

I

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING - JUNE 24, 1975

1
2
3
4 PUBLIC HEARING
5 AT
6 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN FRANCISCO
7 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
8 REPORT
9 FOR
10 THE PROPOSED LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JUNE 24, 1975
TOLAND HALL
7:30 p.m.

Prepared by:
Madeleine J. Leong, CSR

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	INTRODUCTION BY BOB LA POINT	PAGES 1-3
3	DEREK PARKER, ARCHITECT	3-13
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

NAME	PAGE
JOHN C. FRIEDMAN	14
CY SHAIN	17
CALVIN WELCH	19
ALBERT J. REYFF	23
BOAKE CHRISTENSEN	24
V. J. MC GILL	26
ROBERT H. LAWS, JR.	26
PAUL ROSENBERG	28
LUCY DOMIN	29
ALLAN J. CHALMERS	30
DENIS MOSGOFIAN	31, 81
KAY FIELD	33
THOMAS SELIGMAN	35
ANNA THOMPSON	37
ANNETTE MURPHY	40, 80
JOHN OLSEN	42
JOHN BARDIS	45
JOHN E. BARRY	50
LINDA CHALMERS	51
SUE C. HESTOR	51
MICHAEL RICE	54
SUSAN BRADBURY	56
RONALD MERMEL	59
MARCIA LINDEEN	62
JOSEPH N. MINAHAN	68
SUE BIERMAN	70
MICHAEL MC AVOY	74
DOUG ENGMANN	76
ALLEN BIRDSALL	79

Toland Hall, UCSF

Tuesday, June 24, 1975

7:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT (DRAFT EIR) FOR THE PROPOSED LONG RANGE
DEVELOPMENT PLAN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN FRANCISCO

MR. LAPOINT: Good evening, I would like to thank you
for coming tonight.

My name is Bob LaPointe, I will be conducting the
Public Hearing tonight and taking public testimony for the
University of California on the Draft Environmental Impact
Report for the Proposed Long Range Development Plan. For
those of you who may wish to have a copy of the report,
they are available from Ms. Hussey.

The purpose of tonight's Public Hearing is to provide
the public with the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR
for the Proposed Long Range Development Plan and to submit
testimony about the effects of the LRDP on the local environment.
The Hearing also provides the San Francisco campus an opportunity
to obtain comment on local environmental conditions which,
along with other review processes being conducted, may be
beneficial to the completion of the Final Environmental Impact
Report.

Those of you who want to present testimony and have
not filled out a Request to Speak Form may get one from Ms.
Hussey. Speakers will be called to give testimony on a
First Come Basis as the forms are received.

Testimony will be limited to five minutes for speakers

1 representing groups and/or agencies and three minutes for
2 other individuals. Ms. Hussey will signal with a yellow
3 card when there is one-half minute left to speak and with
4 a red card when time is up.

5 After everyone who wants to present testimony has
6 presented testimony, an additional opportunity will be
7 provided persons who have already spoken.

8 Tonight's Hearing will be tape recorded and recorded
9 by a Certified Court Reporter; therefore, please speak
10 clearly and into the microphone.

11 Following the Hearing, a transcript will be made and
12 copies will be available.

13 The University, in its Final Environmental Impact Report
14 will respond to the environmental points raised during
15 this hearing.

16 The hearing record will be kept open after tonight's
17 Public Hearing until Thursday, July 17, 1975. Those of you
18 who do not wish to speak tonight and want an opportunity
19 to present your testimony regarding the environmental impact
20 of the Proposed Long Range Development Plan, may do so
21 during this period. Submit letters and statements for
22 inclusion in the hearing record by writing to:

23 Robert J. LaPointe
24 Community Affairs Officer
25 University of California, San Francisco
26 1363 Third Avenue
27 San Francisco, California 94143

28 Are there any questions about the procedures for

1 tonight's hearing?

2 Before I open the hearing for public testimony, I
3 would like to introduce Mr. Derek Parker, Campus Consulting
4 Architect, who will briefly describe the Proposed Long
5 Range Development Plan. Mr. Parker -- thank you.

6 MR. PARKER: I can best describe five years of planning
7 effort on this campus with a few slides and I'm going to
8 take about five minutes, because I see a number of familiar
9 faces around the forum. Many of you have seen many pieces
10 of this work over the last five years, planning activity,
11 the history and background of the campus, most of you know
12 the location is critical central point of San Francisco
13 on the northern slopes of Mount Sutro. Campus boundaries
14 included about 107 acres. Most of the development is on
15 what's known as the "Parnassus shelf" -- about 30 of those
16 107 acres.

17 The campus boundaries are shown on the map on the
18 right which in yellow shows most of Mount Sutro. North
19 at the bottom of that map and south is to the top.
20 The red area is the Parnassus shelf with approximately
21 30 acres. It does show the one property on the west side
22 of Third Avenue which is not owned by the University.

23 The campus which was started late in the last century
24 has gradually become surrounded by a dense residential
25 neighborhood which coincided also with this high rise
26 density development on the Parnassus shelf of the Health-
27 Science Campus. This campus as many of you know is unique
28 in the university system, the only one dedicated totally

1 to the health sciences, and at this time provides facilities
2 for four basic Health-Science Schools; medicine, nursing,
3 pharmacy, and dentistry as well as providing in-patient
4 and out-patient care.

5 The last plan for this campus was developed by my
6 predecessor in 1964. At that time the academic program
7 for this campus indicated a growth to 7,500 students which
8 would require space that were approximately three million
9 two hundred net square feet.

10 The plan we're talking about tonight is being scaled
11 down to four thousand one hundred students and a net square
12 footage limit of one point seven million net square feet.

13 You will note on the side on the left which is the 1964
14 plan on the slide -- on the right on the 1964 plan, land
15 acquisition was going to be necessary down to Irving Street
16 and to Fifth Avenue. A number of high rise structures
17 would be required north of Parnassus Avenue. The parking
18 structures would be continued from Arguello down to Fifth
19 Avenue and the Parnassus Avenue would be placed underground
20 so a pedestrian plaza could be developed at the present
21 street level.

22 In 1970 it was obvious that this plan was academically
23 out of date and also environmentally out of date that many
24 of us had realized the impact of such institutions upon
25 residential neighborhoods. You will also note although
26 this plan in 1964 was the only university plan in three
27 dimensions and was the most highly developed of the
28 Long Range Development Planning in the University system,

1 planning stopped at the University boundaries. So in
2 1970, it seemed not only did we need a new plan, we needed
3 a new weighted plan, but we also needed an extra element
4 in the plan which was the participation of the neighborhood
5 within which the institution was housed.

6 While we're searching for the next slide, in 1970
7 then, we divided the number of planning processes into
8 a number of phases. We decided to take it more slowly.
9 Participation takes time.

10 The first phase then was the Analysis Phase in which
11 we tried to develop an understanding of the campus as it
12 existed, what were the problem areas, and what were the
13 opportunities on this campus, because, obviously, this
14 campus has a dramatic site. It's the guardian of the last
15 piece of natural open space in San Francisco and has the
16 wonderful views to the Golden Gate Headlands and Marin County,
17 attributes which had not been previously recognized in
18 physical planning.

19 At the conclusion of the First Phase which is illustrated
20 by a slide which we're unable to find -- there were -- the
21 architects were completely independent when making a number
22 of recommendations to this campus-- one, to stimulate
23 dialogue, and two, to provide guidelines for subsequent
24 planning phases. We suggested at this time that Mount Sutro
25 be kept in its present condition. We suggested that the
26 planning were to continue within the present boundaries and
27 a moratorium would be placed on land acquisition. Both
28 recommendations were subsequently acted on by various --

1 to various degrees by both the Chancellor and the Board of
2 Regents.

3 The Second Phase which took most of 1972, consisted
4 of the development of a three dimensional lot of this campus
5 and the surrounding community. The development of a large
6 number of physical planning alternatives in which we were
7 trying to develop with as much assistance as we can get for
8 those on-campus and off-campus have a number of physical
9 planning principles which could be applied to this campus
10 regardless of the individual program elements. This was
11 done three dimensionally. The studies were then recorded
12 photographically. The model dismantled and then reassembled
13 for alternative plans. This, as you may remember, produced
14 a large number of physical planning alternatives which
15 were then recorded in a report which was then evaluated by
16 Task Force which the Chancellor established of both campus
17 and community and city participants. That Task Force then
18 established certain guidelines to guide my office in the
19 subsequent development of a little more detailed plan.

20 Upon conclusion of the current projects which is
21 shown on the left hand side of the screen, the Long Range
22 Development Plan added only 35,000 square feet to this
23 campus, before we achieved the one point seven million net
24 square feet which is the State Mandated maximum for the
25 development of this campus.

26 The project shown in red on the screen, brown buildings
27 are existing on the left hand side with a letter "D" is
28 the School of Dentistry. In the upper part of the picture

1 with a "CC" is a three thousand square feet Child Care Center.

2 On the far right hand side of the screen is the project
3 which is in addition to modernization of the present in-patient
4 hospital, Moffitt Hospital.

5 While this planning was going on, a number of the principles
6 which had been established in the first two phases were then
7 being brought to bear on projects which were ongoing.

8 Moffitt Hospital which in 1964 had been a 15 story building
9 on Parnassus Avenue with 700 beds had been rotated 90 degrees
10 and pushed back from Parnassus Avenue which, as you can
11 see on this side, and the project scope reduced by 200 beds
12 so that the project upon completion would contain the same
13 number of beds as presently exists. This gave us an opportunity
14 also then to develop some open space and some plaza space
15 between Langley Porter and the existing hospital at the east
16 end of the campus.

17 The School of Dentistry, many of you know, has gone through
18 a number of design cycles and was completed with this design
19 cycle which was concluded with this design cycle which has
20 reduced the scope of the building from 160,000 net square
21 feet to approximately 69,000 square feet net, and decentralized
22 a number of the clinic functions from this campus to San
23 Francisco General and to the University Extension at Page and
24 Laguna. The building then, because of its smaller size
25 could be relocated, pushed back on its side about a hundred
26 feet from both Fifth Avenue and Parnassus. Houses on Fifth
27 Avenue could then be retained and we also get the opportunity
28 at the west end of the campus to develop a plaza and some

1 Open Space which we felt for a long time this campus needed.

2 The right hand screen then showed on Parnassus at the top
3 and the Third Avenue on the left indicates the development
4 of the site which used to house these nursing dormitory rooming
5 which, I think, are eight to ten story high which was determined
6 to be a seismic risk and was demolished.

7 On this campus, as you can also imagine, there were all
8 sorts of "urgent demands" for that site and for all sorts of
9 legitimate and valid programs.

10 The Chancellor held out and said that site will remain
11 Open Space and a Mini-Park will be installed in that site.

12 We've entered into agreement with the City to place some
13 Bufano sculptures which are owned by the City on that site,
14 and a small two thousand twenty-five hundred net square feet
15 Child Care Center will be located on the lower part of that site.
16 So, both the pedestrian at the Parnassus level and the
17 children at the lower level will get the benefit of that Open
18 Space.

19 In the Phase "B" stage, we recommended that Mount Sutro
20 remain in its present condition and in November of '73, I
21 guess it was -- the Regents approved a recommendation from
22 the Chancellor to turn the green area there, which is over
23 50 percent of this campus -- 50 acres into Open Space for
24 a period of 25 years.

25 The orange area has been retained for unknown uses.

26 The yellow area-- the small yellow area at the top of
27 Mount Sutro is where the present animal facilities are.

28 As many of you know, with community help, the campus

1 is now being able to relocate those animal facilities
2 to Hunters Point and the campus planning community has approved
3 a program for turning the crest of Mount Sutro back to its
4 natural condition by grading and seeding.

5 Now, let's look at the projects which are proposed in
6 the Long Range Development Plan. With the exception of the
7 30,000 square feet of growth to take this campus to 1.7
8 million, the projects -- and there are eight of them -- are
9 deficiency projects programs.

10 On the left hand side of the screen with the initials "RL"
11 is a four thousand square feet expansion to the Radiobiology
12 Building.

13 The bulk of the academic and research deficiency program
14 and growth will occur in three stages in a building called
15 "HSS" or Health Science South to be located between the two
16 existing research towers to the south end of the campus.

17 This project will be invisible from Parnassus Avenue or
18 from the East, as you will see in some model photographs, only
19 partially visible from the West.

20 On the right hand side of the screen shown in red then
21 is the second phase of the Moffitt Modernization Program
22 which will allow the campus to eliminate the present four
23 bed wards in that hospital, reducing the bedrooms to two beds
24 each and adding toilets and showers to bring the facilities up
25 to what you might think is a normal community standard.

26 As a phase beyond that then is the Second Phase of "HSS".

27 This is a building which was built in three vertical
28 increments. The demolition of U.C. Hospital which is shaded

1 in gray in the left middle part of the screen. The building
2 is seismic and deficient and we have determined that it cost
3 as much to bring that up to current non-hospital codes as
4 it would be to replace it in the new building. It also gives
5 us the opportunity to consolidate in-patient care in one
6 structure on this campus which would be on the Second Phase
7 and the Third Phase of the Modernization Program.

8 In order then to be able to move to the conversion of the
9 existing University-owned houses back to residential use,
10 it's necessary to relocate existing Langley Porter's Neuropsychiatric
11 functions which are in those houses in a small structure which
12 will be relocated on the far right hand side of the left screen
13 there on the Langley Porter side, and that building, I think,
14 is 25,000 square feet or so. Upon completion of that phase,
15 one can complete the demolition of U.C. Hospital. You can
16 see on the right screen it's disappeared. It will be replaced
17 with a smaller building to house some of the academic and
18 administrative functions which are now in houses and the
19 remainder of the site will remain Open Space which will achieve
20 something we've been trying to achieve from the very beginning
21 which is to re-introduce Mount Sutro to Parnassus Avenue.

