"On September 9th, 2002,
President Corrigan --" (I'm referring
to the question, by the way, of the
US campus as a micro climate and the
Humanities Building, the engaging
Humanities Building).

"On September 9th, 2002,
President Corrigan reported about the
successful conclusion of litigation
surrounding the high-rise student
residence school, over to Coit Towers
which we had to close down two years
ago when toxic mold and the lack of
the character of the size of the code
made the building both hazardous to
health and an actual threat to life
safety".

Were you aware of this?
Or do you wish to take refuge in the procedures
and say that you will not reply to questions?

MR. MACIAS: We will not reply to
questions.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: Okay. You
decline to reply to questions. I understand.

So, this is really more like a
deposition in which you want to see the cards in
my hand without making any comments.

All right. We can continue in that
way but it is a very hostile way for you to
proceed.

(Appause)

Now at this time, something you may
-- at this time, yes -- you wish to comment?

MR. STICKLEY: I'd just like to
comment this is the way we are required to conduct
an EIR hearing by California law.

So, it is not like we have a chance
to conduct it in another way. We have had other
formats of public events where it has been more of
a dialogue and I'm not sure if you have been to
any of those.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: Let me
continue.

MR. STICKLEY: Okay.

I gave you forty minutes. If you
want to make a speech, please make it again.
instead of being intruding.

MR. STICKLEY: Well, you asked me to respond.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: I'm just asking to you respond were you aware --

MR. STICKLEY: Yes.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: -- that an enormous building had been to be closed for four years because of mold and the gentleman is responding that he was.

Then why isn't that in an ecological impact report? The fact that the west campus is such a terribly estranged micro climate that has to be -- it has already knocked out a multi million dollar building for four years, over six years after it was opened and, what's more, the Humanities Building which is unseen thereof -- I know that Mr. Macias only came here in 2005.

So, certainly, he wouldn't have known and perhaps the URS member wasn't aware of this, had to be -- almost was lost -- had to be covered by what we call the Burka, an enormous . . . Oh, it looked almost like an old fashioned termite
tent around this gigantic building for a year
and-a-half while they tried to do scrape the mold
off the walls.

It is the building -- now, I know
that you don't have the ground even purchased yet.
I have been told that the building on the map is
like a hypothesis, I have been told by the members
of the administration.

Yet, because it is going through, it
seems like we are agreeing to it. So, let me think
that you are operating in good faith. You did
know about the Towers.

How can that not be? Toxic mold, how
could mold -- that not be included in the
Environmental Impact Report? Especially when just
an hour ago --

MR. MACIAS: Let me interrupt
you, Doctor, for just a second.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: Yes.

MR. MACIAS: A little bit out
of context here but I do want to clarify that what
we are addressing is the program BIR which only
deals with conceptual relationship of buildings to
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each other.

Each building that is built on this
campus will be required to have its own individual
initial study in the EIR which deals with all the
issues we are talking about.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: With the
exception of the relationship of buildings to each
other, I'm talking about the relationship of the
proposed building to the Humanities Building.

MR. MACIAS: Any building
that's built on this campus, it will be in the EIR
and will deal specifically with that particular
structure and will address the issues you are
discussing.

So, to point out that it is not part
of the program in the EIR, is false because the
need to do that really comes from the building
departments through reality for the purpose of
extolling the problems of the environmental
impact.

Please continue.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: I will.
The EIR said on the face of it, no
new building should, quote, "substantially degrade
the existing visual character or quality of the
site and its surroundings."

How about quoting in an existing
building to mold away? The west campus gets in
its mist, fog and rain straight off the ocean only
blocks away which interestingly enough is never
mentioned in the EIR.

So that the expense of the
residential towers was closed six years after it
was built and stayed closed for four while mold
was taken out of it.

Only two years from 2001 to 2003 the
Humanities Building almost had to be closed
because of mold and mildew.

Just six or seven years after it was
opened, Dean McDermott said he could put your
finger through the weaken wall.

It was green with lichen in places
and mildew. Over the course of two years, the
entire Humanities Building was at great expense
covered with scaffolding. All the windows were
sealed with layers of heavy plastic. This
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gentleman is stating that he knows about that.

The walls were floating with like mold. It was hell to be inside that area as in some other place.

This Master Plan tells us a new building will echo in the size of the Humanities Building directly across narrow streets from it on the west.

Even when that Humanities west wall got full sun, all afternoon it turned green, had to be covered with plastic and retrofitted for mold.

The new building will put the lower three floors in perpetual darkness a full rainy winter.

Only the top floor will get an hour of sun a day and the walls in the new building -- of the new building facing Humanities through the mist would never get any sun at all but the people who built it were being paid. So, perhaps they were willing to take the risk.

About an hour ago, I went over -- I don't know if you can see this. I'll show you.
Excuse me.

About an hour ago, I just went over to the Humanities Building and took a picture of the green streaks coming back on the wall.

MR. MACIAS: Remove the mike if you need -- if you want to walk up here and keep talking, then take it with you.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: That's okay.

I'm a Professor. I don't forget, all right?

Green streaks.

The next two pictures are even more interesting.

MR. PENDER: Thank you.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: -- because they are on the --

MS. TRAVELER: Yes, yes,

clearly.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: This is a picture of a tree against the wall which faces east towards the sun.

You can see that on the sunnyside of the tree, there is no mildew nor mold but on the side of the tree -- the side that the tree shades,
already green mold has formed on that wall. You
can just look at it yourself if you walk down
there.

What would it do to the Humanities
Building to put an entire building right across
the street from it and throw the whole western
wall where all the Professors are into darkness?
And what would it do to that new building?

