

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UCSF Project Delay - Strong Support for Peskin Delay (tried to call in)  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 9:16:43 AM

---

**From:** Media Content <[bingewatchingmediacontent@gmail.com](mailto:bingewatchingmediacontent@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:01 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: UCSF Project Delay - Strong Support for Peskin Delay (tried to call in)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I called in to make public comment on something I am passionate about and waited several hours believing that I was waiting in cue. Nothing indicated I was not in cue, and I was very upset when the call in portion of the meeting ended and I was never able to make public comment. Please let me know that my words have been heard regarding this issue and that you will fix this issue in the future. I'm sure I'm not the only person who has experienced this frustration. Thank you

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Media Content** <[bingewatchingmediacontent@gmail.com](mailto:bingewatchingmediacontent@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Jan 11, 2021 at 7:55 PM  
**Subject:** UCSF Project Delay - Strong Support for Peskin Delay (tried to call in)  
**To:** <[Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org)>

Hello Supervisors, my name is Kendall Osborne. As a WORKING CLASS San Franciscan, I would like to reiterate what other callers said that it's disingenuous, rude, and manipulative to paint anyone who supports the delay as millionaire NIMBY home owners, stupid, naive, racist, or new to housing issues while at the same time being "the same people who show up for every housing issue". Save your faux moral outrage and condescension. I have never and will never be able to afford owning a home in San Francisco, despite being a 3rd generation San Franciscan. Trying to shame people for having VERY VALID concerns is unscrupulous. Especially if you're actually listening its quite the opposite, and it's apparently wealthy folks who are all in on this project. There are people in this city who have been using the homeless for political fodder while not doing anything to help them for years. Also using the covid pandemic as an excuse to push this through is quite disingenuous when it won't be ready for years.

We have a city where a giant mural of Greta Thunberg looms over our city and our Board of Supervisors gives a land acknowledgment about stolen land to the Ohlone people at the beginning of every meeting. And that's lovely. But the 1 study that HAS been done regarding the impact on the destruction of this land for this project has indicated that over 6 thousand birds a year will die from the destruction of the old growth trees that will be removed forever to make way for buildings that will be pushed through while people are in lockdown and unaware of this destruction. The rush to

push this project through because of the need for housing is also disingenuous when, as others have pointed out, the housing that would be built wouldn't help the people living in tents on sidewalks.

Speaking of housing, there is now a glut of available housing as another caller has pointed out if you drive around and just look at all of the for rent signs, and yet this hasn't impacted the people in tents at all and won't. Clearly trickle down housing has not and will not ever work. So we need to stop pushing through every development that comes through City Hall under the false premise of "housing." It's not the fact that we aren't building enough housing that's pushed 100 thousand people out of this city since the pandemic started, it's the ridiculous and performative wokeness of our city leaders making this city a laughing stock on the world stage while being in the pocket of big business and corporate hospitals that made 100 thousand people leave this dystopian nightmare of a city, despite how the people that work for UCSF and the contractors unions have tried to shame the rest of us by beating people down by calling them NIMBY's, racists, and privileged simply for making a reasonable request of delaying this project.

I support Supervisor Peskins resolution and against pushing through the expansion. The land and forest that will be destroyed will be gone forever. Please take all voices into consideration and not people who bizarrely presume that they speak for some supposed silent majority who I'm sure TOTALLY also would have called in if they had known about this, while insulting the working class and faking outrage. Thank you.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Support Resolution to postpone UCSF approval to March 2021  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 9:10:49 AM

---

**From:** zrantz <zrantz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 6:21 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Support Resolution to postpone UCSF approval to March 2021

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

January 11, 2021

Board of Supervisors and staff:

re: Resolution to request the Regents consider the proposed CPHP EIR at their March 2021 meeting.

I support the Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza, with EMIA and CSFN

**From:** [Pat Scatena](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Land Use and Transportation Committee Jan 11, 2021 Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 7:48:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I would like to submit the following statement in connection with the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting to be held today. It is a little longer than what I was able to say in the meeting today.

I live 7 blocks from UCSF. I will see the new hospital from my yard and I will hear and experience the construction over the next 30 years. Nevertheless, I strongly support UCSF's project and the increased space ceiling. I am coming around to supporting the new hospital plan, though still with some environmental reservations about the impact of the largest proposed footprint on the Sutro Reserve and a keen interest in seeing that final EIR later this year. I see many good reasons for the UCSF expansion to take place at PARNASSUS, not elsewhere in the city, so that patient care, teaching, and research are tied together in close proximity.

Despite my support for the project overall, I would like to enable a short amount of additional time if needed to further negotiate the MOU, now that a draft has been made available to the public along with one of the final EIRs. The UCSF chancellor seemed to say today that he can sign the MOU without needing board of regents' approval, but if the regents cannot approve the EIR in January without having the MOU in final form, then I support a 2-month extension proposal, not to oppose the project generally and not to achieve world peace among opponents, but specifically for the purpose of fixing targeted aspects of the MOU. It is important to get the MOU right.