22 We also see the third and final stage of "HSS" to house
23 a research and academic programs, and at this point, we think
24 the campus may get an activity level where we will need to
25 introduce a tunnel connection from the parking structure on the
26 north side to the facilities, the patient care and education
27 on the south side of Parnassus.

28 Having accomplished that, we can then turn the houses on

1 Fourth, Fifth, and Third Avenues back to residential use
2 and they're indicate there in red.

3 Now if all these things fall into place and there's no
4 guarantee that they will, no commitment to any one of these
5 projects by the Regents approving the Long Range Development
6 Plan - - it's a planning tool and a guideline only for future
7 campus development and change - - if all of those things fall
8 into place - - the campus eventually then will look like the
9 screen on the left where all of the buildings which we've just
10 talked about are now shown on the ground and we've introduced
11 Open Space at both East and West end of the campus and had the
12 opportunity then to bring the rich Mount Sutro down to Parnassus
13 Avenue. In a portion of the sense, we've also consolidated
14 functions which are now scattered around the campus.
15 As you will see, on the right hand screen, in-patient and
16 out-patient care will be consolidated at the East end of the
17 campus.

18 The South and West part of the campus will be for academic
19 functions with supporting activities on the North side of
20 Parnassus Avenue.

21 Now just to conclude, let's just take a look at some
22 model and aerial photographs so we can make some comparisons.

23 A view from the southwest of the campus as it exists on
24 the right side, the model from the southwest - - the campus as
25 it will be upon completion of the current projects, which
26 in the foreground includes the School of Dentistry and hidden
27 between the two research towers is the space which will
28 show on the next slide for the Health Science South Building,

1 the "HSS" we talked about. You can see the Child Care Center
2 at the junction center of Third Avenue and Parnassus and
3 then upon completion of the total Long Range Development Plan -
4 - Dentistry there is from Phase 1, and you can just see the third
5 stage of "HSS," on the far right hand side of the screen there,
6 peeking up between the two research towers. From another
7 viewpoint - - now the campus virtually as it exists; the campus
8 as it would be upon completion of the current projects shows
9 three projects; phase 1 which is a nine story building from
10 Moffitt Hospital; behind the existing hospital on the left
11 hand side of the screen, Dentistry; on the far right, south
12 of Parnassus Avenue and the Child Care Center and the Mini-Park
13 at the junction of Parnassus and Third Avenue and then that
14 same viewpoint upon completion of the Proposed Long Range
15 Development Plan which shows the vertical expansion of Moffitt
16 Hospital to 15 stories; the completion of the three phases of
17 HSS which from the north is virtually invisible because it's
18 concealed behind an existing height of the two research towers
19 and the School of Dentistry is being completed.

20 And then you'll see on the right hand side that U.C.
21 has gone - - has been replaced by Open Space at the West end
22 of the campus and the small administration building which will
23 then allow us to turn the residences back to residential use.

24 Now in conclusion, the Long Range Development Plan and
25 its revisions will be adopted by the Board of Regents.
26 However, such an action does not commit the Board to implement
27 any one of the projects identified in this plan. Each project
28 must be approved individually for planning, funding, and

1 construction.

2 Through the Long Range Development Planning process,
3 the campus has explored ways of developing and sustaining
4 a dialogue between the campus planners, the off-campus
5 organizations and the individuals who are involved and they had
6 to be informed about the issues of which this campus is dealing.

7 In addition to the plans that we've shown, a commitment
8 is being made by the Chancellor against purchase of additional
9 land for a period of at least ten years.

10 There has been restructuring of the campus planning
11 committee to include equal campus and community participation.
12 There's been a reduction and a relocation of two major projects,
13 the School of Dentistry and Moffitt Hospital.

14 The Regents have designated 50 acres which is approximately
15 50 percent of the campus as Open Space for a period of 25 years.

16 The legislature has placed a 1.7 million square feet
17 limit for the density of this campus which is 35,000 square
18 feet, more than the campus will be upon the completion of
19 the current projects, and the community participation has
20 been invited and has occurred on two key Task Forces; one
21 for the review of the Long Range Development Plan Alternatives
22 and one for the traffic and parking - - Traffic, Transportation
23 and Parking Task Forces.

24 I think that's as much as I can say.

25 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you Mr. Parker.

26 For those who came in late, we have Request to Speak
27 forms down in front and if you like to give your testimony,
28 please fill one out and deliver it down here in the front.

1 There will be five minutes for individuals representing
2 neighborhood organizations and three minutes for other
3 individuals.

4 I would now like to open this Public Hearing for public
5 testimony and would like to ask you when I call your name
6 to indicate your name and if you're representing a neighborhood
7 organization or if you're a neighborhood resident or whatever.

8 I would first like to call Mr. Welch and the second
9 speaker will be Mr. Albert Reyff.

10 MR. REYFF: Mr. LaPoint, I would like to defer my opening
11 comments to Mr. John C. Friedman from SPEAK.

12 MR. LAPOINT: All right. That's number three.

13 JOHN C. FRIEDMAN,

14 75 LURLINE STREET

15 "SPEAK"

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: My name is John Friedman. I'm representing
17 SPEAK which is the Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee
18 and I would like to present the following testimony.

19 It is our opinion that the Draft Environmental Impact
20 Report upon the University of California at San Francisco's
21 Long Range Development Plan points out serious and irreversible
22 negative environmental impacts which call for the revision
23 and in some cases elimination of various elements of the
24 plan.

25 We therefore believe that a Final EIR should not be
26 released until the plan is mitigated and modified to correct
27 the harmful environmental impacts that will adversely affect
28 the surrounding community.

1 Our conclusions are based on information contained in
2 the EIR report itself.

3 The plan projects a 16 percent increase in the daily
4 campus population bringing the total number of people that
5 will be using U.C. facilities to 15,427 by 1985. Anyone
6 familiar with the community immediately adjacent to the
7 university must realize that the area is currently over congested
8 and certainly cannot accommodate any increases in daily
9 population use without serious environmental consequences.

10 The growth projected by the Long Range Development Plan
11 will have serious implications on the local housing market.
12 The report itself states that The impact on the community
13 will be significant. The housing market is already right as
14 indicated by current vacancy trends and no significant increases
15 in the housing supply are anticipated. And that is on
16 Page 125 of the EIR report.

17 The EIR report also indicates that the 16 percent increase
18 in the daily campus population will have an extremely negative
19 impact on already over-crowded streets within the affected
20 community.

21 Currently 1,000 cars generated by UCSF must use neighborhood
22 streets for parking resulting in a situation where nearly
23 eight percent of all cars in the area are parked illegally.

24 Projected construction programs will create a demand
25 for 710 additional on-street parking spaces due to more
26 cars and removal of existing spaces and I refer you to Page
27 138 of the EIR report. This nearly doubles the current
28 parking problems and will place an impossible burden on

1 the local residents.

2 It is obvious that the proposed mitigation measures
3 are encouraging the use of public transportation and will
4 not even come close to solving the problem.

5 We believe that the solution as well as the problems
6 created by the Long Range Development Plan are contained in
7 the EIR report.

8 On Page 144, the EIR proposes the alternative of "freezing
9 campus population growth by decentralization or by diversion
10 of activities to other campuses."

11 Unfortunately the details for such a plan are not
12 contained in the EIR constituting the major deficiency in
13 its completeness.

14 Decentralization and major transportation alternatives
15 seem to be the only feasible alternative to the destruction
16 of the community environment.

17 We therefore urge that the largest and most disruptive
18 projects proposed in the Long Range Development Plan such
19 as the Dental School, Moffitt Hospital Modernization,
20 and the Health Science South Building to be re-examined in
21 light of the EIR's recommendations to decentralization.

22 We find other aspects of the plan such as major additions
23 to the existing facilities, restoration of the university
24 owned homes to residential use and the extensive landscaping
25 plans to be laudable objectives.

26 Finally, we wish to point out that as signators of
27 the Mount Sutro Community Master Plan, we find the EIR
28 incorrect when it states on page 128 that the Long Range

1 Development Plan is consistent with policies in the institutional
2 expansion element of the master plan.

3 The destruction of university owned housing on Fourth
4 Avenue, the unwillingness to decentralize major campus
5 functions, the proposed 16 percent increase of campus
6 population and the refusal to extend commitments not to
7 purchase additional property beyond 1981 or to preserve
8 Mount Sutro as permanent Open Space are all elements of the
9 Long Range Development Plan that are directly contrary
10 to the community master plan and should be so stated in the
11 EIR, and I have extra copies of this report.

12 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Friedman.
13 Now, Mr. Reyff, and then Mr. Welch will be next.

14 MR. WELCH: Bob, I like to defer to Mr. Cy Shain, if I
15 may.

16 CY SHAIN,

17 133 WARREN DRIVE

18 FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

19 MR. SHAIN: My name is Cy Shain and I'm Chairman of
20 the Forest Knolls Neighborhood Organization.

21 For the benefit of those who are not familiar with it,
22 our organization represents residences of approximately
23 500 single family dwelling homes which are located on the
24 southern slope of Mount Sutro. While we have studied the
25 Long Range Plan in great detail and have considerable remarks
26 that we can make, in the interest of time and keeping with
27 the requirements as imposed, my remarks will be brief.

28 While at first blush the Forest Knolls Neighborhood

1 is insulated from the disruption and the inconvenience
2 which will result if and when the proposed construction on
3 sites located on the northern slope of Mount Sutro, we
4 have discovered sometime ago that this is merely a full
5 sense of security. As U.C. neighbors on the southern
6 bounds of its property, we have endured the inconvenience
7 and the noise emanating from the placing of laboratory
8 animals on the top of Mount Sutro and we have had the
9 threat posed by the possible construction of additional
10 married student housing on an eight acre plot of property
11 bordering on Crestmount Drive and incidentally, as an
12 interspaced remark - - the unknown piece of property that
13 Mr. Parker had referred to is the six acres to which we're
14 referring to.

15 In our judgment such construction would have been
16 started and perhaps completed had not physical restraints
17 been imposed. Furthermore, we have community interest in
18 preserving Mount Sutro in perpetuity as a park available to
19 the public for its continuous enjoyment and recreational
20 use.

21 This Long Range Plan while superficially offering
22 50 acres of Mount Sutro to be kept in its natural state for
23 "up to 25 years" does not give us the reassurances that we
24 desire.

25 Specifically, it does not guaranty. We had some reference
26 on the top of Mount Sutro, but the 50 acres does not include
27 potential building sites previously earmarked for this
28 additional married student housing.

1 We think that Mount Sutro should be dedicated as a
2 public park in keeping with the proposals suggested in the
3 Mount Sutro Master Plan.

4 The Environmental Impact Report sets forth some of the
5 many problems which can be anticipated from the implementation
6 of the Long Range Development Plan; namely increased traffic,
7 exacerbated parking problems, disruption of surrounding
8 neighborhoods during construction and a lowering of air
9 quality.

10 We have observed first hand the consequences of U.C.'s
11 growth and the inadequacies of its parking facilities as
12 increasing numbers of cars are being parked on the narrow
13 streets bordering our neighborhood and as Golden Gate Park
14 to our chagrin has become a huge over-flow parking lot for
15 U.C. employees and staff.

16 Manifestly, these are matters of great concern, especially
17 as we contemplate the impact of future growth and construction
18 as proposed by this plan.

19 We share these concerns with you as indeed we have
20 in the past, as residents of this City, as taxpayers, as
21 your neighbors, and in many instances, as alumni of
22 this great university. Thank you.

23 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Shain.
24 Now, Mr. Welch and then after that, Mr. Reyff is next.

25 CALVIN WELCH,

26 519 ASHBURY, SAN FRANCISCO

27 HANC

28 MR. WELCH: I like to read a statement from the Haight-

Ashbury Neighborhood Council.

At its regularly scheduled June membership meeting, the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, after hearing a presentation by the Council's Coordinating Board and Mr. Robert La Pointe, from UCSF's Office of Community Affairs voted unanimously the following resolution in regard to UCSF's Proposed Long Range Development Plan (May 1975) and the Draft Environmental Impact Report on that proposed plan (May 1975):

1) The Council rejects both the Proposed Long Range Development Plan and, therefore, the Draft Environmental Impact Report on that plan for the simple reason that the Council and, to its knowledge, all other community and neighborhood groups in the area have had no chance to review, comment on, request changes in, or challenge the Proposed Long Range Development Plan of UCSF. It calls upon San Francisco Comprehensive Health Planning Council to hold a true hearing on the LRDP. After that hearing it then calls upon UCSF to prepare a new EIR on that corrected LRDP.

2) The Council reaffirms its support of the Mount Sutro Community Master Plan, Institutional Expansion Element, and points out that the Proposed Long Range Development Plan violates that community plan.

Background to the Resolution

The background to this resolution goes back to the very beginnings of the Council as an organization. UCSF's impact on our community has been mixed at best, and destructive at worst. Ten years ago UCSF showed its true

face to our community when it aggressively supported the construction of the Panhandle Freeway. That freeway would not only have destroyed Golden Gate Park, but also thousands of family dwelling units.

UCSF did so because it felt the freeway best solved its long range development needs. The Council felt otherwise, and after prolonged struggle, prevailed.