So, I'm saying something is done very
wrong here. When I received the notice of the new
President of the Union, I looked into it and, you
know, at the moment we are involved in taking a
stretch mode and we don't even have a contract and
I really think that in view of all this new
information which has not been considered and
which endangers the whole Plan of the west campus
that the -- certainly, the procedure should be
delayed an extra year or until we have a contract
and until I can have my colleagues pay attention
to this.

They can't at the moment because we
are in the middle of a strike vote.

Thank you for your time.
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MR. MACIAS: Thank you.

Anita Axt?

VOICE IN AUDIENCE: Can

Professor McKeon speak?

MR. MACIAS: I'm sorry?

VOICE IN AUDIENCE: Can

Professor McKeon speak? She gave her time.

MR. MACIAS: Yes, certainly.

VOICE IN AUDIENCE: Thank you.

PROFESSOR MC KEON: Thank you very much. I have to leave before 5:00 o'clock.

I have an appointment with the Director of International Programs.

My name is Midori McKeon, M-i-d (as in "doctor")-o-r-i, McKeon, M-c (capital) K-e-o-n. I'm Professor of Japanese and also Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature.

There are many colleagues who would like to be here at this hearing but, due to their teaching schedules and office assignments, they are not able to be here. I speak on their behalf as well as for myself.
I would like to bring up for the third time the issue of erecting a five-story Clinical Science Building along the western wall, entire western wall of the existing Humanities Building.

You have heard from our faculty association President, Chapter President and my colleague Leonard that it has toxic and health hazard issues.

I would like to mention two other things. On the first floor of the western wing, there is a precious Japanese tea room housed in Room 117. The structure was donated by a Japanese company in early 1990.

It is a site of cultural studies regarding Japanese traditional culture and as well as learning about the appropriate behaviors and cultural practices that students learn -- that students can learn.

Also, it is a site of annual tea ceremony events that I organized and host for the entire campus community and the local community.

The tea room structure is made of...
wood, paper, bamboo and some dirt walls. The structure is constructed without even a single nail.

It is constructed according to the Japanese traditional carpentry. It is -- the woods, bamboo and dirt walls are combined in a way that they fit with each other without any metal enforcement.

The structure is very sensitive to the moisture metal. If one bamboo wall -- sorry, one bamboo is warped due to excess moisture, the structure will warp and it cannot be fixed and this structure is unique. It was constructed in Japan and shipped over here and assembled on site.

It is a unique structure. There is no replacement. We cannot order any replacement parts of the building and, if it is in perpetual shade and I would like to remind once again, it is on the first floor -- the tea structure, the precious twenty thousand dollars tea room structure will not be able to function.

Even if one sliding door made of wood and paper warps, then the door will not shut and
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nobody is able to fix that problem and I'm very much concerned that we have to use this site for Japanese studies, for the pleasurable site for campus community and local communities to enjoy annual tea ceremony will have to be ruined and I am, as Professor of Japanese, I am the caretaker of that tea room and I beg you, please re-orient the five-story Clinical Science Building so that it would not be standing wall-to-wall throughout the length of the western which anything of the Humanities Building.

Please angle the proposed Clinical Science Building so that we will have adequate air circulation and that our building, Humanities Building will be protected.

(Appause)

And I would like to mention one more thing. I commute from Hercules. There is no public transportation extended to Hercules.

I try to commute by BART. It took three hours because the bus connection to the BART station, nearest BART station, it is about ten freway exits away from the nearest BART station.
There is BART bus connection every hour, once or twice every hour and the connection is so unreliable, I can sit at the bus station without seeing a single bus for one hour.

(Applause)

The closing of that roof top of the parking structure, that's what the faculty parking spaces.

Even, apparently, there aren't enough parking spaces and community -- surrounding communities, they are all residential parking spaces and the Park Merced are substantiated by our students' cars and, if you close one full story of the parking structure, that excess cars will be more into the surrounding streets farther, farther away from campus and it will be communities' nuance and as a faculty member who come from that far away East Bay community which is not served with public transportation, I cannot look for parking coming here one hour -- an hour thirty minutes before my teaching time and park twelve blocks away from Holloway.

That's what I did and at night I had
been escorted by Police to my car and the police
said this is one-time service.

"It's outside the campus community.
Therefore, you will no longer have any escort
service at night." It was 10:00 o'clock p.m.

Without community escort service,
campus Police escort service, students and
professors will be walking far away from campus,
risking their lives and risking violence committed
on their cars.

I beg you please do not take way our
campus parking spaces. We need more parking if
you conducting conference centers and large
performance art structures.

I see some surface parking spaces
planned in front of the department art structure
but we cannot lose one full story of the parking
structure. For our employees and surrounding
community, I beg you.

[Applause]

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.

Does Anita Axt want to speak?
MS. AXT: Thank you very much.
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My name is Anita Axt, A-x-t. I am a faculty member and I'm a staff member and I'm also with the community Park Merced people that are here.

I listened with great attention to the presentation. I was very pleasantly pleased by the remarks of open spaces, public spaces, bringing in the community, valley, Lake Merced, but I was also struck by the comments of contact academic core, high density four-story residents' buildings and it sounds like Bush-speak, "we are winning the war and there is no collateral damage."

I would like to say that I have been very familiar with the San Francisco State campus. I used to ride my brother's bike. I didn't have one.

Out of the fifties, I saw the Stonestown Shopping Center being built. I saw San Francisco State being built.

When I was at Cal, I came to San Francisco State and used the library because it was stacked.
I also used the book store here
because it was much more convenient in front of
Cal and not being able to get into staff until you
are a graduate student.

I love San Francisco State and the
San Francisco area, I care for it very much. I
have actually been on campus since 1965.

