

PARKMERCED PROJECT

Volume 2 - Appendices



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT: CASE NO. 2008.0021E**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009052073

DRAFT EIR PUBLICATION DATE: MAY 12, 2010

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARING DATE: JUNE 17, 2010

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: MAY 12, 2010 TO JUNE 28, 2010

Written comments should be sent to:

Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

PARKMERCED PROJECT

Volume 2 - Appendices

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT: CASE NO. 2008.0021E

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009052073

DRAFT EIR PUBLICATION DATE: MAY 12, 2010

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARING DATE: JUNE 17, 2010

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: MAY 12, 2010 TO JUNE 28, 2010

Written comments should be sent to:

Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

PARKMERCED PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
VOLUME 2 – APPENDICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Appendix A: Scoping Meeting Summary Report
Public Hearing Transcript
Summary of Written and Oral Comments
- Appendix B: Draft Parkmerced Design Standards and Guidelines
- Appendix C: Wind
C.a: Pedestrian Wind Study, Parkmerced Project EIR
C.b: Wind Impacts and Mitigation from the Proposed Parkmerced Project
C.c: Revised Building Heights/Footprints for the Parkmerced Project
- Appendix D: Water Supply Assessment

APPENDIX A. SCOPING MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

**PARKMERCED PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT**

**PARKMERCED PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Project Overview.....1

2.0 Scoping Process.....2

3.0 List of Commenters.....4

4.0 Scoping Comments Summary.....5

Appendices

- A. Transcriptions
 - Stonestown YMCA Annex – June 8, 2009
- B. Oral and Written Commenters

1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Proposed Project

Parkmerced is an existing residential neighborhood with 3,221 residential units on approximately 116 acres of land in the southwest portion of San Francisco adjacent to Lake Merced (Project Site). The existing on-site residential units are located in 11 towers and 170 two-story buildings. The proposed Parkmerced Project is a long-term mixed-use development program to comprehensively re-plan and redesign the Parkmerced site, increase residential density, provide new commercial and retail services and transit facilities, and improve utilities within the development site. About 1,683 of the existing apartments located in 11 tower buildings would be maintained, and over a period of approximately 30 years, the remaining 1,538 existing apartments would be demolished in phases and fully replaced, and an additional 5,679 net new units would be added to the Project Site. With project implementation, there would be a total of 8,900 units on the Project Site. The Proposed Project also includes construction of a new neighborhood core containing neighborhood-serving retail and office space, including such potential uses as a grocery store, restaurants, and banks. The neighborhood core would be within walking distance of the residences at Parkmerced. Small neighborhood-serving retail uses would be constructed outside of the neighborhood core in close proximity to residential units throughout the Project Site. A new Pre K-5 school and day care facility, fitness center, as well as new open space uses, including athletic fields, walking and biking paths, an approximately 2-acre organic farm, and community gardens would also be provided on the Project Site.

The Proposed Project includes construction of (or provides financing for construction of) a series of traffic and infrastructure improvements designed to reduce the amount of automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced, and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way. As a component of these traffic improvements, the Proposed Project includes rerouting the existing MUNI Metro M-Oceanview line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue. The new alignment, as currently envisioned, would leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue, proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced, and re-enter 19th Avenue south of Felix Avenue, providing safer and more direct transit access for Parkmerced visitors, residents and neighbors without removing any existing stops for users. The Proposed Project also includes a plan to landscape the median areas of Junipero Serra Boulevard between 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way and a section of 19th Avenue that are currently occupied by the MUNI rail tracks after the proposed realignment is completed. Other proposed infrastructure improvements include the installation of a variety of new facilities intended to reduce the Proposed Project's per-unit use of electricity, natural gas, water, and the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment systems. A combination of renewable energy sources, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, would be used to meet a portion of the Proposed Project's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. The filtered stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced. This feature of the Proposed Project would reduce the amount of stormwater flows directed to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant, and potentially help to increase and improve water levels in Lake Merced and reduce combined sewage overflows to the ocean.

Amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and the *San Francisco General Plan (General Plan)* would be needed. The Planning Code amendments would change the Height and Bulk District Zoning Map and would add a Special Use District (SUD) applicable to the entire Project

Site. A Development Agreement is also proposed, which would be accompanied by a Design for Development document containing specific development guidelines.

Environmental Review

The San Francisco Planning Department is the lead agency implementing environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the proposed Parkmerced Project. The Planning Department's Major Environmental Analysis Division (MEA) is directing preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project. CEQA requires that the decision-making body and the public be informed about the significant effects of a project and identify ways to avoid or reduce those effects prior to project approval. When a proposed project may have significant effects that are not reduced by mitigation measures included in a project, an EIR must be prepared. As part of the EIR process, the Planning Department conducted public scoping in May-June 2009 to obtain input from agencies and the public regarding the scope and focus of the EIR.

Following consideration of the public comments received during the scoping process, the Planning Department will prepare a Draft EIR on the proposed Project. The Draft EIR will include a description of the existing environmental conditions on and around the project site, and will identify significant impacts on the physical environment that could be caused by construction or operation of the proposed project. The issues raised during the public scoping process will help to identify potentially significant impacts that should be studied in the EIR and the alternatives that should be discussed in the EIR. The Draft EIR will be circulated for public comment, and written responses will be prepared to comments raising physical environmental issues. Following certification of a Final EIR by the Planning Commission, actions on the Parkmerced Project will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

2.0 SCOPING PROCESS

The purpose of scoping is to provide the CEQA lead agency with the opportunity to consult directly with interested public agencies, the public, and organizations and other interested parties on matters related to environmental effects associated with the project. The scoping process helps identify alternatives and mitigation measures that should be considered in the EIR. It also assists with the coordination of regulatory agencies, local agencies and other stakeholders who may have different views and concerns regarding environmental issues. Scoping activities can also serve as a means to engage a community, resolve issues early in the EIR process, and foster public participation in the environmental review process.

Public Notification

On May 20, 2009, the San Francisco Planning Department issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for the Project (see Appendix A). The public comment period extended from May 20, 2009 through June 19, 2009. Legal public notice was provided to local elected officials, affected public agencies, members of the public, including over 3,500 residents on and within 300 feet of the Parkmerced Project site. In addition, full copies of the NOP were available at the San Francisco Planning Department as well as on the City's website, and were mailed to local elected officials, informational repositories (e.g., libraries), and various agencies and interested individuals. Copies of the NOP

and Legal Notice are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2008.0021E.

Scoping Meeting Overview

A public scoping meeting was held to solicit input regarding project issues of concern to the community and identify potential environmental effects and potential alternatives to be considered in the environmental review process. The meeting was held on June 8, 2009 at the Stonestown YMCA Annex. The meeting was attended by approximately 75-100 people. Meeting proceedings were documented via audio recording, and transcribed by a court reporter who made a verbatim written transcript of the meeting (Attachment A).

Scoping Meeting Presentations

The meeting format consisted of an overview of the CEQA process provided by Rick Cooper, EIR Coordinator with the San Francisco Planning Department, and a brief description of the proposed project presented by Leo Chow, AIA, of Sidmore, Owings & Merrill, representing the project sponsor.

Scoping Meeting Comments

During the public comment portion of the scoping meeting, attendees were given an opportunity to provide input regarding issues of concern to the community and identify environmental effects and potential alternatives to be considered in the environmental review process. Those individuals wishing to speak at the meeting filled out speaker cards, and those who did not wish to speak publicly were encouraged to fill out comment cards or provide written comments directed to the Planning Department to document their concerns related to physical environmental issues. Meeting attendees were also reminded that project comments could be submitted by U.S. mail, electronic mail, and by facsimile to San Francisco Planning Department representatives (Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer) through June 19, 2009 (the conclusion of the public comment period). Copies of the sign-in sheets and speaker cards are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2008.0021E.