Then in 1967 UCSF attempted to "buy off" the Council by offering it a \$10,000 grant to help "plan" the future of the Haight-Ashbury so that we here in the Haight would quietly accept whatever the university had to offer.

Again, this was done to serve the best interests of UCSF's long range development needs. Again, after much struggle, including a major split in HANC, this move was rejected.

In 1970 UCSF joined with Mayor Alioto to form a "Mayor's Committee to Restore the Haight-Ashbury." This committee was originally chaired by the Chancellor of UCSF and had not one Haight-Ashbury resident on it. It was immediately attacked by all elements in our community, and in an attempt to divide and rule, certain new members from the community were added.

Chancellor Lee was replaced as Chairman of the Committee with a resident of the community who was an employee of UCSF.

After intense struggle, the Mayor's Committee voted to disband itself because it could never really decide what it was to do or for whom it was to restore the Haight-

Ashbury. UCSF then provided meeting space for the Mayor's Committee members who refused to vote to disband.

In 1971, the Council joined with other groups to rezone our community. UCSF was approached for its support. It refused to support our rezoning, while it supplied assistance to those who opposed our rezoning.

In 1972 UCSF openly opposed the Council's efforts to have the San Francisco Comprehensive Health Planning Council hold hearings on UCSF's proposed dental school after the university refused our requests for them to hold such hearings.

In 1973 UCSF refused to allow the Council's supposedly voting member of the Campus Planning Committee to cast a negative vote on the plans of the proposed dental school. The Council withdrew from the Campus Planning Committee after this and other events which proved the Campus Planning Committee to be nothing but a rubber stamp. During the same year UCSF withdrew its support for a dental clinic in the Haight-Ashbury, even though the university was claiming credit for that clinic in reports to the federal government for federal funds.

In 1974 the Council demanded that the university hold hearings on its Proposed Long Range Development Plan and the university refused. Instead, it held a sham hearing on "options" for development.

Thus, the Council through ten long years of experience has come to realize that UCSF will go to any lengths to further its needs at the expense of our community.

We, as an organization, have felt the direct blows of UCSF. We have survived. We have increased our membership. We have outlived three Chancellors. We have rezoned our community and now, most recently, we have united with our sister organization and developed our own plan; our own line of attack, and we are now moving forward.

MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Welch. Now, Mr. Reyff, and after that, Mr. Christensen.

ALBERT J. REYFF,

231-CRESTMONT DRIVE, SAN FRANCISCO

FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

MR. REYFF: Mr. name is Albert Reyff. I'm speaking as a private resident of the Forest Knolls area and also as Vice-Chairman of the Forest Knolls Association.

The time has come when as proud as we are of the UC university system and this very hospital, we must realize that institutions as fine and as great as this one is encroaching on our way of live in San Francisco. The need to preserve residential community has never been greater and institutions will destroy our residential life.

We would urge that the UC system seek alternative plans for expansion either on other campuses or in other undeveloped areas of San Francisco. This is one of the finest residential communities. It has a fine climate, access to parks and recreation, and this system will destroy it. Thank you.

MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you very much. Mr. Christensen, and then Mr. McGill.

1 BOAKE CHRISTENSEN,

2 151 EDGEWOOD AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO

3 MR. CHRISTENSEN: Boake Christensen. I'm a resident
4 of the Edgewood Avenue. I'm speaking as an individual
5 citizen. I like to make three brief comments about the Draft
6 EIR from a legal point of view.

7 The first comment relates to the EIR on the Dental
8 School, Moffitt Hospital, and the Proposed Long Range
9 Development Plan.

10 California law requires that an EIR be written on
11 projects which are inter-related in one document. I believe
12 that the university is derelict in complying with the law
13 in this respect in that it seems, upon reading the EIR for
14 the Dental School and for Moffitt Hospital and for the
15 elements included within the Long Range Development Plan
16 that indeed there is a phase of inter-relationship among
17 the three. I do not understand how anyone could dispute
18 that point as the tearing down of one building leads to the
19 construction of another, remodeling of one building leads
20 to the construction of another, etc. So, I believe the
21 first point is that from a legal point of view, the Draft
22 EIR is deficient in that it should include an EIR on all
23 three buildings in one document.

24 The second point I would like to make is that the EIR
25 has apparently promised a number of assumptions. None of
26 these assumptions are spelled out. The purpose of an EIR
27 is to permit decision-makers to make rational decisions.
28 There is no way to make a rational decision if one does not

1 know what the underlying assumptions are, what the predicate
2 decision is.

3 On pages 25 and 26, and 27 of the Draft EIR, there's
4 reference to that which apparently is the underlying ground
5 work for the Proposed Long Range Development Plan; namely,
6 that there is going to be an increase student level at the
7 campus. None of this though is stated in any explicit
8 terms.

9 It is implied from a reference to the 1972 Bond issue
10 that increase student level is to be derived is based upon
11 a mandate from that Bond issue. I read the Bond issue and
12 the supporting documents and there's no such thing in it.
13 It appears to me that the San Francisco Campus of the University
14 is making the decisions on its own without consultation
15 with the university as to what its needs are. I think
16 that in order for the Regents to review the decisions of
17 the local campus, they must realize what the assumptions are
18 that are to be made by the university here, so they can
19 consider those assumptions with relevance to the other
20 needs that might be the needs of the university as they
21 might be met at other campuses of the university.

22 So, therefore, I think that the EIR must spell out in
23 detail what those assumptions are so that the decision-makers
24 can fully and carefully consider whether the needs which this
25 campus believes must be met for the State need be met here
26 or whether they can be met elsewhere in the State.

27 My third point is inter-related with the second point
28 and that is that California law requires a detailed

1 statement of alternatives for the proposals.

2 The Draft EIR states in three pages what the alternatives
3 are to the proposals contained here. In my opinion, those
4 statements are totally meaningless. There is a brief
5 statment regarding the need to destroy UC Hospital. There's
6 a throw-back to another alternative being an Act of the
7 1964 Alternative.

8 Now I can't understand how anybody can rationally
9 propose on one hand the alternative of the 1964 Long Range
10 Development Plan; on the other hand, to say nothing.

11 The Statement of Alternatives is totally unacceptable
12 from a legal point of view and that must be corrected
13 before you arrive at an adequate EIR.

14 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much. Now, Ms. or
15 Mr. Mc Gill; I'm not sure which. Could you speak into the
16 microphone. That way we can have it transcribed into the
17 official public hearing. Down to the left on the aisle
18 here is the microphone.

19 V. J. MC GILL,

20 1282 STANYAN STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

21 MR. MC GILL: I want to say that the objections that
22 I had in mind have been pretty well covered by the two
23 previous speakers. I like to defer my time to those
24 who represent organizations.

25 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much. Could we now have
26 Mr. Laws. After Mr. Laws, Mr. Rosenberg.

27 ROBERT H. LAWS, JR.,

28 1248 STANYAN STREET, SAN FRANCISCO.

1 MR. LAWS: My name is Robert Laws. I'm a resident of
2 the Haight-Ashbury Community and have lived here for over
3 ten years. I reside in the last block of Stanyan at 17th
4 and Belgrade.

5 I am concerned about the proposed expansion, not only
6 from the standpoint of the impact of the expansion upon
7 my neighbors, but also upon the impact on myself.
8 Already at that point, quite distant from this campus, we
9 see parking by uniformed university personnel and I dread to
10 think of what the situation would be if the proposed plan
11 for expansion were carried out. The other speakers have
12 alluded to and in fact, the proposed Draft Plan
13 refers to the increased traffic in the neighborhood.

14 I would submit that the plan is grossly deficient
15 in failing to consider the alternatives in light of this
16 campus being a part of the university system. It seems
17 transparent.

18 MR. LAPOINT: Excuse me Mr. Laws, we have to change
19 the tape, I guess. One second.

20 (SHORT PAUSE)

21 MR. LAPOINT: We can go ahead now.

22 MR. LAWS: It seems transparent, as I'm sure it does
23 to everyone in this room, that the Draft Plan fails to take
24 this campus into account as part of the overall university
25 system and to thoroughly explore the alternatives such as
26 the placing of some of the facilities here in other campuses
27 and locations such as Davis, Irvine, or other places within
28 the limits of the City. If the facilities cannot be
29 constructed without significant impact upon the neighborhood,

1 then I submit that the alternative which is not explored
2 in the report, the alternative of increasing the space for
3 parking within the legislatively mandated limits should
4 be thoroughly explored.

5 It seems obvious to me that if you cannot construct
6 this facility without destroying our neighborhood and that
7 you should reduce your goals, reduce the structures, and
8 increase your parking facilities. Of course that would
9 not significantly, perhaps diminish the traffic within the
10 neighborhood, but it would certainly ameliorate a very
11 serious problem for the day to day residents of this
12 community. Thank you.

13 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Laws. We now have
14 Mr. Rosenberg, and then Ms. Lucy Domin.

15 PAUL ROSENBERG,

16 555-40th AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO 94121

17 PLANNING ASSOCIATION FOR THE RICHMOND

18 MR. ROSENBERG: I am Paul Rosenberg, secretary-treasurer
19 of the Planning Association for the Richmond. We have 860
20 paid members of the Richmond District of San Francisco.

21 One of our policies adopted in public meetings
22 concerns institutional expansion. Too often we see such
23 institutions flopping up their surrounding neighbors and
24 generating intolerable traffic situation.

25 PAR joins the other neighborhood organizations in
26 opposing the unchecked cancerous growth of the University
27 of California in an already impacted area. The UC facility
28 should be decentralized into facilities already under-
29 utilizing, which exists in our city; therefor; the

1 Environmental Impact Report should be rejected until
2 other locations have been evaluated.

3 MR. LAPOINTE: Ms. Lucy Domin.

4 LUCY DOMIN,

5 4210 BALBOA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, #509

6 RICHMOND ENVIRONMENT ACTION.

7
8 MS. DOMIN: Good evening, I'm Lucy Domin, representing
9 Richmond, and we're recycling up and grouped out in the
10 Richmond district.

11 Our groups is concerned with him aspects of the
12 Proposed Long Range Development Plan, but I'm just going
13 to mention - - three points and be very brief about them.

14 First, we note that the Proposed Plan in the Draft, EIR
15 calls for 50 acres on top of Mount Sutro to be set aside
16 as Open Sapce for a period "not to exceed 25 years."

17 We recommend that these 50 acres plus the six additional
18 uncommitted acres be designated by the university as a
19 permanent Open Space Reserve to insure their availability
20 to future generations.

21 Second, we note that there is projected increase in
22 the university's solid waste of 45 tons a week. This is
23 mentioned on page 104 of the Draft EIR as a result of the
24 proposed facility expansion. While this amount is not
25 terribly significant when compared to the City's daily
26 trash load, we feel that formal wastepaper recycling
27 program would help to reduce the present solid waste load
28 of the university and offset any increase, and our group

1 would be happy to work with the university in developing
2 a recycling program to reduce your present waste load --
3 never mind any potential increase in it.

4 Finally, REA opposes any expansion by the university
5 since we feel that the total adverse effects of such
6 expansion would be too great and numerous would be dealt
7 with effectively.

8 We urge you to reconsider and modify the Long Range
9 Development Plan so it is compatible with the Mount Sutro
10 Master Plan. Thank you.

11 MR. LAPOINT: Denis Mosgofian.

12 MR. MOSGOFIAN: I like to exchange my time with Allan
13 Chalmers who is one of the co-chairmans of Inner-Sunset
14 speakers.

15 MR. LAPOINT: He's right after you, so, okay.

16 ALLAN J. CHALMERS,

17 1231-12th AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO

18 INNER-SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE

19 MR. CHALMERS: Allan J. Chalmers. Well, the last
20 speaker covered one of my points and that was the "not to
21 exceed 25 years." That's rather interesting semantics there.
22 What does that mean; it means nothing. Next year you could
23 take all the trees down and put something up there.
24 That should be covered much better in this EIR, of course,
25 plus there's -- nothing's said at all about Golden Gate
26 Park.

27 You know, obviously, you're using the park as a parking
28 lot and there are no places at the curbs in the area that

1 they're using and they drive on the grass and everything
2 else. It's very difficult to drive through there. If you
3 happen to have to drive your car, you're pretty much bottled
4 in if you have to go downtown or in that general direction.
5 It's very hazardous and I can pretty well imagine what
6 it's going to be like with thousand odd more cars, and the
7 EIR says, "Even if the community uses the no parking spaces
8 there wouldn't be enough for UCSF." To me, that's a disaster.
9 That should be covered much better. I think that's all I
10 have to say.

11 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you, Mr. Chalmers.

12 DENIS MOSGOFIAN,

13 1227 - 10th Avenue

14 Homeowner and parent of three children.

15 MR. MOSGOFIAN: My name is Denis Mosgofian, and I'm
16 speaking just as a homeowner and a parent tonight.

17 I live on Tenth Avenue near Irving and specifically
18 what I want to say relates to the overall impact of the
19 increasing concentration and the size of the university
20 center right here.

21 I want to relate to the kind of thing we're involved
22 with in the Environment Impact Report regarding another
23 part of the Sunset and one of the features of the Environmental
24 Impact Report that we run into is that it breaks and
25 automizes every single feature of the construction project.
26 so that what happens is you're left with the kind of sort
27 of smattering kind of confusion as to what the real impact
28 would be in terms of your life or the people's lives in the

neighborhood.

Take the university now; already it's very clear to me -- and I've lived here, I've been a native of San Francisco, but only lived in this area for a few years.