I am here seven days a week which the
police can attest to, my Chairman who just spoke,
my Dean, Custodian, et cetera.

I spend a great deal of time here.
My brother lives in Stonestown and has been there
since 1965, has no intention of moving.

I am very very concerned about the
possibility of the Clinical Science Building being
built on the west wing of the building.

You have heard of several concerns of
us who live in this building and I do not use that
word loosely.

We have been through the toxic mold.
I am extremely allergic to fungus and mold. It is
a horrible experience not to be able to breathe
well, having your nose running all the time,
coughing.

It is a problem. It is not going to
go away and it is going to get worse. I'm not
opposed to a Clinical Science Building and I am
against campus saturation and the problem with
calendars that are down but I do think the
position, the projected position of the Clinical
Science Building is not acceptable.

I look and see that there is a garden
area, a patio area, a planting area facing Lake
Merced getting all the sun.

Why can the building not be turned a
hundred and eighty degrees either to facing
Holloway or to the student village? Or to facing
Lake Merced but not covering the western wall of
the Humanities Building. It is a problem. It is
not going away.

Everyone is very much protesting the
ugly DeYoung Museum. Architects standing up to it
and saying it -- the wood is going to rot.

Well, it was changed because of the
outcry of San Franciscans. Where there was a
bronze, as a matter of fact, covered. It is still
ugly, but it is much better. We do not want to do that to San Francisco State.

There is enough mishmash of structural architectural monstrosities on the campus already. I'm very much for green buildings.

I am a Sierra Club member, an Environmental Crest Cardholder, San Francisco Bay, Golden Gate Park, California State Park, National Park, National Park and Historic Preservation and I can continue for another hundred and forty listing them but you don't me to. I'm very concerned about this.

We also have a memorial stone dedicated to Kiyoshi, dedicated to Professor Dr. Kiyoshi who tragically drowned in one of the rains in Tiburon when his house washed off the hill and he was trying to save his paintings.

He was our first Chairman of this Department of Fine Arts and his memorial headstone is right where you are projecting to put this five-story Clinical Science Building and a redwood double tree that came from his province in China.
Comment Letter 49

1 I urge you to go look at those four
trees. With global warming, you do not want to
take out trees, and I think of Park Merced is one
of the most beautiful residential communities.

5 It's a pleasure to drive here
everyday and pass through Park Merced to come to
San Francisco State. It's an outstanding jewel.
8 I guess I will close talking about
9 parking. I am concerned about it.
10 It's a problem. In my department,
11 the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures,
12 we are sixty faculty. Sixteen are full-time
13 which is twenty-five percent.
14 Seventy-five percent of us are
15 part-time. I have been here for thirty years
16 part-time. I also have another job which I have to
17 run to in five minutes. I teach nights, too, at
18 City College.
19 I have had five part-time jobs
20 teaching in San Rafael, in Menlo Park, Berkeley,
21 San Francisco, Skyline, San Mateo, on and on.
22 I do need my car. Unfortunately,
23 though I'm environmentalists, I have a little
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Toyota but I have to be in thirty minutes inside a
classroom elsewhere.

This is every night of the week
except Fridays and on Saturdays. I work here
until 5:00 and jump in the car and I'm off
teaching elsewhere all over San Francisco and the
Bay Area just to survive.

We need parking. We need more
parking. We do not want to make it so difficult
for the Park Merced and Stonestown residents. It
should not be.

I can appreciate the beautiful
picture of students with backpacks and riding
bikes.

I'm getting close to a hundred and I
do have a backpack but I'm not about to ride a
bike and I cannot ride a bike from the Peninsula
and I cannot ride a bike to get out to Noe Valley,
the Marina and teach within thirty minutes from
leaving the campus.

So, it's beautiful pictures but it's
just not doable. I would also urge you not to put
a tennis court on top of the parking structure.
I certainly do not want to play

tennis on top of a parking structure with gas

fumes and I don't want to lose my tennis balls.

I'm not going to run down five stories and go
looking for it.

So, it's ridiculous to put a tennis
court on top of a parking structure when you need
the parking. You absolutely need parking.

So, I would just urge you, again, to
re-look at your drawings. I think everyone here
has been very eloquent.

There is a problem with these plans
and particularly with the orientation of the
Clinical Science Building.

I see no reason why it can't be
relocated, re-shifted, re-configured, leaving an
open terrace or patio or plants close to the
Humanities Building so the Humanities Building can
breathe and yet not get the toxic fumes.

We need to save our environment, not
ruin it. Thank you

(Appause)

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.
Daniel Phillips?

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Can you hear me?

As Robert pointed out, I am a Vice President of Park Merced Residents Organization.

(Appause)

We are the sole bargaining unit for Park Merced and we are recognized as that by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first point I would like to make is that the use of FTE is misleading. Now, according to the University's own statistics, the FTE of twenty thousand actually comes out to a population of twenty-nine thousand plus.

Now, that's nine thousand more people than we think when we hear the FTE projections for 2020 are up to thirty thousand.

Now, how many more people will that be in this area concentrated in a space that's already stressed because of the population?

We have seen schools closing. I do not understand why we need to expand the University.
I do understand that we need to improve the structures in the University but, at the same time, the University is trying to buy the old school at the arts location.

That's one complete school shut down among many in San Francisco. Where is this population coming from? Why is the University marketing itself throughout the world?

The state university system was not created to become a global corporation which is -- (Applause)

which is exactly what you are trying to do.

I don't see any proposal that support our community. I don't see any figures on the expense of relocating the Muni, the expense of interrupting California Highway 1 which is all told 19th. I see no comments on that.

I see no comment on reassigning Buckingham. Buckingham was made a meandering street to keep the traffic slow.

