire Parnassus Campus complex from fires following a major earthquake, and the City should negotiate with UCSF an offset to the currently unreimbursed City costs for the Fire Department's services and for increases in other City services as a result of UCSF's proposed expansion plans."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 2

The City is <u>legally required</u> by the California Constitution Sec. 35 (a)(2) to provide the protection of public safety as local government's *first responsibility* and the local officials have an obligation to give priority to the provision of adequate public safety services. The legislature has also impowered the City in Government Code, Chapter 13.7, Section 54999.3 (b) and (c) to impose fees on a public agency (this includes the Regents of the University of California) to help fund capital facilities construction, and may do so after agreement has been reached between the two agencies through negotiations entered into by both parties. The Mayor points out in

her January 16, 2020 letter to Chancellor Hawgood that the city looks forward to working collaboratively with UCSF and supporting the growth plans. Therefore, it is reasonable for the City to expect that UCSF will participate in funding the AWSS infrastructure expansion and the oceanside pump station vital to preserving the campus from catastrophic fires, just as it is reasonable for UCSF to expect that the City will prioritize fulfilling its fire protection obligations.

REQUEST # 3 to add topic to the MOU - "Both UCSF and the City should engage in a dialogue through
the MOU to explicitly address UCSF's water needs and the City's responsibility to fulfill those needs, so
that appropriate *planning for all water needs* including saltwater can take place by each party."

JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST # 3

A comprehensive review of all of the City's water needs has never taken place and is long overdue. There are department-level decisions about water at the SFPUC, Planning Department, Fire Department, Public Works, and Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, but there is no across-the-board compilation report totaling the City's water needs and how the City plans to supply this water. The City must provide adequate water to serve the needs of its citizens and for public safety. The current bifurcated way the City understands its water needs through individual departmental assessments does not provide the comprehensive knowledge the City must have when advising City leaders who are making decisions about citywide planning issues, capital plans, and funding. Therefore, I recommend that the Mayor appoint a standing committee to analyze data and produce a single report on the City's current and long range water requirements each year to be heard before the Board of Supervisors.

MY CONCLUSION

UCSF can no longer take it for granted that the City will be able to protect the Parnassus Campus
from the fires that follow an earthquake. The City does not have this capability in place now, so the City
can no longer postpone prioritizing and funding citywide expansion of the independent AWSS along with
providing unlimited saltwater, both of which are essential for protecting UCSF from fires. Acknowledging
these issues in the MOU leads to resolving problems. If the lessons learned from the 1906 and 1989
earthquake fires are not enough to mandate fire preparedness for the whole City now, then we need look
no further than the devastation that conflagrations are causing in the North Bay counties to see that this
could be our future. We CAN choose to protect all of San Francisco from uncontrollable fires because we
know HOW to do this with our proven Auxiliary Water Supply System. UCSF should lend its voice and

financial support to this solution.

(2) My comments for **file 210017** fully support the resolution and especially the "RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges The Regents to consider the proposed CPHP EIR at their March 2021 meeting in order to allow the residents of the City and County of San Francisco to better understand, consider, and comment upon the project including the draft MOU between their local representatives and UCSF." The proposed MOU has not been presented for approval, or approved, by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. *No elected public official will be a signatory to the MOU, even though legally binding financial commitments for over $20 million are part of the Agreement.* It is clear that the current draft MOU is a premature document, so I request that the draft MOU not be submitted to the Regents of the University of California as a supporting document to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). I support postponing the Regents' consideration for approval of the EIR on the LRDP until their March 2021 meeting.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Nancy Wuerfel

-->

From: Valerie Aurora
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Public comment on Jan 11 BOS meeting: Strongly support UCSF Parnassus plan
Date: Sunday, January 10, 2021 3:18:04 PM

Hello,

As a San Francisco resident, I strongly support the UCSF Parnassus plan to increase hospital capacity, add housing, and improve public transit. Thank you.

Valerie Aurora
300 Berry St, San Francisco, CA 94158

From:	John W. Hamilton
To:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	Public comment re agenda item 210017 - Do not delay UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan
Date:	Saturday, January 9, 2021 11:29:01 PM

Hello,

I am a resident and homeowner in the Inner Sunset (District 5) and I am writing to urge the Committee to reject item 210017 and to not delay the UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan. The UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan is the right plan for our neighborhood and city. It will bring much needed housing, jobs, and public health investment to the west side of the city. This plan is supported by local small businesses and residents and has received ample community input throughout its design process.

The current UCSF campus is run down and in dire need of updating and repair. This plan will invest in our community, expand desperately needed housing for UCSF community members, and improve our local public health infrastructure. The ongoing pandemic shows us how important it is for our city to have a robust public health network as well as long-term jobs and housing.

Agenda item 210017 will only delay the UCSF Parnassus Expansion Plan, while the residents of our city struggle with high housing costs, a depressed local economy, and a strained healthcare system. We do not have time to delay this project any more.

Do not delay! Reject item 210017 and let's get this project started!

John Hamilton

From: james bennan
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: UCSF Parnassus Heights and community investments
Date: Saturday, January 9, 2021 8:00:30 PM

Hello,

We need to upgrade the medical and research facilities on the Parnassus Heights campus to ensure world class health care in San Francisco for generations to come. Adding housing, upgrading transit infrastructure and committing to jobs for local residents will make this a win for everyone.

As a Parnassus Heights neighbor, SF resident, UCSF patient, UCSF staff member, supporter, I ask for your support of UCSF's Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan and associated community investments including affordable housing, thousands of new jobs, and transit improvements.

A revitalized campus with modernized facilities will help UCSF serve more patients who seek and need specialized care only UCSF can provide. The plan also addresses local challenges such as housing, transit, and open space. Without the CPHP, UCSF will be unable to treat over 3,000 patients annually who seek care but cannot be accommodated due to an insufficient number of hospital beds.

I provided input into the CPHP and community benefits. I appreciate UCSF led an extensive community engagement and internal planning process. I heard about the plan and associated benefits during the planning process and am excited about the vision. I attended information sessions to learn more about the CPHP and community benefits. These updates reflect UCSF's mission and community's priorities based on years of internal collaboration, neighborhood engagement, and community input. I ask for your support of UCSF's commitment to our community and the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan. Please do not delay this essential project that will benefit all San Franciscans. Thank you,

james bennan
2541 15th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Cynthia Travis
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Tomorrow"s Agenda Items 201429 and 210017 Proposed UCSF Expansion
Date: Saturday, January 9, 2021 2:07:55 PM

To the Land Use and Transportation Committee:
Please ask UCSF to scale back its plan for a monstrous new hospital on the Parnassus site. It is cruel and insensitive to propose adding almost 3 million square feet of new building space, and many thousands of people and cars, to the already-overcrowded campus and residential neighborhood. The plan violates UCSF's pledge in the CPHP to "Create building massing to have respectful relationships with neighboring structures and natural features...(and) maintain a similar scale to surrounding structures...(and) create neighborly relations with existing structures at the campus boundaries." It also fails to mitigate what will become a dramatic exacerbation of the current parking and public transportation problems all around the Parnassus campus. Finally, it ignores and disrespects neighbors' concerns by deciding **without consultation** to blow through the limit of 3.55 million square feet for the Parnassus campus. UCSF agreed to that limit in response to the Parnassus neighbors' objections to UCSF's aggressive expansion, at the expense of the neighborhood, in the 1970's. That agreement does not anticipate an ending date, and the neighbors' concerns have not changed. Cynthia Travis, 58 Woodland Ave., SF 94117