It is clear to the people here that the impact of the university is tremendous and the density of the university now mitigates directly against family -- of family character to this neighborhood and while I'm just a familyman, I am not only speaking from that point of view, but a family character to a neighborhood coupled with other styles of life that we've got in this area to make this area a tremendous area to live in, but if the university can continue to expand at the rate that it's currently expanding, all of the factors that had been mentioned to several thousand additional cars, the several thousand additional personnel, students and staff, and what you've got is a situation in which permanent instability in an area where you like to live in a country which is far from stable, and where permanence is a gone feature, becomes even more impossible than it is right now, and that's not dealt with as far as I can tell in the EIR. That whole feature has to do with what happens when this concentration takes place. Beyond this, there are many parking places and there are many other features that are required in the community by the institution.

I think what we have to do is look at that today all across this country and in every urban city, Manhattization is taking place and in most places they tell me it's gone beyond the retrievable point. In San Francisco, it hasn't,

and I think it's up to us to make it clear now that this university right here should be decentralized and not concentrated and as one who went to the University of California and graduated from Berkeley years ago and then, it was way too concentrated and I can see right here that it obviously has gone beyond the point where it really serves the needs of the community in terms of the health services.

It strikes me that the plan has a lot to do with the internal status of the Medical Center vis-a-vis, Mayo Clinic or Harvard or some other place. It has very little to do with the people of San Francisco and northern California, and when we look at this plan, it also sounds like they were given a budget and since they have a budget, they might as well spend the money. That's our money, and that's our lives, and it seems to me that those kinds of things should be dealt with more directly and not simply talking about square footage. Thank you.

MR. LAPOINT: Next speaker is Kay Field, and the speaker after that is Thomas Seligman.

KAY FIELD,

347 OAK PARK DRIVE

FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

MS. FIELD: My name is Kay Field and I'm speaking as a private citizen residing in a neighborhood bordering UCSF on the southern slope of Mount Sutro. I have also been a representative and observer of the Campus Planning Committee these past several years.

1 Speaking in my latter capacity, I have observed the
2 process that UC's consultation with the neighborhood
3 representatives on the Campus Planning Committee first
4 hand and have not been impressed by the so-called partnership
5 between UC administrators and neighborhood representatives.
6 In fact, we feel that we have been exploited and used by
7 the university to give sanction to plans which they have
8 long desired to implement irrespective of the community
9 impact. Thus, at the top of Mount Sutro, one of the most
10 spectacular view sites in the city, the university several
11 years ago placed its animal shelter. Other examples exist.

12 Turning to the Long Range Development Plan, I just
13 want to make two points. First, the 50 acre site on Mount
14 Sutro to which the report refers does not include the top
15 of Mount Sutro, nor does it include the acreage previously
16 destined for use as the married student housing bordering
17 on streets in our neighborhood, and the Board of Regents,
18 pardon me, a show of good faith by the university and the
19 Board of Regents would have them dedicate the entire
20 Mount Sutro land to public park usage for perpetuity.
21 We urge that this step be taken.

22 We are also concerned by the disruption and increased
23 traffic spilling over and parking into our neighborhood if
24 the plan is implemented. We want to be good neighbors, but
25 to guarantee mutual respect and support, we feel that as a
26 minimum, the university should take steps to implement the
27 provisions of the Mount Sutro Master Plan. Thank you.

28 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much Ms. Field. Now Thomas

1 Seligman, and after that is Anna Thompson.

2 THOMAS SELIGMAN,

3 34 WOODLAND AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO

4 WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

5 MR. SELIGMAN: I'm representing the Woodland Avenue
6 Association.

7 The Woodland Avenue Association would like to go on
8 record as opposing the writing of a Final Environmental
9 Impact Report on the Long Range Development Plan for
10 any new construction at the UCSF site due to the major
11 adverse environmental impacts contained within the Draft EIR.
12 We are especially concerned with the proposed 16 percent
13 increase in campus population resulting in the full negative
14 impact on the parking situation by 1985 as stated on page
15 139 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

16 "Thus even if the community used no parking spaces,
17 there will not be enough for UCSF."

18 The EIR also is not complete and does not even consider
19 the parking impacts in Golden Gate Park or on Woodland
20 Avenue which is only two blocks from the university and is
21 not included in any of the statistics in the university's
22 calculations.

23 Another concern is the double language that is used by
24 university officials included in the Draft EIR in relation
25 to the 50 acres of "Open Space" on the top of Mount Sutro.
26 In public forums such as this, representatives of the
27 university say that the Open Space is to be kept for 25
28 years, yet in every printed document, it is quoted as saying,

1 "not to exceed 25 years" which means any time the university
2 wants, they may take any part of that land for their use.

3 As a signatory of the Mount Sutro Community Master
4 Plan Institutional Expansion Element, the Woodland Avenue
5 Association feels that the Draft Environmental Impact Report
6 on the Long Range Development Plan violates the Mount Sutro
7 Community Master Plan while claiming it fulfills all the
8 elements. This must be corrected before Woodland Avenue
9 can endorse the writing of a Final Environmental Impact
10 Report or any new construction. Thank you.

11 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much. Anna Thompson.

12 MS. THOMPSON: I have some slides.

13 MR. LAPOINT: Ms. Thompson, could I ask you if your
14 slides are related to the Draft Environmental Impact Report
15 itself?

16 MS. THOMPSON: Yes, they are.

17 MR. BARDIS: I like to use the projector if it's all
18 right?

19 MR. LAPOINT: And is it appropriate for that purpose?

20 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

21 MR. LAPOINT: If that's the case, I welcome you to
22 use those. If they are not, I would ask you not to use
23 them.

24 A. I believe the slides will show quicker than I
25 can speak of what I'm trying to bring out.

26 MR. LAPOINT: Also, may I ask you though to still stay
27 within the time limit so that other people have an opportunity
28 to speak?

1 MS. THOMPSON: Yes. I'll try to be very fast.

2 ANNA THOMPSON,

3 1327 - Seventh Avenue, SAN FRANCISCO

4 ISAC

5 MS. THOMPSON: My name is Anna Thompson and I have
6 lived near the university for practically all my life.
7 I live on 1327 Seventh Avenue.

8 This first slide is a little bit before my time. It
9 shows the groundbreaking for the University of California.

10 MR. LAPOINT: Could I ask you to keep your voices
11 down. It's very difficult for the courtreporter to get
12 her testimony, and if you don't keep it down, we'll have
13 to -- we would just like them to keep the noise down in
14 order to get your testimony.

15 MS. THOMPSON: This is what I remember of -- I do
16 remember this. These were the three buildings that were
17 nestled by -- at -- into the side of the mountain.
18 We can go up Parnassus and get a beautiful view of the
19 Golden Gate Park, the Golden Gate, Marin and Tamalpais.
20 You can see undeveloped areas down below which is going to
21 disappear.

22 The EIR states, as the city grew, UCSF grew, but it
23 did not state that UCSF grew, the neighborhood started to
24 disappear, and that's what I hope to show with these films.
25 I think it'll show it little better and a little more
26 dramatically than the architect's view.

27 Now, we see down below the Arguello and Second Avenue
28 and we see the UC Hospital, and above, if you will notice,

1 the tennis court which is soon going to disappear. You
2 see now it has already disappeared and we have our Langley
3 Porter. We have Moffitt Hospital there and - - but it's
4 still pretty much over on the other side of the Parnassus
5 "Shelf". Here we see again the beginning of the disappearance.
6 We see Moffitt and we see Millberry Union coming up on the
7 other side. Here, the Medical Science Building. Here,
8 we see the parking garage starting from Hillway over to - -
9 already going over to Arguello. Again, we see the slopes
10 that are going to fast disappear. Here, the excavations
11 for the parking garage. Here is an aerial view of the same
12 thing which we see the houses disappearing and even the
13 streets disappearing in the view. Here we look up at the
14 parking garages very dramatically. You can see they don't
15 fit in very well with the homes that still stay on Arguello.
16 This gives you an idea of the extent of the university. It
17 isn't only the Parnassus "Shelf" but it extends up over
18 Mount Sutro. Here on the little red spot up there is the
19 most beautiful spot on Mount Sutro. You may guess what it
20 is. It's the animal shelters. Here are some of the residents.
21 Unfortunately they're not able to enjoy the beautiful view.
22 You see our trees or this beautiful area is for the animals
23 but not for people. Here are some more of the residents
24 of the top of Mount Sutro. Again, the bars that keep
25 the people who might enjoy away from seeing the view.
26 Here are the gates that keep you away from it. Here is
27 the sign that tells you to keep out. Here was the projected
28 development from Mount Sutro for further development of

1 of animal shelters at the top of Mount Sutro. Here on
2 the other side we see that some of the beauty of Mount
3 Sutro, the married housing. Again, we see the beautiful
4 landscaping, the natural beauty of Mount Sutro. This shows
5 some of the areas that are fast disappearing. You see
6 down on Second Avenue. You see Third Avenue. You see the
7 housing that has been taken over by the university. The
8 yellow areas up above that were scheduled for a while
9 for more student housing.

10 Our favorite Governor tells us that there are too many
11 mansions for the Regents. Here we see one of the grounds
12 around the mansions, the homes that were built for the
13 Chancellors. Here is another view showing the extremely
14 beauty of the landscaping. Here is the extreme beauty for
15 the residents of the entire Sunset. This shows a little
16 bit of the development. You can see up, gradually,
17 up to 1953, and see how it escalates up to 1975? For 120 years.
18 Here's the Transamerica Building. Here we see the six
19 Transamerica Buildings with one access, only East to West,
20 Parnassus Avenue. At least the one downtown has nine. I
21 guess that is it.

22 We don't feel that the Long Range Development Plan is
23 reassuring. We feel it is disheartening because it is
24 the loss of more homes. It means increased density, more
25 traffic and we feel that it is extremely disheartening.

26 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Ms. Thompson,
27 and now I like to call on Ms. Murphy. After Ms. Murphy,
28 John Olsen.

1 ANNETTE MURPHY,

2 1355 - Fifth Avenue

3 ISAC

4 MS. MURPHY: Mr. LaPoint, I have some slides too and
5 they are relevant too.

6 MR. LAPOINT: But you will try to keep them within the
7 amount of time allotted.

8 MS. MURPHY: This is UC today and you saw it, it has
9 grown. Now that beautiful forest is now wall to wall
10 concrete. This is what it has brought us, some parking
11 problems. This is what we see at night. This is the night
12 lights in our front rooms. That's UC. It saved PGE.
13 This is Irving Street where you have this beautiful landscape
14 of buffering between the community and the university, wall
15 to wall gray. This was once an open street with an open
16 sandlot next to it and housing to the right. That housed
17 families like mine -- not anymore. This is Irving Street
18 where you can wait for the streetcar -- in the shadows of UC.
19 This is where you could park your car except it's closed
20 most of the time, not because it's full, they just don't
21 open the ramp. That's "that" ramp that I was showing you
22 out the front window with that beautiful landscaping.
23 They did correct it recently, but it's not grown yet. It
24 will never be as pretty as it was. This is the way the
25 community responded. That's a house for sale. That's
26 another one. There's another one, and there. Look all
27 four on one block, on one weekend. See why up the street?
28 Could you live with that? Breath that? Smell that? Hear

-40-

1 that? See that every day?

2 That's the way we feel! And so this is what we did.
3 We took our concerns to the people who represent us and we
4 cried out for hearings; one from ABAG about the UC plans.
5 We had our Honorable Mr. LaPoint tell us he didn't want to
6 hear from every Tom, Dick, and Harry about the university's
7 plans. 1972. There it is in big bold letters. Cry a
8 little Bob. So, we got our hearing, and this is what we
9 were talking about; misrepresentations in that EIR. They
10 said that UC's Dental School was going to replace the dilapidated
11 neighborhood housing. That's UC property. They've had
12 it for ten years. They let it get that way. There's that
13 same house. They even let it go so bad they had to tear it
14 down because the Health Department told them to. That's
15 that whole block. That's Fifth Avenue, the hill up from
16 me, the block up from me. That's where my friends grew up.
17 They're going to tear it down for a Dental School. There
18 it is in beautiful sunlight. On the other side of the
19 block, the Fourth Avenue has the most beautiful views of
20 the Pacific Ocean and the outer Sunset. We're going to lose
21 that housing stock for a Dental School on an already
22 impacted campus. Here's some more of that stuff about
23 the community's outrage and going to hearings. Here's
24 some more. Here's some more. We got the supervisors to
25 take a stand and, again, I'll be through in a minute --
26 here's some more, and some more, and you know what,
27 they don't say one word about controversy over the university,
28 not one word! There's still some more and some more and
29 some more in their own groupers, and, you know, what, we're

-41-

1 suing them. We even had a press conference. There we all
2 are talking about it again, and here's something else,
3 I'm sorry, Bob, but this is too priceless to pass up. A
4 neighbor put this together and I think you can read it and
5 enjoy it with us. And our beautiful vistas and forests and
6 flowers. If one could only get beyond the barbed wire --
7 beyond the barb wire and the animals, they do; how the wind,
8 they do blow and the bulldozers do keep rolling, eating
9 houses, streets and trees. If we don't act to stop it,
10 Mount Sutro will disappear. Concrete, asphalt, and steel
11 will crease every last leaf, for a false-hearted neighbor
12 is worse than a thief.

13 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Ms. Murphy.
14 After Mr. Olsen, we'll have Mr. Bardis.