Some examples of specific details that I would like to see fixed in the MOU:

- Once a year for community input about the ongoing construction is an inadequate commitment. The impacts on neighbors are going to be significant and we need fulsome opportunities to give community input over the life of the project.
- I'm very pleased to see UCSF commits to keep 61 acres of Sutro Reserve, but the MOU is loose about ability to change existing boundaries and should be more specific about requiring City and community input if UCSF wants to deviate in future from agreed plans for the Reserve. (NOTE: I reviewed the draft EIR but have not yet reviewed the just released EIR and perhaps the commitments about environmental mitigations stated in the final EIR will address this concern.)
- Many have commented about transit, I want to speak up for cars. I am all for transit improvements and reducing use of cars. But the current draft MOU only focuses on UCSF as a destination and UCSF's plans contemplate street changes to enable park to reserve access and new bicycle trails, without specifics yet. No matter what is done to improve transit, more cars will come to the neighborhood to get to a larger UCSF campus. The MOU doesn't address funding for street improvements that preserve driving ingress and egress specifically between Carl, Arguello, Irving, Frederick and Lincoln which are commute roadways. I am not talking about tech workers. Those streets are used by everyone -- contractors, health care workers, teachers, delivery drivers, etc. -- who has to drive for work into, out of and around the city each day. Plumbers do not use mass transit to get from job to job, nor will the construction workers who work on the UCSF project. There needs to be clear planning to keep those streets accessible to cars over time while being made safer for pedestrians and bicyclists (and in the case of the Frederick to Lincoln intersection, safer for cars too).
- The local business provisions should expressly apply to Haight Street as well.
- I think the City should push for more in re: new and truly affordable units and ensure that a number of the units are committed to be at the Parnassus campus. This section of the MOU

begs for more clarity. Also, if I understand the MOU correctly, UCSF is able to offset one for one against the new unit goals for each employee housing purchase they subsidize. There is no structure that ensures equitable decision-making about which employees get these subsidies and the subsidies can apply to employees earning up to 120% of AMI. The subsidies do not seem to create new housing units (unless the existing units purchased with subsidies were being converted into permanent affordable housing). So, it seems the ability to use that offset should be capped or the offset should simply be eliminated.

These are examples of details that still need to be negotiated and it does not seem it should take much more time to get these types of details ironed out. However, I do not support major delays to UCSF's project. Please don't stall the project for a perfect plan. Definitely, please don't do the bidding of wealthy homeowners who oppose the increased density, localized affordable housing, or other aspects of the project as NIMBYs. We should allow this density and lower income affordable housing into this neighborhood, as long as UCSF makes good guarantees to preserve the Sutro Reserve and help put in place the infrastructure that supports the density.

I have been on the UCSF email list for this project for the last 2 years and I have also received paper mail about it. I hear, and agree to some degree with, the people who say that it often feels that UCSF goes from one community meeting to the next like a bulldozer, without really hearing or addressing community concerns. That said, there have been a number of offered meetings and a fairly significant attempt at outreach by UCSF. Occasionally, as happened last week, UCSF community meeting scheduling has not offered the ability to be aware of and digest releases of new information that occurred just prior to meetings (UCSF's email notice about the MOU draft availability was sent to me on Jan 4, not Dec 31 or Jan 1). Sometimes the meetings have been scheduled on odd dates, e.g., one community meeting was held on the night of and overlapping with a presidential debate (and last week's coincided with a day of not completely unexpected, political turmoil). The meetings I have attended have not always been organized in an effective way (to be fair, virtual meetings have made it challenging!). But, for neighbors to say there was inadequate notice to the community is simply not fair.

I do not support delaying the project further in order to try to make the MOU a more binding document. The discussion that occurred today about enforceability was puzzling to me. Typically, MOUs are not entirely unenforceable in court, but it depends how they are written and what kind of default occurs. There is a section of this MOU that purports to make the MOU terms binding and create a dispute resolution for defaults. Unfortunate public statements were made today about unenforceability. It seems it would be fruitful for committee members and staff to consult more fully with the city attorney about MOU enforceability outside of the presence of the public, i.e., in a way that is attorney-client privileged. Again, however, I do not support delaying the MOU to try to make it fully binding.

I am new to attending 6 hour+ city meetings. Why do people get to call in and speak at board of supervisor committee meetings who clearly have direct financial interests (UCSF employees, researchers, etc.) in the project? That's a rhetorical question, you do not need to answer it.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Pat Scatena

**From:** [Cathy Weitenbeck](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** UCSF Parnassus Campus Development  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 3:43:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Erica. I was on the call regarding the UCSF Parnassus Campus Development but for some reason I got kicked off. Please see my comment below.