Oral Comments

Twenty-seven individuals spoke at the scoping meeting.

Written Comments

As noted at the scoping meeting, written comments were accepted via U.S. mail, electronic mail, and fax addressed to Bill Wycko at the San Francisco Planning Department. Twenty-six comment documents were received during the public review period. Copies of the comments received are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2008.0021E.

3.0 LIST OF COMMENTERS

Oral Comments

Oral comments were given by 27 individuals. The commenters are listed below and a summary of their comments is included in Attachment B:

- Maria Elena Guerrero Engber
- Neil Topliffe
- Reverend Dr. Albirda Rose-Eberhardt
- John Jweinat
- Stephen Heide
- Chris Manitsas
- Nima Gabbay
- Laura M. Traveler
- Mark Christensen
- Ronald Stovitz
- Genevieve Callejo
- Jeannie Scott
- Aaron Goodman
- Richard Leconte
- Andrew Wolfram
- John Scott
- Jeff Rocca
- Brian Turner
- M.K. Venkatachari
- Dr. Terence Faulkner
- Judith Flynn
- Maria Elena Mestayer
- Mike Vezzali
- Anna-Maria Brattan
- John Kim
- Adele Passalacqua
- Liz Pruiett

Written Comments

Written comments were received from 27 interested parties and agencies. The commenters are listed below and their comments are summarized in Attachment B:

- Public Utilities Commission, Vincent Kwong (1 of 2)
- Marilia Powers
- Maria Elena Guerrero Engber
- San Francisco Architectural Heritage, Jack A. Gold
- M. K Venkatashari
- John Jweinat (1 of 2)
- John Jweinat (2 of 2)
- The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Melanie Macchio
- Henry Tyldsley
- Dr. Terence Faulkner

- Jeanie Scott
- Janet Karesh
- Marty Walker
- Parkmerced Residents Organization, Aaron Goodman (1 of 2)
- Pruitt, Nguyen, Ala, Njau, Solyuna
- Kevin C. Kozminski
- John J. Beeston, MD
- National Trust for Historic Preservation, Western Office, Anthea M. Hartig
- Parkmerced Residents Organization, Aaron Goodman (2 of 2)
- Aaron Goodman
- The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Charles A. Birnbaum
- docomomo, Chandler McCoy
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Paula Kehoe
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Vincent Kwong (2 of 2)
- Joe Desmond
- Julian Lagos
- Department of Transportation, Lisa Carboni

4.0 SCOPING COMMENTS SUMMARY

The following is a summary of oral and written comments, arranged by topic:

Traffic/Transportation

- EIR should include detailed rail safety analysis, including considerations of grade separation or tunneling, median-running track, track alignments to reduce potential vehicle and pedestrian conflicts, adequate line of sights, adequate pedestrian safety, queuing times, traffic signal configuration, and lane configuration and width.
- Mitigation measures need to be included to address all rail safety-related impacts.
- EIR should consider parking issues and gridlock related to SFSU students parking on Parkmerced streets.
- EIR should evaluate the impacts of over 11,000 cars proposed to be parked on the site.
- A needs assessment should be conducted and included in the EIR to assess future projected MUNI ridership.
- EIR should examine alternative locations for re-routing MUNI, including out of the 19th Avenue median, and including providing direct connection to BART.
- EIR should identify an updated maintenance agreement for 19th Avenue.
- EIR should identify performance measures and/or mitigation measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.
- The Traffic Impact Study in the EIR should include analysis of the impacts on State highway facilities.

Historic Preservation

- EIR should identify the original Parkmerced boundary and discuss impacts of the selling off (division) throughout the years.
- EIR should identify how “poor” landscape maintenance and ad-hoc landscape work throughout the years (and still on-going) has damaged the originally designed landscaping on site.
- EIR should include a district-level evaluation of project impacts and should accurately detail the project’s impacts on the key features of the identified cultural landscape on the site.