15 Excuse me, could you please keep the noise down so
16 Mr. Olsen can give a little testimony. Thank you.

17 JOHN OLSEN,

18 1455 - Eight Avenue, San Francisco

19 ISAC

20 MR. OLSEN: I like to address my remarks, specifically
21 to the impact of the Long Range Development Plan on the
22 housing stock in the Inner Sunset.

23 MR. LAPOINT: Do you have slides, Mr. Olsen? Okay.

24 MR. OLSEN: The physical state of the residential
25 structures in this community has not approached the deterioration
26 of those in the Haight-Ashbury Community with the exception
27 of the area directly adjoining the university.

28 I like to point out that most of the houses directly

1 adjoining the university belong to the university, and all
2 those basically sound structures have been poorly maintained
3 and this has caused their deterioration over the years.
4 The growth of the UCSF Campus has been paralleled by the
5 growth of the surrounding neighborhood which now consists
6 of high density residential community composed of ethnically
7 diverse population of all incomes and ages.

8 Well, just this past last year we rezoned this entire
9 neighborhood on the basis that it was a low density neighborhood.
10 In fact, the entire area is either R-2 or R-1, and I can't
11 account for that comment in the summary of the Environmental
12 Impact Report. This showed all of the houses that have
13 been either confiscated or acquired by the university over
14 300 dwelling units have been either confiscated or acquired
15 by the university in past years. On the left those are
16 the homes that were devastated for the UC Clinics Building
17 and Garage and the Center. Those homes are presently
18 being used by the university as offices, over 200 of them.
19 Over 100 houses were demolished for the UC Clinics Building.
20 Those houses are still being used by the university.
21 They have been denied to the residents of San Francisco
22 who have a very limited scarce number of low to moderate
23 income housing units. All of those units up to your
24 right are also owned by the university and the first 18
25 houses on the left side on Fourth Avenue are destined to
26 be demolished for the new Dental School and I might point
27 out that all of these residences are presently being used
28 in violation of the City Ordinances. This is Third Avenue.

1 All of the houses are being used by the university. As
2 you can see, they're all basically sound houses. In fact,
3 the university's Community Affairs Office uses one of them.
4 This is Third Avenue going up on the other side. That house
5 was destroyed by the university because it was rat infested.
6 All of this housing has been destroyed to the community.
7 This is the housing on Fourth Avenue between Fourth and Fifth
8 which is destined for the Dental School. That is the first
9 13 hours on the top.

10 MR. LAPOINT: Mr. Olsen, can I ask you - -

11 MR. OLSEN: I'll be through in a second, Bob.

12 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much.

13 MR. OLSEN: Here is a view from some of those houses.
14 ~~They're among the best in the city. This is a view from~~
15 ~~one of the houses on Fifth Avenue, up looking to Mount Sutro.~~
16 ~~These are the homes that will be destroyed, demolished.~~
17 ~~All of these homes could be renovated and I'm sure there will~~
18 ~~be plenty of buyers. All of them will be denied to the~~
19 ~~tax rolls of San Francisco. They are presently being used~~
20 ~~as offices in violation of City Ordinances and will be~~
21 ~~destroyed forever. These houses are not destined to be~~
22 ~~destroyed, but will probably be continued to be used as~~
23 ~~offices although the university mentioned some of them may~~
24 ~~be converted to residences, it is the last priority in their~~
25 ~~plan and most likely will never happen and probably will be~~
26 ~~too expensive to convert and used for student housing.~~

27 MR. LAPOINT: Mr. Olsen, could you conclude your
28 remarks?

-44-

F-26

1 MR. OLSEN: Just about through. A lot of houses are
2 owned by the university. This is all on Fifth Avenue, all
3 being used for offices, every one of them, and to summarize
4 once again, these are the 300 dwellings which the university
5 has denied to the community and which has caused the very
6 serious deterioration in the housing stock in this area
7 and is only because of the residents' determination to improve
8 the area through rezoning, through renovation of their houses,
9 through joining together in a common action to bring some
10 sense to this university that we've gained some. It's a very
11 delicate period now of stability which is going to be ruined
12 by the very existence of this Long Range Development Plan.
13 It has an impact in itself. the very fact that it exists
14 and contemplates these programs. Even if they never go
15 through, we will have an impact on the surrounding housing
16 and its desirability to families. Thank you.

17 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Olsen. As I
18 indicated before, we're trying to limit the presentations to
19 five minutes if you're representing an organization, and
20 three minutes as an individual. We still have quite a few
21 more people who wish to give testimony tonight, so I'll
22 please ask you to respect their rights too and try and limit
23 your discussions to those allotted times. Thank you very much.
24 Mr. Bardis. After Mr. Bardis, it says John E. Barry.

25 JOHN BARDIS,

26 1353 - FOURTH AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO

27 ISAC

28 MR. BARDIS: Bob, I just like to make a couple of points

-45-

1 before I provide the rest of our presentation, and that is,
2 that we are concerned about the Long Range Development Plan.
3 We had a conversation this evening, discussion by the planner
4 about the Long Range Development Plan and this presumably
5 was a hearing on the Environmental Impact Report. If you had
6 your consultant here on the Environmental Impact Report,
7 he would have talked about the Environmental Impacts that he
8 has described in his report to this community. Presumably,
9 that was the purpose of the hearing and when you confused it,
10 it confuses people here who are probably not as versed with
11 the subject as probably others who have followed it over the
12 years. The main thing you should be addressing to here is
13 that there is a real need for a new Draft and I'll indicate
14 why that there would be. We have some parking problems.
15 Talk about transportation -- and here's the Draft that we've
16 had in front of the Med Center and you had lights put up here
17 just a year ago and was it -- by July 2, people had been
18 killed on the street because you have pedestrians running
19 across the street because you built a building across the
20 street from Parnassus. This is the kind of real threat to the
21 community life and limb that's happening to your growth.

22 In addition to that, we have parking problems. There's
23 a little sign -- that's a car parked in front of the
24 driveway in a garage door. There's a little sign here that
25 says, "Please do not do this again otherwise I will have to
26 tow you away -- get you towed away." We have good enforcement
27 taking place by the police officer here. This is upside
28 down, but it shows that we have a hundred parking -- illegal

1 parking vehicles -- illegally parked everyday now. You're
2 projecting by your own Environmental Impact Report, it
3 will be over 800 illegally parked cars. We feel it will even
4 be worse than that. You've taken over our streets for parking
5 lots. You've taken over housing to use as parking lots.
6 You put parking lots behind the housing on Third Avenue,
7 punched holes through the Third Avenue for parking lots.
8 You've even taken over Golden Gate Park and you don't
9 say a thing about this in your Environmental Impact Report.
10 Here are all your students and faculty parked in Golden Gate
11 Park and here's your plan in the Environmental Impact Report.
12 The boundaries lines of the survey follow the community and
13 don't even go into G.G. Park -- Golden Gate Park and that's
14 your biggest parking lot, Bob. You're overlooking it. It's
15 only a block away from your campus and that ought to be corrected.

16 We have 2,000 people as an increase in this campus, but
17 what do we have for students; 600 of those students.

18 Then we look at those students on some other figures.
19 I don't know why you don't reconcile, but in any event, we
20 only see a couple of hundred in terms of dental or medical
21 students being increased. So, what's the purpose of the
22 expansion -- of adding another Transamerica Building on the
23 campus for two or three hundred dental or medical students.

24 Look at our plan for 50 acres of Open Space. The
25 original areas have been preserved by the university for
26 development. The yellow areas are presumably developed.
27 Obviously, the top of the Mount Sutro and the side over there
28 which is the easier slope, is the best part of the whole

1 campus has been set aside. Only part of the campus the City
2 owns is that little green part right on the Mount Sutro
3 side that the City put out \$150,000 for 15 years ago and picked
4 up the Montgomery parcel; otherwise we don't have anything,
5 we're told.

6 The Community Master Plan calls for permanent Open
7 Space on Mount Sutro. This plan that you had here calls for
8 ten year plan. It should be a permanent plan, Bob, not a
9 ten year plan. We have a permanent community here. It's
10 mature, urbanized area. There's no need for ten year
11 increments in plans here. It's over. We're mature!

12 You have proposed three different stages of growth and
13 we are very concerned about the spaces for the growth, and
14 you know, you're looking for space. You're talking about
15 Thunder School Building. You're talking about a Moffitt
16 Expansion. You're talking about more space; space, space,
17 space, and what's the space being used for? Private offices
18 on public property for private patients, for private fees.
19 These are the private offices and in fact, as we walk out this
20 evening and go all the way down this corridor, you just look
21 at those names on those doors and just ask yourself, are
22 there patients in there. This is UC Hospital. This is the
23 building that's supposedly going to be seismically unsafe,
24 and it's going to collapse on our heads, and therefore, you
25 have to move and build a \$60 million facility across the way.
26 We have more offices. Well, I just want to pick more.
27 Again, like the houses, you have a lot of the private houses.
28 Let me just review.

1 MR. LAPOINT: I hope you won't go to each office. Maybe
2 you can indicate how many the total is.

3 MR. BARIS: I'll indicate this, Bob, it would have been
4 very fair - - I don't expect that from the university, but
5 if you had been equitable, you would have had said, Mr.
6 Parker, come in with your 20 minutes, we'll have some community
7 people come in with their 20 minutes to deal with the plan as
8 a plan from people who follow it and then there would have
9 been pros and cons from both sides and so we're trying to do
10 it with your limitations and we know we're getting strangled
11 by it little bit, but we'll survive.

12 MR. LAPOINT: John, thank you.

13 MR. BARDIS: Why don't you ask people if they would
14 mind?

15 VOICE: Go ahead, John, finish it.

16 MR. BARDIS: So, here's the private practices and here
17 the people that are moved from this building now to the new
18 Clinics Building across the street that were built with
19 public funds. Their private offices now have new facilities.
20 This is a corridor of private offices right outside here.
21 The people that are moved over to the other building are
22 the people that were marked "X". The "X" is over in the
23 left hand column into the new building. Now, here's the
24 new building, Neurosurgery and you see these are the people
25 that have their private offices there now in beautiful
26 facilities. You wonder why the medical profession is outraged
27 in San Francisco with this kind of abuse of public funds.
28 Here's an indication of the Clinics Building which is a building

1 right next door to this. It shows in the Clinics Building
2 which is the left hand column what's left in that building,
3 and here's what's been moved across the street. Now that's
4 rather important because in our community proposal, we've
5 asked and in our original plan in '64, you said you would
6 put a Dental School Building in the Clinics Building when
7 you moved out of it. Now here's another Clinics Building as
8 it was on Sunday and here are your plastic curtains where
9 you're renovating it and that's where the Dental School
10 could be going in and you could move whatever was going into
11 here, into those private offices across the way here and leave
12 our houses to us. There are whole floors in that Clinics
13 Building which is that red thing in the middle of that Open
14 Space for us, and Bob, what it really amounts to is, we have
15 private practice here taking place which really should not
16 be taking place on public facilities. We have them taking
17 up, using space here. We also have the university taking
18 funds and squandering it on a new hospital facility on this
19 campus where/are surplus facilities in the facility, and
20 then there's very miniscule increase in medical students being
21 caused by these monies, so the real question people would
22 ask is, you're spending millions here. You're not increasing
23 the Dental and the Medical professionals and whose
24 pocket are you lining with all these new facilities? You're
25 not giving us any doctors or any dentists. Thank you.

26 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Bardis. Now
27 I like to proceed to call John E. Barry.

28 JOHN E. BARRY,

1 1581 - 11th Avenue, San Francisco
2 R.E.A.

3 MR. BARRY: I can see no reason to try to add to what
4 these people just said. I just want to give them a round of
5 applause.

6 MR. LAPOINT: The next speaker is Linda Chalmers, and
7 Sue Hestor is after that.

8 LINDA CHALMERS,

9 1235 - 12th Avenue

10 INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE

11 MS. CHALMERS: My reports have been taken in.

12 SUE HESTOR,

13 4536 - 20th Street

14 SAN FRANCISCO COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH
15 PLANNING COUNCIL

16 MS. HESTOR: My name is Sue Hestor. I'm a member of
17 San Francisco Comprehensive Health Planning Council, and I
18 would like to address all concerns about this procedure.

19 You should have received already a letter which was
20 a Motion passed by CHP at our May meeting. That letter
21 went to the State Legislature.

22 San Francisco Comprehensive Health Planning is
23 responsible for health planning in the city for all health
24 planning in the city. CHP has requested the university as
25 well as the Legislature to make sure that we get a chance
26 to review your Long Range Development Plan.

27 It is going in the back door to avoid the only medical
28 planning body that exists in this city. To avoid us by
29 going directly to the State Legislature for your funding
30 is dishonest in an institution which in token at least
gives support to the idea of medical planning in this

1 city. We have to deal with every other medical facility in
2 this city; every other hospital of every other small project
3 that deals with medical care. Groups that are going for
4 \$25,000 of federal funds have to have CHP's approval because
5 you're a State Agency. If you avoid us, that is medically
6 and ethically dishonest. The affects of UC expansion and the
7 effects of the way UC does its medicine in this city can
8 be seen in every medical aspect in the city. UC doctors
9 have offices at other medical institutions in this city.

10 We would like to see a Long Range Development Plan that
11 talks about how the expansion of UC is going to affect
12 other medical institutions because we cannot do planning in
13 a vacuum. Right now, there is a disparity of medical
14 services in this city. This area around Mount Sutro,
15 around the UC Med. Center has a concentration of medical
16 facilities. In other parts of the city there is no medical
17 service or poor medical service to the extent you do not
18 honestly address alternatives that would shift your
19 facilities to other parts of the city. You're not really
20 dealing with it medically in this city.