Thanks,

Cathy

My name is Cathy and I previously lived in Cole Valley and the Haight but now for the past 4 years I have been renting on 7<sup>th</sup> ave in the Inner Sunset still in District 5. I also work for UCSF in the management of medical devices across all the campuses. I'm calling to support the Parnassus Campus development and asking that it continue without delay. The current infrastructure is not adequate for the medical technology of today much less 10 to 50 years into the future. The new hospital will not only be for the continuation of world renowned medical care but also make facilities far safer for both patients and staff. The issues around safety with the current infrastructure have only become more obvious with the pandemic. These include crowded stairwells, elevators, offices, breakrooms, and even patient units where patients rooms may still be shared. As a resident of the neighborhood I look forward to the improvements in housing and transportation but also the physical changes to make the campus safer to move about and also more accessible to the neighborhood. Again please do not delay these essential changes. Thanks for your time.

Cathy

--

Catherine Weitenbeck  
E-mail: [weitenbeck.cathy@gmail.com](mailto:weitenbeck.cathy@gmail.com)  
Phone: (414) 731 1766

**From:** [Roger Hofmann](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment regarding UCSF MOU  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 3:31:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Ms. Major,

Please add my comments to the discussion:

What is the total dollar amount of the impacts of the project? What is the dollar amount the City will spend to mitigate the impacts? Where will the money come from?

During the last drought we were asked to reduce water consumption by 25%. The PUC suggested that restrictions could be even more severe in the next drought. What water allotment will UCSF get compared to other SF water users during the next drought?

Thank you,

Roger Hofmann  
District 7  
UCSF Neighbor

**From:** [ttl Par](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** UCSF Expansion  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 2:22:17 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Erica Major,

The Land Use & Transportation Committee

Supervisors Melgar, Preston, & Peskin

Please note my comments on the proposed expansion of UCSF Parnassus.

I owe my life to the wonderful medical professionals of UCSF Parnassus. This is a jewel of an institution benefitting many.

However, the proposed expansion shocks me. As a former member of the Inner Sunset merchants I allended about a decade ago a UCSF presentation for the remodel of the Parnassus campus. This presentation discussed a downsizing due to the expanding Mission Bay campus.

As a resident of the Inner Sunset for more than three decades, I am blessed with the proximity to UCSF Parnassus. Nevertheless, I strongly oppose this expansion. The hurried pace UCSF requests for approval is appalling.

The meager attention to public transit and housing shocks me not when I consider the upper managers of this medical gem. This shows poor understanding of the needs of our neighborhood, and the future of urban design.

Now, how do these managers at UCSF Parnassus so blithely brush aside the promises made by their pervious colleagues to limit their expansion.

These promises in the 1970's and reaffirmed just 6 years ago should in themselves end this porposed expansion. Is a promise to be trusted ???

YES, the Board here must insist on the gravity of these promises and the dire consequences of breaking them

Thank you.

Jim Iwersen

Inner Sunset

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Support Resolution to postpone UCSF approval to March 2021  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 2:19:52 PM

---

**From:** Jane Dunlap <dunlapjc@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 12:15 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Support Resolution to postpone UCSF approval to March 2021

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I support the Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

Jane Dunlap  
SF 94122

**From:** [Bradley Buda](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Board of Supervisors Hearing, 2021-01-11  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 2:15:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Bradley Buda, I'm a resident of District 5 living in Cole Valley. I'd like to provide these public comments in reference to today's Board of Supervisors hearing regarding the UCSF Parnassus expansion plan. Thank you:

---

The January 11th, 2021 hearing regarding the UCSF Parnassus expansion plan is a transparent attempt to run the standard San Francisco anti-development shakedown on UCSF by delaying, asking for handouts and special fees. This shakedown is even more brazen given that the city attorney has made it clear that the memorandum of understanding (MoU) in question isn't even legally enforceable. Even if it were, slowing down this project would be a bad idea for those of us who live in the neighborhood.

The main objection raised to the proposal, that it includes insufficient housing, is actually an indictment of how little the leaders of this city and these districts have done over the past half-century to allow the construction of affordable, dense, walkable neighborhoods in much of San Francisco, particularly in Districts 5 and 7. There is an incredible amount of latent supply that would like to build new housing in our neighborhood, but developers are hamstrung by regressive zoning and a byzantine approvals project. Supervisor Preston is correct to point out that our neighborhood does not have enough homes to supply the demand, but the solution cannot be to squash new job creation and attempt to fossilize the neighborhood in amber - it must be to allow smart, dense, transit-oriented housing development in concert with commercial projects like this one.