- A feasibility analysis in the EIR should take into account regulatory and tax incentives available under the California Historical Building Code, Mills Act, and Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program.
- EIR should discuss whether the Army Corps must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) before issuing a permit.

Land Use/Visual/Massing

- EIR should address the overall “departure” from the site’s unique character.
- EIR should analyze the size of the project site in relation to the planned population increase and determine if there is “adequate” space for all the residents.
- EIR should identify that the new MUNI wires will be overhead even though all other utilities on the site are underground.
- EIR should discuss that re-routing of MUNI will impact existing peaceful character.
- View corridors should be identified and view (skyline) impacts of new towers identified.
- EIR should identify that the removal of Juan Bautista Circle for stormwater retention (the heart of Parkmerced) would damage the character of Parkmerced.
- EIR should discuss the scale of this project in relation to other San Francisco neighborhoods (numbers of units and residents per acre compared to other parts of the City).

Biological Resources

- EIR should identify avian corridors and address potential for bird strikes from wind turbines and high-rise buildings.
- A tree survey should be done, and identify include any heritage trees (or trees that could be eligible as a heritage tree).
- EIR should identify impacts on nesting birds as a result of the tree removal planned on the site.
- EIR should discuss a tree replacement plan.

Sustainability

- EIR should quantify the carbon footprint from all construction activity planned (including planned tree removal activities).
- EIR should identify safety of wind turbines (on people and animals).
- EIR should clarify the definition of green space.
- EIR should mention preservation, renovation, rehabilitation, restoration as sustainable methods of increasing the neighborhood sustainability.
- EIR should address the useful lifespan of the existing buildings.
- EIR should measure the impacts of “wholesale” demolition on sustainability goals.

Open Space

- EIR should identify the overall cumulative effects on open space – density proposed should be calculated for the Parkmerced community based on its original outline, not current boundaries.
- EIR needs to identify how the open space is being calculated (what is being included?).
- EIR should address how the loss of open space will affect the neighboring uses (SFSU, 800 Brotherhood, etc.).

Water

- EIR should identify current water wastefulness.
- A regional “water use report” should be included in the EIR that addresses the surrounding development.

- Any groundwater use will need review and authorization by the SFPUC.

Wind

- EIR should include wind tunnel analysis and identify wind impacts to avian corridors.

Population/Jobs/Housing

- EIR should identify population density and potential for over-crowding, including increased wear-and-tear on open space, public resources and infrastructure, traffic, pollution, litter, traffic and congestion.
- EIR should identify the number of units (and bedrooms).
- Density impacts should be evaluated per the original 191.5-acre Parkmerced boundary.
- EIR should address the loss of rental homes and where people are supposed to go once they are displaced.
- EIR should assume implementation of the SFSU Master Plan, which involves purchasing over 1,000 units of rent-controlled housing.
- EIR should identify the proposed target demographic for both proposed rental and for-sale units.
- EIR should include a cost-benefit analysis for both housing and commercial/retail uses planned.
- EIR needs to address rent control laws in place that protect the existing residents.
- EIR should identify impacts to existing retail and commercial services as a result of construction of new retail and commercial services.

Stormwater

- EIR should identify storm water diversion designs and should address maintenance of planned bio-swales.

Noise

- Streetcar noise should be analyzed in the EIR.

Air Quality/Hazards

- EIR should address the health impacts of demolishing the existing buildings.

Geology

- EIR should identify existing seismic upgrades that have been made to the property.
- EIR should provide information about locations of earthquake faults near the site.
- EIR should address proposed seismic upgrades and whether these upgraded and new buildings would stand up to a large earthquake.

Cumulative

- EIR needs to address cumulative impacts (to the surrounding areas, SF as a whole, and regionally) as a result of expansion identified in the SFSU Master Plan.
- EIR should mention the cumulative development impacts from other nearby sites: 800 Brotherhood, 77 Cambon, 700 Font (SFUSD site).