21 CHP would like you to submit or ask you to give us at
22 least 30 days to evaluate your Long Range Master Plan.
23 That is the minimal amount of time. We would really like
24 a longer amount of time.

25 You are doing dishonest medical planning. You may be
26 doing fine and I disagree with that architectural planning,
27 but you are not doing good medicine. I think you have a
28 responsibility to deal with the rest of the medical community
29 in this city. I think you have the responsibility to come

1 to CHP which is composed of both health providers and health
2 consumers and people from this university. You should be
3 coming to us. Those of us who have to do this on a
4 day long range basis deal with medical institutions in this
5 city and do some planning. By going to the State legislature
6 in the phony method that you have done, by going in,
7 rushing in with the Long Range Development Plan, rushing
8 in with an EIR, and having these deadlines that no one can
9 really evaluate are things that are putting too much
10 pressure on us. When a group comes in with a request from
11 ABAG for a \$25,000. grant, they've got to give us 30 days
12 to evaluate their proposal so that we can gear up. This
13 is \$100 million worth of expansion. We deserve; the community
14 deserves, the medical institution in the city deserves
15 some time to really get into this plan. Don't cut yourself
16 off from us. We, you know, we will down the line reek
17 the whirl wind. If you do, you will reek the wind, because
18 there are going to be effects of this expansion in every
19 part of the communities in this city and on medicine in all
20 communities. Those of you who go home at night to your --
21 in many cases out of the city to your suburban homes, leave
22 the problems behind when you walk out, get into your car,
23 go across the bridge across the San Mateo boundary. We
24 live here. We got to deal with it on a daily basis. We
25 got to deal not only with the housing on our neighborhood,
26 but the medical care we are receiving in this community.
27 You haven't been cooperating with the rest of the medical
28 community in the city. You have not been cooperating with

1 CHP. I think you owe us an explanation why you are not
2 doing that; why you aren't voluntarily bringing your plan
3 for review and the Long Range Plan with everyone else that
4 deals with medicine in the city. I think you have an
5 obligation to go to CHP and ask for our review. Thank you.

6 MR. LAPOINT: Now, could we have Mr. Michael Rice, and
7 after Mr. Rice, Mr. Mermel.

8 MICHAEL RICE,

9 1228 Third Avenue, San Francisco

10 MR. RICE: My name is Michael Rice and I live at
11 1228 Third Avenue.

12 One year ago I was in this room discussing the traffic
13 impact and the School of Dentistry EIR and how the litigating
14 the measures proposed in that EIR did not appear to meet - -

15 MR. LAPOINT: Could I please ask you to keep the noise
16 down while Mr. Rice is giving testimony, just some respect
17 for his testimony. Thank you very much.

18 MR. RICE: Well, one year ago I was in this room and
19 probably others of you were also. We were talking about
20 the School of Dentistry EIR and I talked about how the
21 mitigating measures proposed in that EIR did not appear to
22 meet State guidelines because they were not part of the pro-
23 ject planned. We haven't progressed very far.

24 The EIR in the Long Range Development Plan clearly points
25 out the adverse serious traffic and parking impacts which
26 will result from the carrying out of the expansion of
27 the Medical Center.

28 The State EIR guidelines direct that discussion of

1 voidable adverse impacts, and I think the impacts in this
2 EIR are voidable if the university will face up to the
3 measures that these are voidable adverse impacts and
4 measures to minimize these impacts and I quote: "Shall
5 include an identification of the acceptable levels to which
6 such impacts will be reduced and the basis upon which
7 such levels were identified." Well, this isn't in the EIR.
8 The right mitigating measures for traffic and parking
9 impacts described on pages 142 and 180 of the Long Range
10 Development Plan, EIR do not refer to any acceptable levels
11 to which the traffic problems will be reduced, nor any
12 basis upon which such acceptable levels can be identified.
13 In fact, such compliance with the guidelines would require
14 quantitative evaluation to the effect of selling Bart
15 tickets and encouraging car pooling or running special
16 purpose shuttles by UC would have on the overall traffic
17 generated by the Long Range Development Plan. Unless
18 this is done, this EIR is inadequate both in terms of
19 fulfilling the State guidelines and in making clear any
20 commitment by UC to attack these traffic problems that is
21 imposing on this community. The kind of mitigating measures
22 UC proposes are mere window dressings on a problem that it
23 doesn't intend to solve because the real solution would
24 require major scaling down of UCSF plans, a mitigating
25 measure alternative that UC isn't going to discuss openly.
26 Thank you.

27 MR. LAPOINT: We will take a five minute break.

28 (SHORT RECESS TAKEN)

MR. LAPOINT: Mr. Poloski wanted to ask just one question or clarify, really, one point, and I'll be glad to clarify that point before we proceed with the rest of the official testimony.

MR. POLOSKI: What I wanted to ask Mr. LaPoint is something I asked him during the break and I wasn't clear on it, and I'm not sure everybody here was. I'm sorry that half of the people left in the last five minutes,

and that is, who in fact certifies this Draft EIR or any Draft EIR regarding this project as in the final form a certifiable Environmental Impact Report -- that's okay, I mean, who does that?

MR. LAPOINT: After we finish the public testimony for the Draft Environmental Impact Report tonight, all your comments will be included in the Final Environmental Impact Report and there will be responses to all your comments. This Final Environmental Impact Report then goes to the Board of Regents for their certification after it's been reviewed by the Chancellor, Office of the President, and General Council; that is the answer to your comment.

Now, I would like to go on with testimony.

I like to first include into the public hearing a statement by Mrs. Susan Bradbury, and I will not hand this to the shorthand reporter.

MRS. SUSAN BRADBURY

UCSF Development Plans - Public Benefit?

The EIR Report (on the Proposed Long Range Development Plan of the University of California, San Francisco, May

1975) indicates that presently 31 percent of the UCSF Campus population commutes from outside the City of San Francisco. Let's assume this same residence distribution for 184-85 and assume that the majority of non-city residents arrive by automobile -- in particular, due to irregular hours and fewer direct commuting lines to this area.

By utilizing the Exhibits IX-25 and IX-26, page 134 EIR, we assume the following:

Commuting Modes of SF Resident Campus Population		
Commuting Mode	ALL UCSF Campus Population (100%)	SF Residents UCSF Campus Population (69%)
Auto:		
From outside City	31%	
Within City	28%	
Total	59%	41%
Non-Auto:		
Transit	20% (12% increase to 32%)	(32%/69% = 46% increase 29%, 17% increase
Walking	19%	28%
Taxi	1%	1%
Other	1%	1%
Total	41%	59%

Therefore, 29% of SF resident campus population presently commute by transit. By 1984, if current plans are undertaken, the total number of transit commuters to the UCSF Campus must increase by 12% (page 141, EIR) to eliminate the need for 710 non-existent parking spaces. In other words, 47% of San Francisco resident population would have to commute by public transportation.

This is a reduction of the percentage of SF residents who travel to UCSF via auto by 18%. The percentage of walkers is not expected to increase due to the lack of student housing in the area. Car pooling is difficult due to

1 to unpredictable work hours of many workers and inconvenience,
2 etc. Therefore, all reduction in auto commuting must be
3 accomplished through increased transit usage.

4 Due to odd working hours of campus population, indirect
5 transit routes, time, convenience, etc., it will be difficult
6 to convert auto riders to public transit.

7 The present level of on-street parking has already caused
8 much resident inconvenience. In addition, the heavy traffic
9 on neighborhood streets has made the area unsuitable for
10 family residents. The neighborhood will continue to change
11 negatively as absentee landlords and more transient populations
12 move into the area, as families and long time residents
13 move out to seek more peaceful and less congested surroundings.
14 The character of the neighborhood is changing, the community
15 or neighborhood feeling is weakening. Increased traffic
16 and parking problems will only worsen the present negative
17 effects of UCSF on the neighboring communities.

18 In addition, the EIR Report never mentioned the increase
19 of parking problems and traffic during construction. Most
20 construction plans of this magnitude require a large
21 number of construction workers and construction vehicles.

22 The EIR study suggested as incentives to increase transit
23 usage to provide limited time parking, and/or resident
24 parking only on neighborhood streets. Neither of these
25 unresearched solutions would alleviate the problem, but
26 cause more inconvenience for residents and their guests
27 and increase illegal parking. In addition, streets in
28 Golden Gate Park will be utilized for UCSF parking needs,

1 rather than recreational purposes.

2 Ask yourself -- are UCSF's proposed plans a public
3 benefit?

4 Recommendation: A Study of auto commuters should be
5 undertaken to determine reasons for such mode of commuting,
6 to determine possible reductions in auto commuting and
7 increased use of public transportation. Is it possible to
8 reduce San Francisco resident campus auto commuters by
9 17% by 1985? NO!

10 MR. LAPOINT: Now, I like to go along and -- Mr.
11 Ron Mermel is next on the agenda and then Marcia Lindeen.

12 RON MERMEL,

13 28 HILL POINT AVENUE

14 PARNASSUS HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION

15 MR. MERMEL: My name is Ron Mermel, Parnassus Heights
16 Association.

17 In the interest of time, I'm going to like eliminate
18 a lot of points I planned to say rather than repeat what
19 other speakers have said.

20 The Parnassus Heights Association worked with other
21 neighborhood groups, everyone surrounding Mount Sutro
22 in the formulation of the Mount Sutro Community Master
23 Plan and its institutional expansion element.

24 The Master Plan of UC fails to take this into regard.
25 It fails to take into account the necessary dialogue between
26 UC and its community and in the interest of a dialogue,
27 it's interesting to note tonight that the Vice-Chancellor
28 Erickson left at 8:25, and Chancellor Sooy stayed only 25

1 minutes.

2 One thing that the EIR fails to do is consider alternative
3 facilities here in San Francisco such as the VA or Public
4 Health Hospitals, and the fact that the Bay Area Comprehensive
5 Health Planning Council has long ago stated that there's too
6 many empty hospital beds in San Francisco. The EIR does not
7 also address itself to the fact that alternative sites might
8 exist in other neighborhoods of San Francisco or better,

9 perhaps, also, on the other campuses throughout the State of
10 California. There comes a point, I think when the neighborhoods
11 who worked so hard in terms of rezoning beautification efforts
12 to maintain the housing stock and so forth have come to the
13 point where we've said, "Enough is enough." And what you've
14 heard tonight is just that. Those of us who are here raising
15 families, renting, homeownership, whatever, have said, "Enough
16 is enough," and what we'll come to is that the association has
17 said, UC should restrict its construction or alternations
18 on the facilities to the present levels of 2.9 million gross
19 square feet and both the community and the legislature have
20 insisted that the university used gross square feet, not
21 assignable square feet because gross is real, assignable, and
22 is a figure on paper. Your four thousand gross square foot
23 incinerator is real, but it disappears when you put it in
24 terms of assignable square foot. Within the past 20 years,
25 40 residential structures have been demolished for expansion.
26 Eighteen more are now scheduled for demolition to accommodate
27 the Dental School. With the critical shortage of housing,
28 you should restore the private family ownership, the houses

1 acquired or confiscated by UC. It's also interesting to note
2 that the prior Chancellor of 1971 gave a ten year commitment.
3 Well, there's only six years left to that commitment. We're
4 wondering what does Chancellor Sooy - - what's his position
5 now as to acquiring property. It's that type of instability
6 that we feel that the presence of the university in order to
7 get some type of stability, we've come up with that Community
8 Master Plan with our plans for our community. Your plans are
9 only for ten years. Our plans are the way we want to see it
10 forever.

11 One thing that we do applaud is your plan to beautify
12 Parnassus Avenue, yet most of your major proposed construction
13 is taking place on the East end of the Campus. Interestingly
14 enough that your landscape planners, Royston and Beck, and
15 Hanamoto, Mr. Parker. The beautification plan only goes as
16 far as Hillway when in fact your new entrance, your North-South
17 Medical Center way entrance will be opposite Hillpoint which
18 is an extreme East end. So, what we propose is your beautifi-
19 cation plan for Parnassus, go to the very East end of your
20 campus that includes a mini-park such as you're proposing
21 for the center of the campus and that the community be
22 consulted in the design, if it ever does come to that stage,
23 in that the community be consulted, and that the new cross
24 campus entrance road and entrance to the campus and also
25 taken the fact the presence of the private medical building,
26 the Parnassus Heights Building of 350 Parnassus. The presence
27 of that building does relate to the community and does relate
28 to the university and your planning should reflect that.

1 The last thing is that you know we're trying to preserve
2 a residential neighborhood. We respect the fact fine
3 institutions like this needs to maintain fine medical
4 training and services, but we're saying, "Enough is enough"
5 from the residential community and you should start looking
6 at other facilities in San Francisco and across the State to
7 decentralize. If you're going to tear down UC, if you
8 insist on that, then if you still stay within your 2.9 gross
9 square feet, you can still do some construction as is
10 necessary, but within that limit. Thank you.

11 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Mr. Mermel.
12 Now, Ms. Lindeen. After her is Joseph Minahan.

13 MARCIA LINDEEN,

14 1330 Fourth Avenue, San Francisco

15 ISAC

16 MS. LINDEEN: My name is Marcia Lindeen from the Inner-
17 Sunset Action Committee and I've lived in this area since 1956
18 and worked in the area also. If a patient told you that he
19 took three pills at a time instead of the one you prescribed,
20 if some is good, more is better, you would try to change that
21 attitude.