In addition, members of the board objected to the lack of transit options to serve an expanded UCSF Parnassus. Again, this is a self-own. As Supervisor Preston and others pointed out, the Muni N Judah line (of which I was a daily rider before COVID-19) has been chronically overloaded for at least five years. What has the BoS and city government done to add capacity and modernize this line to meet the needs of the thousands of San Franciscans who want a dense, climate-friendly way to get to work or school? Instead of trying to build and fix, the response is to reject growth and progress and make it someone else's problem.

UCSF has been an incredible neighbor to those of us who live in the surrounding area. My family is lucky to have a world-class teaching hospital in our backyard who wants to invest further in bringing great jobs and cutting-edge research to our area. That doesn't mean UCSF doesn't need to do their fair share, but the proposal they have offered is more than fair. This project should proceed as proposed without further delay, and those supervisors who object to it should take a long hard look in the mirror and then get to work on fixing the housing and transit problems they have created and sustained during their tenures.



**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SUPPORT Resolution to postpone UCSF approval  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:59:13 PM

---

**From:** Bruce Wolfe <brucewolfe.sf@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:23 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** SUPPORT Resolution to postpone UCSF approval

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors of the Rules Committee,

I am a District 5 neighbor.

I SUPPORT Supervisor Dean Preston's Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UCSF expansion: more time needed!  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:58:51 PM

---

**From:** sdlatham <sdlatham@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:14 AM  
**To:** Carl Russo <c\_russo@hotmail.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Vanessa Picton <vpicton@hotmail.com>; tesw@aol.com; Bruce Wolfe <bruce@brucewolfe.net>; hancsf@yahoo.com; Denise Bradley <sfodab@hotmail.com>; sherry hugi <sherryhugi@hotmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: UCSF expansion: more time needed!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Exactly.

Susan Latham  
1965 Page Street #301  
San Francisco CA 94117

On Monday, January 11, 2021, 8:10 AM, Carl Russo <[c\\_russo@hotmail.com](mailto:c_russo@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support Supervisor Preston's resolution asking UCSF regents to delay the hearing on their proposed CPHP EIR until March. San Franciscans need more time to weigh the enormity of such an expansion, which will impact neighbors, affordable housing, transportation, traffic, and the environment.

Thank you,

Carl Russo  
1965 Page Street, Apt. 303  
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UCSF expansion: more time needed!  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:58:22 PM

---

**From:** Carl Russo <c\_russo@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:11 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Susan Latham <sdlatam@yahoo.com>; Vanessa Picton <vpicton@hotmail.com>;  
tesw@aol.com; Bruce Wolfe <bruce@brucewolfe.net>; hancsf@yahoo.com; Denise Bradley  
<sfodab@hotmail.com>; sherry hugi <sherryhugi@hotmail.com>  
**Subject:** UCSF expansion: more time needed!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support Supervisor Preston's resolution asking UCSF regents to delay the hearing on their proposed CPHP EIR until March. San Franciscans need more time to weigh the enormity of such an expansion, which will impact neighbors, affordable housing, transportation, traffic, and the environment.

Thank you,

Carl Russo  
1965 Page Street, Apt. 303  
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UCSF Parnassus Resolution - Support  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:55:51 PM

---

**From:** James Parke <jdbparke@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 7:50 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** UCSF Parnassus Resolution - Support

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I support the Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

James Parke

1375 44th Avenue  
San Francisco

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UCSF Parnassus Resolution - Support  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:51:31 PM

---

**From:** James Parke <jdbparke@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 7:50 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** UCSF Parnassus Resolution - Support

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I support the Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

James Parke

1375 44th Avenue  
San Francisco

From: [Turkold B](#)  
To: [Major Erica BOD](#)  
Subject: Public Comment: UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan  
Date: Monday, January 11, 2021 1:46:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

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,

*Turboki Baatarchuluu*  
San Francisco, CA 94122  
(925) 549-1658

**From:** [Karthik Balakrishnan](#)  
**To:** [Parnassus Neighbors](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comments in support of UCSF Expansion Re: Sierra Club opposes massive UCSF expansion  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:39:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Sorry folks, but fighting against a hospital in the middle of a city because of environmental concerns makes no sense.

-If you're concerned about additional car trips, let's push for more frequent transit on existing lines (N, 6), the creation of new lines, and better regional transit coordination so that people going to work and the hospital don't need to use their car.

-If you're concerned about the lack of housing, let's change zoning and land use to create more housing. Sounds like we should change local zoning to enable an additional 4,000 units by-right.

-This is a city. A 300 foot *hospital* makes total sense here. And ultimately, it's better than a massive sprawling complex outside the city leading to even more changes in natural habitat and even more car trips.

The land use policy of this city over the last 50 years has created massive problems which my generation is suffering from and are stuck fixing. Let's not repeat problems of the past.

Signed - a younger homeowner in the city, who wholeheartedly supports this expansion and the benefits it will bring to the city for the next century.