With the new design you want to bring it straight in from 19th Avenue, it is going to turn it into a race course like Holloway.
Holloway as a main street is ridiculous. It is already a main street for Park Merced. It is one of the main thoroughfares in and out of Park Merced and, while I think the pedestrian walkway or the alley as you call it is wonderful, when you get to Font and Tapier, you have a death trap without traffic signals and without these lovely people with the big stop signs, pedestrians are going to be in danger.

Most pedestrians in this area and that includes students and residents who are not students pay no attention to traffic. They meander across streets and, when you have an alley that's going all the way to Lake Merced Boulevard, that's going to invite people to ignore the traffic coming up Font and down Font and on to Arbello.

That's one of the main intersections of Park Merced. It has always been a main intersection and building and restructuring the University is not going to change that.

Now, you talk about the ecology of the area and returning the ecology.
I look at the old maps of the area and what I see is Lake Merced going all the way up to Cox Stadium.

If you are going to return the area to the ecology, does that mean that you are going to return the lake to Cox Stadium? Or are you just going to have a seasonal lake or a river going through there?

I don't think that your glorified speech that you are returning it into to the ecology is anything of the sort.

It's just glossing over the fact that put a little frosting on the cake and maybe you'll get away with it.

Now, as far as the illustrations that I have seen of the Plan, a couple of them of the Master Plan showing the particular portion are wonderful but most of them are sketches and they don't really show the volume and the mass and the scale to the people and, as Aaron pointed out, a fifty-story structure is quite different in scale to the twenty-foot structures we have mostly throughout Park Merced.
Granted, we have the towers but those have been there almost from the beginning of the Park, not quite. They are not as old at the entire Park but they have been there for a long time and they are part of the icons of the area but our towers are situated in large open spaces.

In San Francisco, you cannot afford to acquire that kind of space. To get the proportions that Park Merced have would cost millions, hundred dollars of millions, close to billions probably, and we want to preserve that heritage.

There is no reason why an ideal place to live should be destroyed because some developers can make a little money. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.

Woody Hastings?

MR. HASTINGS: My name is Woody Hastings, W-o-o-d-y, Hastings, H-a-s-t-i-n-g-s. I'm a student here at the school, Environmental Studies major.

Thanks for the opportunity to
comment. My concerns revolve largely around the
stated goals of sustainability, the continued
planned use of fossil fuels for power generation
and, specifically, the contribution to global
warming impacts caused by increased CO2 and the
power generation.

I understand that CO2 is not
something you are required by law to address but
something which I think the current times and the
CSU Executive Order 987 which I'll talk about more
later would dictate or indicate that these
emissions should be considered and mitigation
measures proposed.

The bottom line is my concern is that
sustainability, particularly as it relates to
energy, is inadequately addressed in the Draft and
I appreciate its mentioned and it's focused as a,
you know, as a priority and something of a goal to
attain but I don't see that at all in the document
in terms of specifically power generation and I'm
not going to comment specifically a lot about the
-- my concerns aren't about the local air quality
impact but I want to mention that the local air
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quality that is outlaid in the Draft has got
twenty-three pounds each per reactor of gases of
NOx, eighteen pounds of PM10, a hundred and
fifty-three pounds of carbon monoxide per day that
the EIR states that these were being emitted after
mitigation and it states that these are less than
significant but what about the idea of avoiding
the emissions in the first place via the
implementation of conservation, energy efficiency,
and reliable energy indications?
The projected emissions need to
consistent with the clean air plan but are the
facilities that produce the emissions actually
even necessary if you do all the conservation and
energy and efficiency right and produce the energy
in the first place right with those facilities be
even necessary with satellite and those satellite
plans and extensions and central planning?
Are they consistent with
comprehensive thinking about potential future
circumstances regarding fossil fuel availability,
cost, and global impact?
Those specifically in place where I
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think some of these areas of concern that you
mentioned, Section 3.6 Campus Master Plan
Objectives refers to one of the objectives as a
campus that models sustainability.

Arguably, the core of sustainability
is the nature of energy used and the degree to
which it is clean and doable and the degree to
which conservation energy efficiency and rebuilt
have been substantially implemented.

The section mentions sustainability
as an objective but the reality of the Plan and
the degree to which the Draft EIR addresses
energy-related factors and is inadequate to the
very worthy goal of modeling sustainability.

It does mention green building and
site design which includes energy efficiency
that's mentioned in this section but energy
generation should also be specifically broken up.

Section 3.4.2, referring to the CSU
Mission, there is no mention at all in the EIR in
the August 2006 Executive Order 987 which is a
policy statement on energy conservation and
sustainable building practices and physical plant
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management for the California -- the CSU.

    Delegates to each campus -- the
implementation -- the campus president, the
implementation of energy conservation, sustainable
building practices and physical plant management
policy.

    The Order reaffirms the need to
conserve energy in order to achieve the goal, to
reduce energy consumption by fifteen percent by
the end of fiscal year 2009, 2010 as compared to

    To what extent is the Plan consistent
with that goal? I couldn't find that in the
draft. I could not find mention any mention of it
in the draft -- sorry.

    It seems to me that if this issue was
important enough to issue a nine-page policy
statement from the CSU, then it's a significant
enough issue to be addressed in the EIR.

    Section 4.12.2.4, "Cumulative Impacts
and Mitigation Measures," this section bundles
several utilities and public services.

    It states that "the projects"
contribution to cumulative impact is negligible"
(quote/unquote).

This could be said by just about any
and every emitter of CO2 about their own
contribution.

The point is that although SFSU's
contribution may be relatively small, the problem
is that it needs to be addressed by every
contributor. The final document should include
mitigation measures.