Alternatives

- A preservation alternative should be considered that follows the Secretary of Interior Standards.
- EIR should include a reduced scale alternative that would maintain Parkmerced's eligibility for the National Register.

- The standards-compliant alternative should analyze whether and where some infill construction and selective demolition and new construction could be appropriate within the identified cultural landscape.
- Other locations for re-urbanization and construction should be identified.

Miscellaneous

- The EIR should consider quality of life impacts, particularly nuisances created by on-going construction activities, stresses from needing to relocate from existing housing units and into a new unit.
- EIR should identify the existing micro climate in the area and that neighboring developments have many issues such as mould and mildew, causing respiratory issues for occupants.
- An initial study needs to be done for the project.
- Adequate notice of all environmental documents needs to be given to the public.
- All environmental documents need to be translated so that the large Russian, and Asian communities can understand the proposed project and environmental impacts.

hearing 6-8-09

0001
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PARK MERCED PROJECT, 3711 19TH AVENUE
(CASE NO. 2008.0021E)
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE PARK MERCED PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2009
STONESTOWN YMCA ANNEX
3150 20TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

0002

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

For the San Francisco Planning Department:
Rick Cooper
For the Project Sponsor:
Leo Chow, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
For the Public:
Maria Elena Guerrero Ingber
Neil Topliffe
Reverend Dr. Albirda Rose-Eberhardt
John Jweinat
Monroe Jacobson
Stephen Heide, Merced Extension Triangle
Neighborhood Association
Chris Manitsas
Nima Gabbay
Laura Traveler
Mark Christensen, Merced Extension Triangle
Neighborhood Association
Ronald Stovitz
Genevieve Callejo
Jeannie Scott
Aaron Goodman
Richard LeConte
Andrew Wolfram, DOCOMOMO, Northern California Chapter

0003

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

John S. Scott
Jeff Rocca, St. Stephen's School and Parish
Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic
Preservation
M.K. Venkatachari
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Judith Flynn
Maria Elena Mestayer
Mike Vezzali
Anna-Maria Brattan

John Kim
Adele Passalacqua
Liz Pruiett

--oOo--

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0004

[The meeting began at 6:15 p.m.]

RICK COOPER: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to tonight's public scoping meeting for the Park Merced project environmental impact report.

My name is Rick Cooper and I am an environmental planner with the San Francisco Planning Department. And with me tonight is my colleague Monica Pereira. We and our colleagues Devyani Jain and Greg Riessen, who could not be here this evening, are the coordinators for this environmental impact report. With us tonight, also, are Julie Tilley Barlow and Barbara Sahm from Turnstone Consulting, who will be assisting in preparation of the EIR. Also with us tonight is Seth Mallen of Stellar Management and his team representing the project sponsor, Park Merced Investors LLC. Also, we have a representative tonight of Supervisor Elsbernd, who is here just to monitor our meeting; and she's certainly available if you wish to speak to her.

Absolutely, yeah. I should say that it will be important, as you make your comments this evening, to be sure to speak into the mike, as I should, so that we can be heard. The acoustics are a little bit difficult in here, so it is important to use the microphones.

As you came in, hopefully, you signed in on our sign-up sheet. If you have not done so, Julie is

0005

sitting in the back to assist you. Also, if you plan on speaking you should complete a speaker card, which we'll be collecting from you. Another item you may wish to pick up is a comment form -- actually, it's lined paper -- in the back, on which you can write comments, regardless of whether or not you decide to speak tonight. You may place your written comments in the box before you depart this evening.

A couple of housekeeping items before we go on. The restrooms are located outside the door. And if you continue on past the front door, they are in the back. Also, we request that you turn off the ringers on your cellphones and pagers and that you step outside the room if you need to talk on the phone.

I'd like to take a minute to discuss the purpose of tonight's meeting. The EIR process, as required by the California Environment Quality Act, or CEQA, is a public one; and this is the very first step. The main reason for this scoping meeting is to elicit public comments or suggestions concerning the scope and focus of the EIR. This is your opportunity to assist

22 our department by sharing any information you may have
23 that will be useful in preparation of the EIR. This is
24 not a meeting about the merits of the proposed project
25 or about whether to approve or disapprove the project.