-Karthik

On Sun, Jan 10, 2021 at 1:00 PM Parnassus Neighbors  
<[ParnassusNeighborhoodCoalition@gmail.com](mailto:ParnassusNeighborhoodCoalition@gmail.com)> wrote:

## [Parnassus Neighborhood Coalition](#)

Dear Karthik,

In less than two weeks, the UC Board of Regents is scheduled to vote on a massive expansion plan for UCSF Parnassus.

Despite long-standing commitments to not expand the footprint of the Parnassus Campus, they are now pushing for a 2 million square foot addition -- a 42% increase in size. **Former Mayor Art Agnos said it's "like jamming the Salesforce Tower and Transamerica Pyramid combined into a small residential neighborhood that is already overloaded."**

Now the Sierra Club has written a [letter of concern](#) to the Regents, asking for substantial changes to the plan to reduce global warming, transit overload, negative impacts on open space and parks, and increase affordable housing.

The Sierra Club's concerns include:

- **3,000 additional daily car trips and transit overload** which will increase global warming and hurt commuters on N-Judah and 6-Haight transit lines.
- **Only 134 units of affordable housing in next 10 years**, despite the addition of 4,000 new staff and students in the same time period. UCSF's plan will create more jobs than housing thus exacerbating San Francisco's housing crisis.
- **300 foot high building which will negatively impact open space** and cause wind and shadow impacts on open space, parks and schools.

The Sierra Club joins the Parnassus Neighborhood Coalition, the Cole Valley Improvement Association, TODCO affordable housing advocates, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, former Mayor Art Agnos and many others in seeking significant changes to the UCSF plan.

We love UCSF and support the need to upgrade their Parnassus campus. However, we need more community input and exploration of alternatives before any final decisions are made.

If you agree, here's what you can do:

1. [Sign the petition](#) asking UCSF to slow down and gather more community input
2. [Join our community group](#) and sign up for news and updates
3. [Attend \(via zoom\) the Board of Supervisors hearing on Monday, January 11](#) regarding the project

Thank you for your support!

Sincerely,

Parnassus Neighborhood Coalition

PS: [Click here to sign our petition to the UC Board of Regents!](#)

[Unsubscribe](#)

**From:** [Andrei Goga](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Parnassus Renovation  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 12:51:49 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Lan Use and Transportation Committee,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed expansion of the UCSF Parnassus Campus. A world-leading medical center needs renovation and expansion as we move into this new decade. Most buildings were built in the 1950s and are woefully lacking in adequate research and clinical space. The proposed renovations would support new housing, improved open space utilization and would support the local businesses in the Inner Sunset area. I fully support the proposed expansion plan and feel it is long overdue.

Sincerely,

Andrei Goga  
San Francisco, 94129

**From:** [Cynthia Travis](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Today's Agenda Items 201429 and 210017 Proposed UCSF Expansion  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 11:39:43 AM

---

To the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Please encourage UCSF to consider alternative sites for its proposed new hospital. UCSF has claimed, for instance, that its Mission Bay campus is already overcrowded, but a quick look at that campus' map suggests otherwise. For instance, in the area along Nelson Rising Way on the campus' north side, UCSF has a series of contiguous surface parking lots. That would be a lovely spot for a new hospital, complete with stunning views of the SF Bay.  
Cynthia Travis, 58 Woodland Ave., SF

On Jan 10, 2021, at 7:59 PM, Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)> wrote:

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](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://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:** Cynthia Travis <[ctravis@sonic.net](mailto:ctravis@sonic.net)>

**Sent:** Saturday, January 9, 2021 2:08 PM

**To:** Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Tomorrow's Agenda Items 201429 and 210017 Proposed UCSF Expansion

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

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

**From:** [Denis Mosgofian](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** letter to BOS & Land Use re UCSF-MOU  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 11:50:54 AM  
**Attachments:** [Microsoft Word - Delay Regents UCSF EIR Vote.docx.pdf](#)

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Erica Major,

Please distribute this letter to the Land Use Committee Supervisors and to the rest of the full Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,

Lori Liederman and Denis Mosgofian

January 10, 2021

Re: Support Delay Request for Regents UCSF EIR Vote

Dear Supervisors,

**That UCSF is a greatly valued medical institution is not at issue.**

**The central issues addressed herein, concern the role of the City representatives vis-à-vis UCSF as a Developer.** The purpose of the MOU is to help ensure the community benefits for Parnassus Heights align with the City's priorities for housing, open space, and transportation. But overall, the role of the City officials must be to insure that the project is prohibited from imposing undue hardships on adjacent neighborhoods, and from shifting to San Franciscans, the tax burdens required to sustain the project which are rightly the responsibility of the project sponsors.

Unfortunately, the MOU between the City of San Francisco and UCSF falls short. It is the people of San Francisco who will be left to endure the massive 30 year construction project, and who will bear the pressures from the lack of affordable housing, displacement, and congestion. It will be the taxpayers of San Francisco who will have to bear the ongoing costs for MUNI when the paltry \$20M runs out.