Table 2-1, "Summary of Impacts and
Mitigation Measures," UEL-3, states that the
construction of new electrical facilities will be
required but that these new facilities will not
cause significant environmental impacts.

It states mitigation not required but
the Draft never addresses CO2 and so never
quantifies what those emissions are and how they
might be mitigated.

The final document should quantify
CO2 emissions or at least just assume that the CO2
emissions are undesirable and offer mitigation
measures, conservation energy efficient and
renewable energy.

Section 3.10.4.2, "Project Description, Increase in Demand and Proposed Improvements Overall, the Master Plan," calls for about -- almost 3.3 megawatt increase in electrical generation.

Although much of this generation is derived from the burning of natural gas which is better than oil or coal, it is still CO2 emissions and it's still a fossil fuel and it still contributes to the global climate problem.

Again, none of this discussion ever references Executive Order 987 and to what extent it is consistent or not consistent with that order.

Since that actual environmental impact, the quantity of new CO2 generation is never addressed, mitigation measures such as energy conservation and energy efficiency and/or the construction of clean, renewal on-site energy generational alternatives are likewise going to be addressed.

How much of that 3.3 megawatts might
be displaced by on-site solar or wind generated
power? The final document should consider this.
And just as a last note about
Hunter’s Point Section 4.12.1.6, it says that --
it refers to Hunters Point and it states that it
is scheduled to close.
Hunters Point did close in May of
2006 last year. So that’s my comments. Thank you
very much

(Applause)

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.
Andrew Wolfram?
MR. WOLFRAM: My is Andrew
Wolfram.
I am the President of the Northern
California Chapter of DOCOMOMO which is a modern
architecture preservation organization.
It's an infinite small organization
with chapters in forty-five countries. Our local
chapter is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization.
DOCOMOMO considers that Park Merced
is a highly significant modern landscape and
unprofessional composition.
As you know, the States EIR was designed by Thomas Church, he with Leonard Schultz, in the early 1940s. It is -- Thomas Church is probably the largest public work. He was known mostly for things, exquisite small gardens for residential units, and this is his largest accessible public works visited by many people opening to the public.

It is extremely successful example of Church's work. It's a very unique aesthetic composition with a variety of courtyards, large and small courtyards occurring in your paths, the walls, the planting details and it has a tremendous integrity to this date.

The size of the building and the height of the buildings and the shape of the courtyards was really scaled to the climate and frequently understood but this is a climate in which it is hard to grow many plants and they do have a lot of shade and not a lot of sun.

So, the size of the courtyards and the density of the development really was his
understanding of how to create a very lush
environment in an area in which plants really do
not grow well.

So, the density that is in Park
Merced is really appropriate to this climate and
it really responds very well to this exact locale.
DOCOMOMO is extremely concerned with
the impact of this Master Plan on the landscape in
Park Merced, specifically, the blocks that are now
called University Park South.

We recommend that an alternative be
developed that keeps the block apartments of Park
Merced in their entirety, the way they are in
existing currently and maintain their integrity
and thus do not demolish or erase those far.

Thank you

(Appause)

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.
Andrew Lesa?

MR. LESA: Okay.

First, my name is Andrew Lesa, and
currently I'm a student here at San Francisco
State University. I'm a senior student in the
Urban Studies Department.

Just a brief background. I just did some internship work with the San Francisco Redevelopment. I'm also currently working as a consultant with the San Francisco Planning Department.

I just wanted to comment from a student's perspective and, unfortunately, for this hearing I think that we are under-represented.

Both my comments are going to be made towards the Board and towards the community here and, first off, I want to commend you guys for --

MR. MACIAS: Excuse me.

It seems though the mike went out down here. Is there another roving mike we can have?

MR. LESA: I can just talk if everyone can hear me.

First off, I just want to commend the Board, the planners here at San Francisco State University, for what they have done at this point. I think from a student's perspective some key issues that they have attempted to
address here of being successful with the
connection, the north/west connection of the
University public north with the existing Quad and
the academic.

Some of the residents in Park Merced
expressed a concern of the impact that the housing
development is going to cause along the Holloway
corridor and, specifically, the Park Merced urban
University Park South development.

First, I believe someone mentioned a
little bit about the sprawl and I believe that
sprawl defines an obligate pending community and
something that has low rise places or living
dwellings and I think that that is actually very
descriptive of what our perspective is right now
and I understand that it is a great community with
open spaces that are rare to the San Francisco
area. That is great that we can preserve that.

I think that the units that have been
discussed as being altered to a four-story fifty
foot height limit, I don't believe will interfere
with that community element you have.

I think what's important, you guys
mentioned partly historical preservation which I think is extremely important.

Unfortunately, I feel that it is already deteriorated with the existing four-story complex that's scattered throughout the Park Merced area.

Myself being a student here for a couple of years, I actually resided in one of those for almost one year.

So, I don't believe that it really holds true to its historical value as some people have commented on today.

I would also like to say that new urbanism which is a concept that locks a view in space, some -- a place that you can -- have served in and that are easily accessible to you, something that's affordable for this community to have.

It is not going to just serve the community here at twenty-five dressed out and to be used at San Francisco State University.

There is also going to be exhibited a community at Park Merced and I think that that's a
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positive for you guys to look at.

    It allows mixed use development which
is going to address the housing influx with
students while creating, like I said, the walkway
environment for students, seniors, and also others
that have limited access of transportation,
whether it be public transportation or their own
private transportation.

    As far as -- I wanted to address also
the tennis courts being placed on top of the
parking structure.

    As someone who commutes from school
to downtown, there is two concerns that I have.

