

San Francisco + UCSF Parnassus MOU

Community Meeting #1

Tuesday, September 29, 2020

1. Presentation on scope of the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan by UCSF staff
2. Welcome comments from Rich Hillis, San Francisco Planning Director, Jen Low, Legislative Aide to Board President Norman Yee, and Kyle Smeallie, Legislative Aide to Board Member Dean Preston
3. Presentation by Joshua Switzky, Planning Department, on the MOU purpose and process.
4. Four break-out groups with seven to ten participants each focused on specific community priorities. Comments from the four groups are consolidated here by topic.

Housing

- Many meeting participants had concerns about the lack of planning for workforce housing, not just students and faculty
 - Attendees voiced concern about a range of consequences for not building adequate housing: environmental and social impacts of long commutes for new employees; shortages in certain critical lower-paid workforce sectors; displacement of existing residents in the immediate area as they are pushed out by increased demand
 - One participant proposed enough housing for 50% of the new workforce associated with the campus expansion
 - One participant proposed that an agreement to train and hire SF residents would decrease the impact of hiring on local housing; this would also help to address expected unemployment rates resulting from Covid
- Many participants wanted more details from UCSF regarding location, unit type, construction timeline, etc for the proposed housing
- Need a variety of housing types from studios to family housing
- Many commented that housing construction should be done early in advance of or coinciding with completion of space that will increase jobs (ie in phase 1), not in later phases after impact of job growth has already impacted the housing market.
- One participant was concerned about housing impacts on natural spaces in Sutro Forest (i.e., Aldea)
- Housing needs to comply with San Francisco's General Plan, particularly Policy 1.9 of the 2014 Housing Element Update (workforce housing)
 - Criticism that UCSF is reluctant to talk about workforce salaries, which is critical to determining workforce housing need
- CPMC agreed to substantial payment into affordable housing; UCSF should do the same

Transportation

- Concern about increased ridership on the N, which is already at capacity.
- Opinion that UCSF transportation investment should be in expanding or enhancing *public* transportation system, not into private shuttles
- Concern about adequate parking for the many patients who are assumed to come by car.
- Need to address ADA concerns regarding the streetscape and access to campus buildings.
- Concern that TNCs will add to the congestion and that they will need sufficient loading areas

- Loading/waiting space will also be needed to emergency vehicles
- An adequate TDM plan is needed
- Support for a range of transportation options, including electric bicycles
- Timeline – UCSF needs to address & plan for transportation before they approve plan
- One request for more parking for staff and patients, due to concern about limited street parking

Street scape and safety

- Improve access points to GG Park. Focus on "park-to-peak" and access routes from the park via 9th, 7th, and 5th Ave to the campus as being devoted to Arguello route, since not everyone is coming from a direction that Arguello/2nd makes sense. ; RPD will not be able to implement some of their planned improvements in the near future
 - One person felt that UCSF has made a much greater investment in open space at Mission Bay than it has made at Parnassus and that they should expand their investments in neighborhood open space around Parnassus, such as improvements to the edges of GG Park closest to the campus (eg between Arguello/9th Ave)
- Unlike CMPC or other large hospital facilities, the Parnassus campus is not accessible from all sides and has generally limited accessibility – some questions if this is the right site for major hospital expansion
- Concern about ped safety at intersection of Parnassus/4th Ave with proposed extension
- Support for corridor from park to Irving, 2nd Arguello
- One participant proposed a car free zone for Parnassus (for transit, bikes & ped only)
 - Include ambulance & emergency car access
- Support for more open space and better street connections to the surrounding neighborhood
- Trees and greening leading from campus to Inner Sunset commercial district
- Request to include safety enhancements: pedestrian access, wayfinding

Construction Impacts

- Given that Irving & Lincoln are the only two fully east/west streets from sunset into rest of city, construction congestion must be managed, not just in immediate zone of hospital, but also in all the surrounding residential streets
- Recommend strong const. management plan throughout life of plan to be included in MOU
- unlike Chase Center, homes all around, patients can't walk very far, can't come on shuttles, paratransit issues

Other

- Space ceiling agreement between City and UCSF should be included in the MOU (ie not just imposed by the Regents, such that the City is not a party) and the new ceiling needs to be defensible
- Murals: concern that murals should be included in the MOU and should be kept out of storage.
 - Removal and storage estimated at \$8M.
 - UCSF has issued an RFP for removal and storage; they are assessing the proposals
- Building shadows will not be subject to Prop K because UCSF is a State institution, but shadows will impact the surrounding neighborhood year-round, including Gratton playground; this was identified as a quality of life issue
- Water impacts and reduction of available water due to climate change and other factors need to be addressed.

- Sutro is a watershed that UCSF should capitalize on via grey water/runoff capture
- It's important for UCSF to do whatever they can do support local businesses and facilitating campus population to patronize businesses in Inner Sunset and Cole Valley, especially post-COVID, by not building competing retail on campus and by making it easier to get to/from those shopping areas
- Concern about the aesthetic, bulk, and height of the proposed hospital and how it will impact the skyline and public view of Mt Sutro.

Ongoing Cooperation / MOU Implementation

- There should be public discussion of the implementation

Health Care Services

One participant made the following comments re health care:

- Parnassus services not physically or financially accessible so additional services at community clinics are needed
- Onsite: More **geriatric** primary care - outpatient Medicare; SNF units / **subacute** skilled nursing is an urgent and has to be a hospital campus; Hospital rehab too
- In and out psychiatric care is needed for MediCal and under-insured; Langley Porter not adequate
 - The City's 2019 Health Care Master Plan identifies behavioral health care as a priority