The 2014 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which included the Parnassus Campus, reaffirmed the 3.55 million square foot space ceiling. Less than 2 years later UCSF began developing a new plan that expanded the space ceiling by 42%. This expansion betrayed the 2014 LRDP and was an overt bait and switch for the community.

While the planned hospital will be subject to a separate environmental review, there is no such assurance with respect to the remainder of the project. It is disheartening that CPHP's violation of decades of understandings and agreements is not addressed at all in this MOU. What assurance can there be that UCSF leaders of the future won't violate this MOU when it is again inconvenient?

We appreciate the work of City departments and elected officials to negotiate an MOU with UCSF mid-pandemic within UCSF's fast-paced-timeline. The negotiated increases to housing and transit are positive but **are obviously not nearly enough**. There is too little housing, too late in the 30-year process, with too little affordability for the staff. As we have seen repeatedly, this leads to many workers commuting longer distances with high-salaried recruits putting pressure on local housing costs driving gentrification and displacement.

It is reflective of the entire MOU that UCSF retains the option to pay an in-lieu fee or give in-lieu land to the City for up to 200 of the affordable units, with no timely deadline for said decision. The MOU wrongly permits UCSF to choose whether or not to build, at or near the end of the 30-year construction period, leaving the City of San Francisco to produce the actual housing after UCSF's own deadlines for construction.

\$20 million for transit is a drop in the bucket to help pay SFMTA for public transit that will be required for the UCSF population for the rest of the century. It is less than \$700,000 per each year of construction. SFMTA would be on the hook for the rest.

**The bulk of agreements in the MOU are rendered non-binding** by the use of language such as: "Good faith efforts", "Investigate potential for", "explore opportunities", "subject to available space", "reaffirms desire to", etc. The MOU must be a commitment, not full of vague get-out-of-jail-free cards. Even with respect to the much-lauded commitment to behavioral health, the MOU cites intentions, not requirements. It overflows with paragraphs that simply acknowledge existing partnerships and programs.

While understanding the limits on the City's authority in this case, it is concerning that San Francisco Officials relinquished their only true leverage, the issuance of permits, in exchange for so little. UC receives numerous exemptions in addition to exemption from our Planning and Zoning laws. They pay no property taxes, which means they contribute nothing to our long-term bonds. They pay no gross-receipts tax and they pay a reduced sales tax on all purchases related to research and development.

We wish to remind the City that when UCSF was contesting the Chase-Warriors Stadium, the City threatened UCSF's role at SF General Hospital if UCSF did not back down. So when the City officials were representing billionaire Warrior owners and Chase Bank, the City used its leverage. The city must use its leverage now to make UCSF pay for what it intends to impose.

Finally, UC's rush to seek Regent approval during a pandemic within 7 months of releasing the **Draft** EIR for this massive 30-year plan manifests a lack of good faith. As of this writing, the **Final** EIR has yet to be released to the public. There is insufficient time this month for the City, the public or the Regents to review and consider the final EIR.

We support the request for a delayed vote by the Regents.

Sincerely,

Lori Liederman, Inner Sunset D5  
Denis Mosgofian, Inner Sunset D5  
Allan Chalmers Inner Sunset D5  
Linda Chalmers Inner Sunset D5  
Jonnina Simpson Inner Sunset D5  
Madeleine Simpson Inner Sunset D5  
David Simpson Inner Sunset D5  
Dave Freitas Inner Sunset D5  
Jerry Gerber Inner Sunset D5  
Pat Chin Inner Sunset D5  
Ray Dudum Sunset D4

Renee Curran Inner Sunset D5  
Hugo Kobayashi Inner Sunset D5  
Lilian Stielstra Inner Sunset D5  
Scott Stielstra Inner Sunset D5  
Dennis Antenore Inner Sunset D7  
Maria Wabl Inner Sunset D7  
Roger Hofmann Kirkham Hts. D7  
Pam Hofmann Kirkham Hts. D7  
Jacqueline Ventura Kirkham Hts. D7  
Daniel Tomasevich Inner Sunset D7  
D'Anna Alexander Kirkham Hts. D7  
Patricia Veitch Kirkham Hts. D7  
Tiina Sepp, Kirkham Hts. D7  
Sarah Safir, Kirkham Hts. D7  
Steve Labrum, Kirkham Hts. D7

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [MelgarStaff](#); [ChanStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Action alert - write today! SUPPORT BOS Resolution - More time to consider UCSF Expansion Project  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 1:51:03 PM  
**Attachments:** [2021-01-04 Sierra Club - UCSF - CPHP comments.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Kathy Howard <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 5:41 AM  
**To:** Kathy Howard <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Action alert - write today! SUPPORT BOS Resolution - More time to consider UCSF Expansion Project

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi affordable housing supporters,

You have probably read about the UCSF Parnassus massive expansion project. Despite the glowing descriptions in the *SF Chronicle*, this project will have an enormous negative impact on the neighborhood and will exacerbate the housing crises in SF by bringing in more people while providing only a small increase in housing. Please see the attached letter from the Sierra Club outlining some of the other problems with this project.