    One, it is expensive to live anywhere
else in the City and, of course, people are riding
BART and CalTrans and Muni which addresses the
needs of students and also it should be able to
take away some of the pressure that you guys --
that you guys are feeling in the Park Merced
community with the students living there and some
of the inappropriate problems that you have been
encountered with.

    And, as far as the tennis courts
taking way one of the parking spots, I feel that
within the Plan they have addressed plenty of
opportunity to add new parking which as a student
that has lived here, I feel pretty confident that
I will be able to find new parking and bike areas.

I like the idea of the tennis courts
being placed within the greenbelt that is proposed
because, as someone mentioned, it might not be the
most pleasant place to play when on top of the
parking structure although, as you can imagine,
it's looking out on to a vast green space may be
actually enticing.

So, basically, I will conclude my
comments with that and the fact that I just wanted
to say from a student's perspective that we are
excited to see a change not only for us and for
the students here at this campus but also to
integrate our campus lifestyle and living within
the neighborhood's living that can take advantage
of these services as well. Thank you.

MR. MACIAS: Thank you.

The next name is Robert Pender. I'm
going to hand the mike to him so it will be
MR. PENDER: Thank you.

Good afternoon, fellow tenants. My name is Robert Pender. I am the President of the Park Merced Residents organization.

I'm going to tell you something about the Park Merced Residents Organization. I think it is a subject that I am qualified to tell people about.

I am one of the original members of the Park Merced Residents Organization which was founded on March the 4th, 1974.

The reason I know that is because I was one of the original member and I have been a member continuously since March the 4th, 1974.

The Park Merced Residents Organization is strictly a tenant's organization. You have to be living in Park Merced to be a member.

You cannot be -- you can be employed and work in Park Merced but, to be a full fledged member, you must live in Park Merced in one of the towers or one of the garden club homes.

Now, we are the oldest continuous
tenant organization in San Francisco and there is a pamphlet around state college -- Park Merced, no offense, but my youngest daughter graduated from San Francisco State college over ten years ago but anyhow, you must be a tenant in Park Merced and we also have another organization called the "San Francisco Tenants Network".

That is a network made up of other organizations like the housing, the housing rights committee, the tenants union and, in other words, we reach out to other tenant organizations in San Francisco.

Now, for the benefit of our educators over here, I want to say -- well, I was going to say that San Francisco, the City and County of San Francisco is a very unique place. There are only two city and counties in the whole State of California.

We are a charter city. By being a charter City of San Francisco, we have -- we have options or we have privileges that allow to be able to be available to other communities in the State of California.
The other charter city is the City of Los Angeles, not the County of Los Angeles but the City of Los Angeles.

So, I won't say anything about them because I don't know anything about them but we have a -- we have a right and the obligation to our tenants, to ourself and people like me to live in peaceful harmony in our homes.

Now, I know that's been a difficult thing to do with so many changes with the landlord going on.

Landlords can come -- San Francisco can buy property. They're stopping from that. It is a free market. Anybody can buy property if they have the money.

We have seen that happen time and time again in Park Merced but you cannot come in and push us out of our homes.

We have certain protectants that we will fight for and we have certain principles that we will fight for and we are fighting for our lives, for our homes, and for our way of life.

(Appause)
Whether we are living in a tower or an apartment, we are all tenants in San Francisco and we will fight any attempt to put us out of our homes and I want to thank you for -- members of San Francisco State for bringing us together in a public place where we can express our ideas and our ideals and our principles and, believe me, the Park Merced Residents Organization, we discussed this many times.

Our Board of Directors discussed it.
At our general membership meeting, we've discussed it and we voted unanimously that we were going to fight if they take our homes and, ladies and gentlemen, please believe me, we will fight with everything, with every -- everything that we have.
Thank you for the speaking.

(Appause)

MR. MACIAS: Thank you, Mr. Pender.

Is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to address this public hearing? Would you state your name, please?

MS. FLYNN: Sure.
It's Judith Flynn and, really, it is very brief.

My name is Judith Flynn. I'm the Director of the Montessori Center which is located on property within Park Merced and I'm really here to make a statement for the record that I was extremely discouraged when I heard that I could not have questions answered because I was of the impression that I could come listen and I generated some questions but now I can't get them answered.

Therefore, I can't give the articulate input that I would like to have given with accuracy and I'm sorry that if that is a, you know, a proposition of California law.

I just think that's unbelievable.

Anyway, be that as it may, I really want to say because I'm of a different situation than the tenants from Park Merced because I run a small business within Park Merced that this expansion Plan really will have serious impact upon the community that I serve and I am here to listen.

I have a very well crafted written
response that I intend to explain to you but I
think it is something that needs to be really
thought about from the viewpoint of what all the
tenants have mentioned to you, the idea of
community, the idea of family, the idea of family
with children, idea of family with children who
can walk to a local preschool --

(Applause)

--which, in effect, if Park Merced is taken over
by students and San Francisco State, we in a brand
new building just built three years ago probably
won't have any reason to occupy because we might
not necessarily have the clientele to come to it.

Also, the impact of parking and
traffic will seriously affect what our families
will want to do and I brought that up at the
previous meeting.

I don't feel that parking and traffic
has been adequately addressed.

So, I bring it up again and, as I
say, I have some questions which I have taken note
of and I am going to and I started to draft my
written response which I will give to you but it
really was the fact that you mentioned you can't
have questions.

I mean being in education, and
working with young children, that was a real
interesting insight to me that you can come to a
meeting and be told, "I'm sorry, but you can't get
your questions answered."

Why is that a big issue? Now, I'm
sorry. I can't get an answer to it but thank you.

MS. SANSEVERO: May I respond?

I think the whole idea is that we
have a transcript of what your comments are so
that we can go back and respond to them.