22 We are here today to try to change your attitude because
23 we don't want to be wiped out by an overdose of medicine.

24 The Medical model most applicable and frequently heard
25 concerning the rampant growth that has lost its capacity for
26 self-restraint is cancer, and you have become this cancer in
27 our midst that we have to battle over years of time
28 because you keep coming up with new gigantic plans for

1 wiping us out. You profess concern for the health and well
2 being of all people and yet are wilfully and knowingly
3 violating the laws that protect us from the excessive onslaught
4 of pollution and noise both known by you to have harmful
5 cumulative effects on our bodies. We have seen the quality
6 of care at this previous well-thought of medical center
7 decline while the mushrooming growth of buildings consumed our
8 taxdollars and the time and energy of the administrators
9 whose function should have been to see that the health care
10 needs of the people were served, not cash flow needs of
11 architects and construction companies propelled by the aggressive
12 competition between and within the departments for more
13 secretaries, more administrators, more research assistants.
14 Tell us how many primary care physicians have you graduated
15 since UC learned that this was the greatest need in California?
16 Even San Francisco which has an over-supply of physicians is
17 lacking in them, and they won't be replied by this type of
18 institution where the status is in research and sub-specialties
19 and the people are avoiding providing the care that's needed
20 within our own city in the Mission Districts and South of
21 Market. This is an unfortunate demonstration of the
22 mal-distribution of health care services throughout our
23 State and it exists even in here in San Francisco and we're
24 very concerned about the health care dollars being spent in
25 this way, because we want to see health care easily accessible
26 to all the people. We do not think that this comes from a
27 dehumanized environment of people in high rises alienated
28 from each other as well as the patients that does not create

1 an atmosphere where the physicians are willing to take the time
2 to spend to get a good history from their patient and not just
3 send them to the lab and see what it comes up with.

4 Now the EIR gives false data on the true impact of UC
5 San Francisco on the traffic and parking problems in our
6 neighborhood, both as it is now and with the impact of the
7 proposed growth of 1800 more people on campus. Sixty percent
8 of the 12,000 on campus now come by car. If 60 percent
9 of the 1800 additional people do that, we will have over
10 1,000 more cars trying to get here through our already
11 congested streets which are loaded now to beyond their
12 capacity and looking for parking. Meanwhile UC will have
13 removed or built over 275 of the spaces. They currently
14 have 1,000 cars in excess of the spaces of the UC garage and
15 lots that now impact our area, not just to the Seventh

16 Avenue and Lincoln area that they show on their survey map, but
17 to Tenth Avenue and all the way into Golden Gate Park where
18 hundreds of UC cars are illegally parked everyday.

19 We would like to have you stop counting all of our neighbor-
20 hood spaces as your parking inventory. If you can, try to
21 keep in mind that we residents need parking for ourselves too.
22 Stanyan Street and Seventh Avenue and Lincoln Way are all at
23 capacity now by your own statement on page 129 where you can
24 put -- where can you put the traffic capacity increase of 15
25 percent that this LRDP would increase according to page 135.
26 And page 177, Item 4, it's already not just merely exceeds
27 the existing capacity. We certainly appreciate your offer
28 to rent the residence spaces as your garage so you can

1 continue to use the space in front of our houses for free
2 parking for yourselves, but we do not want that arrangement,
3 thank you. Provision for ambulances, fire trucks and police
4 to bypass this congestion by using the wrong side of Parnassus
5 are suggestive. If the real truth about the problems were
6 expressed, they would have to acknowledge that the traffic is
7 bumper to bumper in both directions. Now the statement that
8 through traffic will probably seek alternative routes forgets
9 that only two lane residential streets lead to this campus.
10 The EIR is inadequate because it does not even mention the
11 City College Fault line which is only one mile away.

12 We request seismic evaluation on all of the buildings we
13 made available so we can see if you are applying the same
14 standards to all the buildings that you are using for an excuse
15 to tear down this very sturdy building which we are in tonight.

16 Old UC Hospital had an evaluation before the extensive
17 rewiring and re-plumbing with our taxpayer's money. That was done
18 only ten years ago. We hope to have it used for administration
19 or outpatient surgery or clinics and not demolish it. We can
20 no longer afford to make such a wasteful misuse of our natural
21 resources and our tax money. This building is on a very sturdy
22 piece of bedrock with very little overlay of ground as it is in
23 the other sections where you have your high rise development
24 while Moffitt straddles the bedrock valley where the site
25 varies widely in soil types and soil depths vary from 40 feet to
26 140 feet. This will be over-burdened by doubling the size
27 of Moffitt and adding the 16 floor Health-Science Tower.

28 The next major earthquake hits, what happens then?

1 With ten of our major hospital facilities concentrated in this
2 two mile radius of Mount Sutro, the disruption of just a couple
3 of streets would make services unavailable. The EIR is
4 inadequate because it does not effectively deal with the noise
5 problems. It cites that all our neighborhood streets are already
6 exceeding the maximum allowable noise level for a residential
7 district of 55 DBA. Currently, there is a range of 54 to 71
8 50% of the time and 64 to 80, 10% of the time. The temporary
9 inconvenience that they speak of in ten years of construction
10 noise with early morning steel deliveries and cement trucks
11 going up our hills will be unbearable.

12 Page 148 refers to selecting truck routes, but if they know
13 the territory, they would know there are no alternative routes
14 available that do not go up hills and through residential
15 districts and can you believe that 1,000 cars in our neighborhood
16 and the traffic would not increase, the noise level?

17 I have one more thing that I like to cover, if you
18 don't mind, Bob. I listened to you quite a while tonight.

19 This EIR is inadequate because the wind problem was
20 against -- if you hadn't ignored so many things, we wouldn't
21 have to say so much.

22 VOICE: Right, right.

23 MS. LINDEEN: Even though this was brought out at the
24 previous EIR hearings on Moffitt Hospital, the problem will not
25 blow away. If you will acknowledge, and surely the technology
26 is available to record and examine this problem, they were
27 able to do it in the last century and I think you can do it
28 again this year.

1 The air displacement caused by the combination of
2 high rise buildings on the hill creates high velocity winds
3 that are especially severe in the area of the new Clinics
4 Building and Moffitt Hospital. Doubling the size of Moffitt
5 and adding another 16 story Health Science Tower there and more
6 to Langley Porter will make the wind unbearable. The EIR gave
7 information about increasing the decentralization in their
8 academic planning principle, but still proposes ten more years of
9 concentration of facilities here. How can you reconcile that?
10 To destroy our neighborhoods around the Eastern ends of Golden
11 Gate Park by increasing the already excessive concentration of
12 facilities in this part of town while the whole south of
13 market and Mission districts is underserved and asking for more
14 readily available medical care is an unfortunate example of this
15 mal-distribution of care that we referred to that the Medical
16 Center has proposed throughout the State and that includes the
17 over-production of sub-specialties and research people while
18 neglecting the needs for primary care physician until the State
19 demanded that they be given higher priority in retraining programs.

20 Now, we want to know the amount of space assigned to the
21 administration and students in each school on the campus, the
22 amount of private medical doctors office space and where it is
23 located and does it need to be in the new Clinics Building that
24 we taxpayers are still paying off, the amount of space each office
25 had prior to getting a whole house only because it was vacant
26 and available, and these people now claim to need the whole
27 house space when one office room might have been all that was
28 needed and they have the capacity to expand to infinite given the

1 opportunity and we would like to ask you to re-evaluate the entire
2 Long Range Development Plan, and we hope that you will come up with
3 a statement that is at the end of the book here -- on the 1964
4 Long Range Alternative where it said this alternative is the
5 least feasible since it was based on projected enrollments and
6 provisions of square footage far in excess of those currently
7 needed are feasible on the UCSF Campus and we think this same
8 statement is true of the current Long Range Development Plan.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Mr.
11 Joseph Minahan. After that is Sue Bierman.

12 JOSEPH N. MINAHAN,

13 1377 NINTH AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO

14 MINAHAN ASSOCIATES, URBAN PLANNING
15 CONSULTANTS

16 MR. MINAHAN: Thank you, Mr. LaPoint. I am Joe Minahan of
17 Minahan Associates, urban planning consultants, born and reared
18 in this beautiful city of San Francisco right here in the
19 Haight-Ashbury District, 163 Delmas Street. Thank you Haight
20 Ashbury. You've done a good job and still is doing a good job
21 over there. Since that time I've been a resident right down here
22 on 50 Irving Street with a consulting office. I've been at 26
23 Hugo Street. You've been at the 1200 block of Ninth Avenue
24 and currently I have my office up in the 1300 block of Ninth
25 Avenue. My family home is at Tenth adn Lawton. After we left
26 the Haight-Ashbury, my father built that property and Ms.
27 Thompson brought memories back to me with some of Mr. Bardis'
28 slides, seeing the affiliated colleges, as I recall them in the

1 old days as a youngster. I am now 62 years of age. I want to
2 hand it to these young people for the tremendous organizational
3 program they have mustered here this evening, both as organization-
4 al people and as individuals. In all of my testifying over the
5 last 35 years as a professional and more recently the last ten
6 years before our Board of Supervisors in Sacramento and
7 Washington, D.C., I say in all sincerity to you young people,
8 I have never seen such a tremendous comprehensive documented
9 presentation even in the Halls of Congress, and I mean it!
10 And I am proud at my age and whatever little time the man
11 upstairs allows me, to see and have faith that this beautiful
12 City of San Francisco is not decayed, maybe grass rapidly is
13 going into economic decay, but you can rest assured it will
14 never go into social decay when you have young people like this
15 representing the true feeling, the true hardheads and hands of
16 what actually is happening in this beautiful city today and
17 sad to say, Mr. LaPoint, the University of California, San
18 Francisco is magnificat attribute to what these young people
19 have done as we have seen not only these walls of concrete, but
20 that garage of concrete, we have been encompassed by an amphi-
21 theatre here that has strangled the residents and has crippled
22 the neighborhood, but these people have survived. You can
23 not erase roots; not grass roots, tact roots. There it is right
24 there, your young people. So, my words may be feeble, but I
25 have a lot of technical points here or a few that I mentioned some
26 three years ago and has proceeded through the Board of Supervisors
27 and so on, but any words of mine would not add to the tremendous
28 research that they have done on this EIR and I am sure with

1 the presentations that they've made tonight that they will not
2 forget the proper method and manner of documentation even if
3 they must go to the courts, because of the bureaucratic
4 manner and method of the democratic system in which this
5 university will review this EIR. I'm not interested in that,
6 that's secondary; forget that. My point is this, that I trust
7 that they will present -- whether they go to the courts
8 or whether they go to the Governor himself, this, believe me of
9 anything, you cannot, and you will not ever preempt people.
10 This nation was founded on that. When those poor people back
11 there in the Continental Congress said, "Give me liberty or
12 give me death"-- Patrick Henry -- he meant it! These people
13 meant it! When they present slides like that up into Sacramento
14 and so on, you can rest assured if San Francisco representatives
15 don't stand up and be counted -- and two of them are running
16 for Mayor in this beautiful city of San Francisco, and the three
17 assemblyman -- you rest assured, Bob, I say this to you --
18 pardon me for addressing you by your first name, but I say
19 this to you. I feel perfectly at ease resting whatever experience
20 I had had in this beautiful city with this university and with
21 what I have experienced here tonight. I feel safe in leaving it
22 in the hands of these young people. Thank you very much.

23 MR. LAPOINT: Now, Sue Bierman, and after Sue Bierman,
24 Michael McAvoy.

25 SUE BIERMAN,

26 1529 Shrader Street, San Francisco

27 MS. BIERMAN: I am Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street
28 speaking for San Francisco Tomorrow. I am also speaking as a

1 representative -- not as a representative -- a former
2 member of whatever this is called, The Long Range Planning
3 Development. We were the committee to review the Long Range
4 Development Plan. I took part in that plan and I really want to
5 enter into the official record the problems that that plan and its
6 community participation had. I think the committee was made up
7 of anywhere -- I don't know the exact number, about 20 or 30
8 people. I don't think I ever in the time that I went to those
9 meetings was in the company of more than four community represen-
10 tatives, and I can't tell you any of those four were at any
11 other meeting. Usually there were two of us. I kept going
12 because I really have a great care and concern about the
13 forest. I've worked very hard for saving a lot of trees. I
14 care about it, but I also cared that we tried to work out a
15 community participation process. It became apparent after
16 the first meeting it was totally futile. I had to talk to the
17 Council about it, and the Haight-Ashbury Council asked me to become
18 a non-voting member simply an observer. One time I went to that
19 session and I took a young woman from the Haight who had shown a
20 lot of interest in health care matters, not particularly
21 planning, but health care. She volunteered in clinics. She had
22 given great evidence of interest. She was treated so rudely
23 and so badly, you'd thought I brought an enemy in. It was just
24 a young woman in from the Haight, but she was told that she
25 couldn't speak. It was really an unpleasant situation and I
26 think that this university should do better than that.