Supervisor Preston has introduced a resolution asking that the UC Regents give the City a few more months to review this project. This is NOT a request to cancel the project but rather for more time for input.

*Please support his resolution at the BOS Land Use Committee today and at the full BOS tomorrow.*

Write today to:

A Clerk of the Board [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)

Subject: UCSF Resolution - Support

I support the Resolution asking that the Regents 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.

Thanks, everyone!

Kathy H.



## San Francisco Group, SF Bay Chapter

Serving San Francisco County

January 4, 2021

Board of Regents

University of California at San Francisco

c/o Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents

1111 Franklin St., 12th floor

Oakland, CA 94607

[regentsoffice@ucop.edu](mailto:regentsoffice@ucop.edu)

Subject: Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (CPHP)

Dear Board of Regents,

In December 2020, the Sierra Club held a meeting to discuss the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (CPHP) attended by representatives from UCSF and from the local community. The topics discussed at that meeting were transportation, housing, open space, and community participation in the planning process.

First let us say that we deeply appreciate the work that the staff of UCSF has done during the COVID-19 pandemic and the benefit that they bring to the community. We also understand the need to update or replace facilities that may be at the end of their lifespan. We appreciate UCSF's goals to incorporate "planning elements that seek to improve mobility, increase campus housing, and create significantly more open spaces and greater community access."<sup>1</sup> After reviewing the CPHP planning and environmental documents and hearing from community members who have been involved with this project and with UCSF for many years, we are submitting the following concerns for your consideration.

### Transportation

UCSF proposes to add an average of 8,000 people to its daily population. UCSF estimates that this will mean adding approximately 3,000 automobile trips a day, about two-thirds of which would be people driving alone, with an additional 2,500 people taking public transportation.

This will place a substantial strain on an already over-burdened transportation system and in particular on the N Judah streetcar, the primary route to downtown for the entire northern part of the Sunset District. Pre-COVID, the N Judah streetcar route was one of San Francisco's most heavily used transit lines, with full-capacity trains that often didn't stop to pick up passengers at rush hour. We commend

---

<sup>1</sup> "Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan," Updated June 2020, Page 3.

UCSF for volunteering to donate approximately \$20 million<sup>2</sup> to San Francisco's Transportation Sustainability Fee program for transit improvements, an amount equal to that which would normally be paid by a private developer; however, it is unlikely that the proposed fee will be enough to accommodate the additional riders that will use public transit over the life of the project. It is also unclear how the current system could be expanded to handle the additional projected ridership.

Furthermore, projecting 3,000 automobile trips a day is not a sustainable approach to transportation. The increase in air pollution and greenhouse gases alone are of concern. The State of California has an ambitious goal of reducing greenhouse gasses, and an aggressive transit element in the UCSF proposal is necessary. Any increase in the amount of automobile traffic will also have a negative impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood.

*Better plans for and more extensive funding of public transit are going to be needed to keep people out of their cars and meet climate goals regarding greenhouse gases.*

### Jobs and Housing Balance

The project will bring approximately 4,100 new staff and students to the UCSF campus on Parnassus by 2030. However, only 134 units of housing will be developed by 2030. By 2050, another 1,000 jobs will be created and some additional housing units are planned, but only a fraction of what is needed. In addition, there is no housing planned for the workforce that will be needed to support the additional faculty and staff. It is likely that the result will be the further gentrification of the housing surrounding the UCSF campus as well as the loss of affordable housing for those living nearby through evictions, raised rents, or other pressures.

The Sierra Club is a strong advocate for social equity. A large portion of the existing workforce already cannot afford to live in San Francisco. We urge UCSF to better balance the amount of housing with the number of new jobs. We commend UCSF for increasing the percentage of affordable housing to 40% affordable, which is much closer to our preference for 50%. However, there is no indication when the affordable homes will be built other than a promise to do so by 2050. The need is now, not in 30 years.

Many workers commute daily from as far away as Tracy and Sacramento. Without a substantial increase in the workforce housing, this project will put more economic pressures on the staff and have an enormous negative impact on the local community. Pushing the workforce into extended commutes will result in significant increases in greenhouse gas emissions and undermine attempts to reduce the amount of climate change we are already facing in the future.