You know, if you have a question
about what the process is, I think we can talk
about that.

Otherwise, you can after the hearing
talk with Richard, talk with Jason, and, you know,
you can have your questions answered.

It is just that in this format, we
need to be able to have a documentation of what
your comments are so that we can respond them in
writing.
If we go back and forth, it's hard to follow the train of what the comments are.

MS. FLYNN: I just wanted to make that comment that were never answered.

MR. STICKLEY: I just want to add to that that, you know, a summary was put up in the beginning about, you know, the public workshop versus the EIR event. This event tonight has a very specific and prescribed purpose that's within the CEQA process and I agree with you.

It is awkward, but we have tried to have both kinds of events and I know I have seen you at other ones where we can add a dialogue and try to respond to questions but this is simply, you know, not one of those events.

It's a different kind of event. It's very well described by the CEQA process.

So, you know, I apologize for that but this is what it is tonight but we hope that with the other venues and, as Ann said, there are other avenues that will be open still for communications and we hope we can handle all of 
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MR. GOODMAN: Is there any way to step back from the previous format and to address when they were discussed and all the designs and special meetings on campus or wherever they were held?

MR. MACIAS: I didn't hear the question. Can you come to the mike when you talk, please?

MR. GOODMAN: The Vice President of Park Merced.

The schedule -- the slide that you put up way back at the beginning, it showed the overall number of meetings or eight meetings or ten meetings or whatever that was.

The October 24th meeting you had as many people notified through the Park Merced Residents Organization as possible to attend that meeting.

Now, of course, students didn't come.

There wasn't a lot of student representation there.

Through the previous meeting, there
was no advertisement on campus that I saw
notifying students of this meeting.

    I mean, I think there was a flyer
that went out to students? There was a flyer that
went out to students, in general.

    VOICE IN AUDIENCE: It was
carried in the University campus memo.

    MR. GOODMAN: If there was
anything specific entered in the campus memo, then
I apologize.

    VOICE IN AUDIENCE: That's
right. Three weeks ago.

    MR. GOODMAN: There wasn't
anything this week. I know students that are
interested and are concerned and have comments.

    VOICE IN AUDIENCE: It may be.

    MR. MACIAS: Mr. Goodman,
could you hold on for just a second?

    MR. GOODMAN: Sure.

    MR. MACIAS: Since you have
had a chance to speak, is there anyone else who
wanted to speak at the public meeting?

    If not, I would declare the public
hearing closed and you can continue.

MR. GOODMAN: I want this item actually reported. I don't want it closed. I think it should still remain open because those meetings and the issues that CEQA inhabits possibly involves is key.

You had a number of meetings, though, and we mentioned in the October 24th meeting that there was a lack of information provided to the City in general about this issue and there is a lot of issues about the design of buildings, about how these buildings should have been looked at, how the housing or transportation, maybe they should have come first or all those issues may be an improvement over the overall concept now that was actually a design by the building.

Now, I don't know what the CEQA process is in terms of maybe they could have been just arriving at a benefit of taking all these steps back and looking at it carefully and maybe that's part of this process of the draft of the final EIR. Maybe that's what they're going to say to the response but the draft EIR I saw has not
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taken seriously a lot of comments into play.

So, I'm concerned that the initial meetings that were held didn't have as much affect as could have occurred in a public meeting in the City through other organizations that were mentioned tonight: Lake Merced Task Force, the West Portal or the Greater West Portal Organization.

So, I think there was a presentation from them a few weeks back.

So, maybe they will be at the 6:00 o'clock meeting but I think it is important that these items are included and that there is some kind of special task force about what the CEQA process does when there is a problem; when there is a problem in terms of the issues that are to be documented, when you're investigating with the URS Corporation and WRT. Is there any other process that occurs and addresses this when there are other issues brought up.

[Applause]

MR. STICKLEY: I'm not sure if this session is still officially open but I think
it would be good to clarify those and, by the way,
we did run over and we apologize for that.

We did extend the hearing until now
because we started a little bit late but just
specifically to answer, you know, these concerns
and, Ann or Richard, you may have something to
add, I think that those first meetings in the
public workshops, I think you are right in
retrospect that they weren't as well attended by
the surrounding community as we had hoped.

So, we actually ended up adding three
additional public meetings and extending not only
the CEQA but the actual Master Planning process so
that we can hear fully those public comments and,
while there is still time to incorporate input
into the Plan itself even before the EIR started
analyzing it.

So, I think we are, you know, we are
very sensitive to that concern of, you know, the
amount of attendance and that's why we set up
three additional workshops and they were very much
about, you know, hearing questions and dialogue
and responding and I think we heard a lot of those
concerns with a lot more clarity than how they
were represented in the earlier meetings where,
you know, they were very -- the community members
were in attendance.

So, I think that promised to
incorporate input into the Master Plan itself and,
when the EIR came along to analyze that, it could
analyze a plan that actually reflected those to be
conferenced.

So, that's my comment. I don't know
if you want to add?

MS. SANSEVERO: Well, just to
say, you know, what happens from here and that is
to say that the comments that you all have given
tonight and anything else received during a public
review period are reviewed and responded to in
writing as part of the draft of the final EIR and
so that is the process that we will be building
on.

MR. GOODMAN: Is there a draft
officially? (Unintelligible) -- and issues, they
are allowed to appeal from the draft EIR to
people?
MS. SANSEVERO: Not that I know of.

MR. GOODMAN: I hope that it will be published for the next meeting of the final draft, that they will publish it in newspapers papers that will go out to the public.

MR. STICKLEY: So, we are going to reconvene. We are going to reconvene at 6:00, in half-an-hour -- in twenty minutes, actually.