27 In these two documents, the Plan itself and the EIR,
28 there's great credibility given to the 50 percent voting on

1 campus planning committee. That's a shuck; that's a farce.
2 There may be 50 percent of some groups who are -- who don't
3 have the kind of memberships that groups have who aren't able
4 to take part in the process because they can't be used that way,
5 but even if all 50 percent were voting, they have no power.
6 The Chancellor has total power. The Chancellor has total veto
7 power, total decision power. The community has no power except
8 to come here and talk to you, Bob. We can talk to you at the
9 Haight-Ashbury Council. We can go on tape. That's a swell
10 deal, you know, but I mean the Chancellor's gone because he
11 can't even live in the neighborhood because it's so unpleasant.
12 He lives, I think in El Cerrito. He can't live in the
13 house up here because there's too much building going on. You
14 know, every year they walk out. That's really -- Ron Mermel's
15 right. ~~That's embarrassment for us to come out here and just~~
16 talk to you who are nice enough and you can come and talk to
17 us any way. I want to speak particularly to the idea that
18 it shouldn't have been a Long Range Development Plan because,
19 guess what, you're already developed! You are so developed that
20 you know, the business of having Dereck Parker and all those
21 people from your departments coming to discuss development,
22 they're talking about the wrong thing. They ought to be
23 talking about medical care. They ought to be talking about how
24 to use the facilities that you have. I'm reminded the university
25 is kind of like a hyperkinetic child that just can't sit still
26 and everybody's troubled and everybody's worried about what do we
27 do with it? What do we do with it? What's going to happen to
28 it. How do you contain it? How do you settle it down?

1 Well, I really feel that way about you guys. It's just,
2 you know --and nothing in this report makes me feel differently.
3 I want to read one, -- two little paragraphs. "Temporary
4 Impacts," it's called. The construction of the components of the
5 LRPD -- DP can be expected to increase traffic congestion, air
6 pollution, noise and parking problems near the campus. This
7 EIR assumes that the individually proposed projects will all be
8 completed during a period from 1975 to 1975. Lots of Luck!
9 During portions of this ten year period, the impacts would
10 be compounded by the simultaneous construction of two or more
11 projects. Traffic congestion would be aggravated by road blockage,
12 movement of large construction vehicles. Deliveries of materials
13 to the campus would bring a large number of trucks into the
14 area with resulting increases in traffic congestion and noise.
15 The total number of truck movement would be in the thousands
16 over a ten year period. Deliveries of steel could be particularly
17 disruptive. They may have to be made in early morning to avoid
18 traffic. The noise impact of these trucks on residences would
19 be substantial at this time of day.

20 In summary, the construction impacts associated with the
21 LRDP would be compounded when two or more projects were
22 under construction simultaneously. It can be expected that
23 the construction would cause varying degrees of disruption to
24 the surrounding community for a period of ten years. Well, I
25 want to tell you that I don't think ten years is anything like
26 it. I think that the problem with this university is that you've
27 got too big a planning staff and you've got yourselves all
28 in a box to thinking you can spend all our lives and our

1 assistance planning. Well, you're planned, and you're built!
2 Now if a building falls down or something -- an earthquake,
3 I guess we'll all get together and help you to get built up
4 again, but until that time, I really would like you to start
5 doing medical care and not spend all the money you've spent
6 on planning. I'm going to put my faith in the legislators
7 of this City and the State and the Federal legislators, and
8 not in this Long Range Planning Process. Thank you.

9 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much, Ms. Bierman. Now
10 could we have Mr. McAvoy, and after that, Mr. Doug Engmann.

11 MICHAEL MC AVOY,
12 1282 SECOND AVENUE
13 PEOPLE'S HEALTH RESOURCE CENTER

14 MR. MC AVOY: I'm from the Haight-Ashbury, People's Health
15 Resource Center, and I was a medical student for a few years and
16 a resident for the last few years either in the Haight Ashbury
17 -- I live on Second Avenue now.

18 So, as a resident, I like to support all the things that
19 I've heard about the Environmental Impact. I like to say some
20 ideas that I have about what I saw tonight and how it -- I don't
21 think it affects positively the quality of health care, but would
22 indeed affect it negatively.

23 I believe in the concept that materiality creates conscious-
24 ness and what you have here in terms of materiality is a compart-
25 mentalization of services and compartmentalization of people
26 so that in little parts, you have different sections of health
27 care and what this does is to compartmentalize ideas about
28 health care that are innately whole ideas which translate into

1 treating people as parts and most of the time, not even as the
2 sum of their parts, but as an arm or leg or uterus or what
3 have you, and also, one of the things I saw was this separation
4 that they have researched here and medical education is a little
5 ways away from that, and then the actual hospital off in a corner
6 and the clinics off in another corner, and I've had enough
7 experience working in medical complexes to know that communication
8 between those things is a miracle rather than a standard process,
9 and with that kind of dis-simplification of services, God
10 knows what can be carried out in the Research Department and
11 how long, what will translations of that will take part in
12 getting it to the medical education and then over to the actual
13 health delivery system. Another thing that I noticed on that
14 was, I guess it's on the south side of Parnassus Avenue. There
15 was all the white coats, the education, the research and the
16 hospital. The services were on the other side. There's been
17 a tradition in this country in health care of racism and
18 elitist classism and I think that this materiality fosters that,
19 and I like to see that end if I'm going to participate in health
20 care any longer in this country and I like to say that the People's
21 Health Resources Center supports a decentralization of health
22 care system so that they will no longer serve private interests,
23 the private interests being drug companies -- if you can,
24 take in the movie that Donald Parker did called, "No Harm"
25 which shows how that happened; hospital supply companies --
26 I once worked for a year in the Supply Department of a hospital.
27 It was incredible how much this hospital supply business been
28 taken over by mass producers of plastic junk, plastic junks gets

1 gets transported on systems that run along on little cars and
2 has taken the place of real human contact. That's really important
3 for health care, and also, it fosters, as I've said the
4 professionalism, the hierarchial kinds of things that go on in a
5 medical complex like this. They just kind of feed off of
6 themselves, and these three things, the drug companies, the
7 health supply systems and the hierarchial professionalism are
8 just drooling and just feed off of medical compexes that grow
9 like this and it's time that we stop the growth of these
10 impersonal medical complexes and that health care in this
11 country begin to serve the people. Thank you.

12 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much.. Mr. Doug Engmann.

13 DOUG ENGMANN,

14 408 STANYAN

15 STANYAN-FULTON STREET ASSOCIATION

16 MR. ENGMANN: My name is Doug Engmann. I'm president of
17 Stanyan-Fulton Street Association, member of the Board of
18 Directors of HANC.

19 It's a pleasure to be here again. I think this is the
20 third or fourth time. We keep going through this again and
21 again. I don't know -- as I look around here, it's interesting
22 mural on the wall, but I was noticing on the wall there a little
23 tabloid that I think the University of California Staff has been
24 maybe reading too much and let me read it to you.

25 "Remember that our school built by the hearts and brains of
26 many great men is greater than all, any, or all of us here
27 today. Join yourself to its greatness. Add the stature of your
28 persoality to these life buildings," and I think maybe living and

1 buildings is a more appropriate term. That was written in 1938
2 which, I think was the beginning of the problems of the Inner-
3 Sunset dealing with the university. It's unfortunate that we're
4 testifying here only on an EIR. It would be more fortunate if
5 we were testifying to somebody who could do something about the
6 Long Range Development Plan. Unfortunately we're not at that point
7 and we have to make -- go through this laborious process because
8 when we sue you on the Long Range Development Plan and EIR,
9 we don't get tossed out of court because the court is the only one
10 that can do something about the EIR. Unfortunately, you can't.
11 We do have a point that we understand the Department of the
12 City's controversial planning is going to hear on the medical
13 aspects of this proposal in addition to saying Fulton Street
14 Association is going to request that the Department of City
15 Planning hold hearings as it must do for any other institution
16 in this City and even though the State owns University of
17 California, we don't believe that the University of California
18 should be exempt from the same requirements that the City has.
19 Therefore, in accordance with the Department of City Planning
20 Guidelines, we're going to request that the Department of City
21 Planning hold hearings on the Long Range Development plan
22 as well as the Mount Sutro community master plan and hopefully
23 when the new ordinances passes, the Board of Supervisors, the
24 University of California will be required to go through this
25 process. I remember last time I was here I made some specific
26 comments on the EIR.

27 I like to take the liberty of pointing out a couple of
28 things for the record and just say that the HANC statement

1 is a formal statement and we'll give you a copy for the record
2 and I won't read it all, however, Calvin didn't have a chance
3 to get around to noting the problems that UC seems to have with
4 its tape measure in measuring the size of the buildings.

5 We have two reports here. One was a Mayor Progress Report,
6 May 1974 on the Long Range Development -- September 1974, and
7 then we have the May 1975 Long Range Development Plan and as the
8 HANC statement says, somehow in the course of nine months, the
9 size of UC has shrunk by about 32,000 square feet. Now maybe
10 they went to the metric system, we're not sure, but it's curious
11 that in an EIR upon which there are certain legal requirements
12 that their discrepancy between the two reports on the size of
13 the buildings which has impact in terms of the Environmental
14 Impact as well as has some relationship to the 33.5 gross
15 million square feet limitation, and I'll give you an example.
16 For example, on page four of the September 1974 Progress Report
17 the gross square feet figure for the Proctor Building Laboratory
18 was 10,916 gross square feet and on the -- in the new report,
19 the Proctor Building is now listed as 9,864 gross square feet or
20 a loss about a thousand square feet in nine months.

21 We know John Bardis is working hard, but I don't think his
22 magical act has gotten that far. If you go through the reports,
23 you'll find out about, I'd say at least 30 to 35 other instances.
24 I think a court would have some very serious concerns about trying
25 to reconcile those kinds of differences. I know we have a lot
26 of concern about that and I'm sure the legislators are going
27 to have a lot of concern when they start looking at that 3.5
28 million gross square feet. We intend to look at it and we hope

1 that you look at it because this is just an indication that the
2 type of -- I don't know what you call it -- sloppiness,
3 typing errors or just plain deceit in terms of trying to get the
4 types of building that you want in under the limitation.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you very much. Mr. Allen Birdsall.

7 ALLEN BIRDSALL,
8 638 PARNASSUS AVENUE

9 MR. BIRDSALL: I live on Parnassus. I'm right across the
10 street from this building in a block between Third and Fourth
11 Avenue.

12 The university proposes to build a Child Care Center on the
13 corner of Third Avenue and Parnassus. That would be in the
14 lower corner of that vacant lot where the nurses' dormitory were
15 torn down. It would be directly behind our property.

16 Now I'm sure that as a private individual, if my wife and I
17 decided to have a Day Care Center and started bringing in
18 neighborhood children in our backyards, we would have opposition
19 all the way down Fourth Avenue, probably over on Fifth Avenue.
20 And on Third Avenue, there are private families, they would object
21 to the noise there too. So, my objection for the building of
22 Child Care Center is purely on the basis of noise that 50
23 children and teachers would present to our well-being.

24 Secondly, the additional traffic would promote, with
25 parents dropping their children off in the morning and picking
26 them up in the evening, would also add to the traffic and
27 parking situation on Parnassus Shelf.

28 MR. LA POINT: Thank you very much.

1 MR. LAPOINT: Is there anybody else who would like to
2 incorporate their testimony into the official transcript?

3 MRS. MURPHY: Yes.

4 MR. LAPOINT: Mr. Murphy would like to incorporate
5 additional statement to her testimony.

6 MRS. MURPHY: Medical science has two other things to
7 serve; one of them is compassion, and another is good bedside
8 manner. Maybe those are old fashion, but they seem to be
9 overlooked and you have to live them before you can teach
10 them.

11 MR. WELCH: I understood your answer given to the
12 question on who had final review on the adequacy of the
13 Environmental Impact Report. In short, who will have final
14 say on this hearing. I believe your answer was from the
15 campus side, the Chancellor.

16 I would like to point out that it is 10:24 p.m., and
17 the Chancellor left this hearing at approximately 9:30 p.m.
18 He did not stay to the end of the hearing. I assumed that
19 the tapes will be played for him, but I think that it's
20 important to point out for the record that the major
21 officer, local officer on this campus was not present for the
22 "only" public hearing on the Long Range Development Plan.

23 MR. LAPOINT: Thank you. I like to thank you for coming
24 tonight and giving your testimony on the Draft Environmental
25 Impact Report on the Proposed Long Range Development Plan.

26 As I indicated earlier in the evening, the hearing
27 record will be kept open after tonight's public hearing until
28 Thursday, July 17, 1975, and during this period, you may

1 submit letters and statement for inclusion in the hearing
2 record by writing to the Community Affairs Office at 1363
3 Third Avenue, San Francisco, California 94143. Also, those
4 who would like a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact
5 Report or the Proposed Long Range Development Plan or the Final
6 EIR when it is completed, please give me your name or call
7 my office at 666-1131. Thank you.

8 MR. MOSGOFIAN: I like to make one final comment that
9 I think would be probably seconded by everyone here, but
10 after hearing the testimony tonight and reviewing the
11 document presented and after listening specifically to what
12 Marcia Lindeen described in terms after ten years - - Susan
13 Bierman as a ten year or 15 year construction project, I
14 personally feel now that I'll be damned if I'm going to put
15 up with in my neighborhood a ten or 15 year construction
16 project to the kind that's been described in this document,
17 and I personally will help and I'm sure hundreds of people
18 in this neighborhood will help. And I want this strictly
19 directed to the Regents that we will help organize whatever
20 it takes to stop that because I'll be damned if this is
21 going to take place in the heart of San Francisco in a City
22 where I was raised, where I want to live, in a community
23 where I'm going to live. You're going to destroy the very
24 fabric of this neighborhood with this God Damn institution.
25 So put down on the official record that I personally will
26 help organize whatever it takes to stop it in the next period
27 of time. Thank you.

28 (CONCLUSION OF HEARING 10:30 p.m.)