*The housing-jobs balance for this project should be re-evaluated for the impact it will have on housing not only for the current residents of the neighborhood and the City as a whole, but also for the new workforce.*

### Open Space – Shadows and Wind

We appreciate the emphasis on open space that is shown in the Programmatic EIR. The Sierra Club supports providing more open space for people who will be working on the new campus as well as for the local residents. Opening up the campus so that there is a connection between Mt. Sutro and Golden Gate Park ("Park to Peak") is also to be commended. However, there is a certain irony to this connection, because the proposed new hospital – the height of a 30-story-tall building - will have a negative impact in terms of wind and shadows on the open space as well as on Golden Gate Park.

---

<sup>2</sup> *SF Chronicle*, January 4, 2021.

A three-hundred-foot building is completely out of scale with this residential neighborhood. Because it is being placed on the side of a hill, the top of the building will be over 400 feet above the level of Golden Gate Park. This building will have considerable impacts in terms of shadows and wind.

The Sierra Club recognizes the importance of open space in urban areas. Parks are a vital resource not only for public health and recreation but also as necessary habitat for wildlife. Wildlife is struggling everywhere, and our cities are becoming one of the areas where they can eke out survival. As isolated parkland surrounded on three sides by urban development, Golden Gate Park is easily impacted by any negative changes in its environment. Even limited shadowing will have an impact on the health of the plant life and on the wildlife habitat as well as detract from the park experience for people, who use the park at all hours of the day.

The EIR illustrates shadowing in Golden Gate Park, including the Park nursery, an area that would be especially sensitive to the need for steady sunlight. In addition, two schools (including school yards open for the public as part of the City's shared Schoolyard Project) and an additional park and a playground, as well as part of the Reserve will be in shadow part of the time with the new project. The Sierra Club opposes any shadowing of our parks, and asks that this plan be modified so that the new buildings will not shadow our parks and have a limited shadow impact on other outdoor space in the neighborhood, such as backyards, which also provide habitat.

An increase in the wind in the area is also a concern. Parnassus Heights is already a windy area. The On-shore breezes sweep in from the ocean. Once the wind hits the proposed 300-foot-tall building, it will be intensified and bounce down into the open space and the surrounding neighborhoods. Although UCSF states that it will meet the City's requirement for wind hazards, that requirement is only for 26-mph winds that don't last more than one hour; this does not make for a comfortable park experience and most plants do not do well in a constantly windy environment.

Moreover, stating in the EIR that tall buildings can be built even if wind speed reduction strategies are "not feasible" or cost more money,<sup>3</sup> is essentially the same as saying that wind reduction does not have to be done.

*A shorter building, wind baffles and other controls on all of the buildings to decrease windspeed, and a more stringent requirement for a lower wind speed throughout the project site should be part of the analysis of this project.*

In addition, the CPHP proposes adding outdoor heating elements to mitigate the wind conditions on the project.<sup>4</sup> This is not environmentally sustainable and should not be considered for this site.

*Instead, a building and open space design that naturally protects open space from wind and preserves natural sunlight should be supported.*

### Community input

The CHPC states, "We are excited to begin the transformation of Parnassus Heights, a process that will be guided by the continued collaboration and guidance of our stakeholders over many decades".<sup>5</sup>

However, many neighbors feel that the local community's suggestions have not been given serious consideration and that UCSF entered the public feedback process with a predetermined plan that was

---

<sup>3</sup> "OCSF CPHP, EIR". July 2020 page 4.1-47

<sup>4</sup> "Design buildings and public spaces to address the local microclimate (wind, solar access, fog). Exterior spaces should function for year-round occupancy and include wind mitigation treatments, heating elements, and efficient lighting."

<sup>5</sup> "Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan," Updated June 2020, Page 3.

more or less unchangeable. The Sierra Club has signed on to the Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing, which support local determination for communities. <sup>6</sup>

*We suggest that UCSF go back to the neighborhood and include residents' ideas in the plans for the CPHP.*

### Conclusion

The Sierra Club understands the importance of up-to-date facilities for medical care; however, we would also like to put forward the idea that a healthy environment is important for the well-being of local communities and to combat climate change. A project of this magnitude needs to address its environmental and social equity impacts.

The project's massive increase in square footage, resulting in a much larger campus and patient/workforce/commuter population, as well as the addition of a 300-foot-tall building on a hillside in the middle of a residential community with parks, schools, and other open space, are major factors in the negative environmental impacts that this project will have on this residential section of San Francisco.

New developments should strive to balance new jobs with providing new housing and meeting social equity goals by having a large percentage of the housing be affordable. Providing sufficient affordable housing will also help reduce the greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the number of car trips needed by employees who will walk to work rather than commute long distances. In addition, the project will need an aggressive mass transit program in order to reduce single car use so that the project will not result in increased greenhouse gas emissions.

*The Sierra Club urges UCSF to rethink the parameters of this project and create a more environmentally-sustainable, equitable, and neighborhood-friendly project.*

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Barry Hermanson*

Barry Hermanson

On behalf of the  
San Francisco Group Executive Committee

cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco Planning Commission

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ejnet.org/ej/jemez.pdf>