So, I don't know if any one of you are able to come back with additional comments. Thank you very much for coming in.

[CONCLUDED AT 5:35 P.M.]
Response to Comment Letter 49

Response to Comment 49-1. Please see Master Response 5, *Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building*, for a response to this comment.

Response to Comment 49-2. Please see Response to Comment 20-1 for a summary of public meetings, media coverage, and other university outreach that has been conducted for this project.

Response to Comment 49-3. Faculty and staff would increase by about 711 people by 2020 under the Campus Master Plan, as indicated in Draft EIR Table 3-1. New and redeveloped housing on the campus would be constructed in part to house faculty and staff. Please see Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*, for additional information about new on-campus housing.

Response to Comment 49-4. The neighborhoods surrounding the campus were evaluated as relevant in the EIR. Please refer to each topical section in the Draft EIR and in the Final EIR Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for detailed information. Please also see Final EIR, Section 4.2, *Master Responses*, for an overview of the responses to major issues raised during the public review period on the Draft EIR.

Response to Comments 49-5 through 49-20. Please see Responses to Letters 7, 20, and 21 for responses to these comments.

Response to Comment 49-21. Please see Master Response 5, *Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building*, for a response to this comment. Please also see Response to Letter 31.

Response to Comment 49-22. Please see Master Response 5, *Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building*, for a response to this comment.


Response to Comments 49-25 and 49-26. Please see Master Response 5, *Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building*, for a response to this comment.

Response to Comment 49-27. Please see Response to Comments 31-7 and 31-8. Please also see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, for a discussion of parking.

Response to Comment 49-28. Please see Master Response 5, *Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building*, for a response to this comment.

Response to Comment 49-29. Draft EIR Table 3-1 (page 3-8) identifies the total number of students, also known as head count, associated with the existing and proposed FTE level of 20,000 FTE and 25,000 FTE, respectively. Please see Master Response 10, *Campus Population Growth Evaluated in the Draft EIR*, for additional information about the population growth evaluated in the EIR. Master Response 6, *Proposed Enrollment Increase*, discusses the need for the proposed enrollment increase.

Response to Comment 49-31. Please see Master Response 4, Village Main Streets, for a response to this comment. Please also see Response to Comment 2E-23 related to the City and County of San Francisco’s jurisdiction over the Holloway and Buckingham rights-of-way.

Response to Comments 49-32 and 49-33. Draft EIR Chapter 3, Project Description, and Chapter 2, Project Refinements, of this Final EIR volume describe the proposed plans for the valley portion of the campus. As described therein, the valley portion of the campus is proposed to be retained primarily in open space and recreational uses, as is currently the case. The proposed landscaping and stormwater system recognizes the campus’s position in the historic ecosystem at the junction of a former estuary (now a freshwater lake), creek, and upland forest and establishes plant communities appropriate to that ecosystem. Further, the proposed open stormwater management concept would reestablish the former streambed drainage connection into Lake Merced from the valley. Please see the above sections for further information.

The impacts of the proposed project on the visual character of the site and surroundings was evaluated in the Draft EIR, Section 4.1, Aesthetics (see Impact AES-3, page 4.1-12). This analysis addressed the scale of proposed development in University Park South (UPS) in relationship to surrounding development in Parkmerced and concluded that potentially significant impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of Mitigation AES-3. This measure calls for the development of architectural and urban design guidelines that apply specifically to the proposed redevelopment of a portion of UPS. Please see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR volume for minor revisions to this measure.

Response to Comment 49-34 through 49-38. Please see Response to Letter 23. As indicated in Response to Letter 23, while the use of renewable energy sources, such as photovoltaics (PV) or wind turbines were discussed as a possibility, the detailed study to determine feasibility of such energy alternatives was beyond the scope of the Campus Master Plan. In an effort to develop a plan that is constructible, cost effective, and truly sustainable, the Campus Master Plan study focused on estimating the projected energy demand using conventional sources of energy such as natural gas and diesel. A campus-wide integrated strategic energy resource plan is recommended in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) as a critical follow-on study, which can include investigation of alternative energy generation.

Other aspects of the Campus Master Plan and/or recommended EIR mitigation measures that would reduce the overall emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project include the following:

- Replacement of older energy inefficient buildings with higher density energy-efficient buildings;
- Implementation of building energy management systems, such as ambient light sensors and timers, which would be part of the future development;
- Compliance with the most recent LEED-NC guidelines per EIR Mitigation AES-4A;
- Maximizing the amount of on-campus housing for SF State affiliates as called for in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) to minimize vehicle and transit trips to the campus;
• Establishing a more walkable community by including limited neighborhood retail to minimize
the need to travel afar to shop and by creating more pedestrian-friendly paths and street frontages.
• Minimizing or avoiding new vehicle trips through the expansion of the campus’s existing
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, which includes but is not limited to
parking management, replacement, and fee programs designed to ensure that single-occupant
vehicle use does not increase;
• Conducting ongoing monitoring of vehicle use and implementing additional TDM programs if
necessary to reduce new vehicle trips, per EIR Mitigation TRA-1A;
• Ensuring the provision of adequate transit and campus shuttle services via implementation of EIR
Mitigations TRA-2A through 2C; and
• Pursuit of a universal transit pass program to provide free access to transit for SF State affiliates.

Response to Comment 49-39. Please see Master Response 13, Parkmerced Historical Resource
Impacts, for a response to this comment.

Response to Comment 49-40. Comment noted.

Response to Comment 49-41. Comment noted. Please see Master Response 14, Regional Housing
Supply Impact, for a response to this comment. In particular, please refer to the subsection called
“Displacement of People.”


Response to Comments 49-44 and 49-45. Please see Response to Comment 20-1.