0006

1 It is also not a question-and-answer session, although
2 we may ask questions of you for points of clarification.
3 Instead, it's an opportunity for us to collect
4 information for use by the EIR team that will develop
5 the CEQA documents.

6 In just a moment you'll hear a brief
7 presentation from Leo Chow of Skidmore, Owings, and
8 Merrill regarding the proposed project. After that I'll
9 speak to you briefly about how the CEQA process works
10 and then we'll open up the meeting for your comments.
11 After all speakers have commented, we'll wrap up the
12 meeting.

13 Now I'd like to hand things over to Leo, who
14 will speak to you and describe the proposed project.

15 LEO CHOW: Thank you, Rick.

16 I think one of the things that we wanted to do
17 today is to just really give you a quick overview of the
18 project. For those of you who have attended a lot of
19 our -- or some -- of our community meetings, you know
20 that the project description could go on for quite
21 sometime. I can continue to speak for a very long time
22 about the project. It's very involved. It has some
23 very high ambitions and includes many, many components.
24 So I'll be going through it very quickly today for
25 purposes of background information and then turn it back

0007

1 over to Rick.

2 So the view that you see on the wall is
3 basically where Park Merced is located. It's located in
4 the southwest corner of the city. And it sits on land
5 that was once the watershed for Lake Merced. And what's
6 happened over the years is that that watershed has been
7 built over so that it no longer sustains Lake Merced.
8 One of our concerns and one of the things that we want
9 to address with this project is really how we can try to
10 rebuild and restructure some of the ecology that's
11 natural to this site long before it was built.

12 Park Merced itself was built from about 1942
13 to 1951. It was built during the war, so parts of it
14 were built with original construction as concrete and
15 quality materials, but a lot of it was also built during
16 periods when there were material shortages. So it was
17 built -- some parts of it were built with wood frame.
18 They have -- you know -- concrete in some of them and
19 also no metal flashing. So there have been a lot of
20 issues with the project over the years.

21 More importantly, the project was built at a
22 time when the planning principles of the day were to be
23 car-centric. In other words, it was planned around the
24 fact that everybody would get in a car and drive to go
25 some place. In fact, if you look at the original

0008

1 marketing brochures, it was meant to be a suburb in the
2 city.

3 The way they laid out the plan -- the way that
4 the plan was laid out, a lot of the support services
5 were way off on the edges. So we have playing fields,
6 schools, retail -- they were all pushed to the edges.

7 So what happened was that people that needed to use any
8 of these amenities had to get in their cars often or at
9 least walk potentially very long distances. What's
10 happened over the years is that those parcels are the
11 most difficult for the owners to sustain. So what has
12 happened over the years is that they have been sold off
13 by the previous owners one by one. So what we have
14 today now in Park Merced is essentially a bedroom
15 community in the heart of the city. And that is one of
16 the real issues that we've been trying to address.

17 The other fact is that there are a lot of
18 things about the structures themselves. They're
19 approaching 50 to 60 years old; and many of them are
20 showing signs of their age. Many of them were built
21 as -- I wouldn't say temporary, but they were built with
22 materials, as I mentioned before, that weren't intended
23 to be permanent construction; and such that a lot of
24 them are facing a lot of issues.

25 There's -- and then the other thing that I've
0009

1 been talking about in the past a great deal is the
2 sustainability of landscapes. Park Merced uses potable
3 water to irrigate all those landscapes, so every year
4 55 million gallons of water is going into keeping those
5 lawns green and trying to keep the planting alive.

6 The other thing that's happening is because it
7 was planned all at once -- 40, 50 years ago -- all the
8 planting -- a lot of the planting -- is dying off at the
9 same time now. A lot of trees, particularly the
10 Monterey pines, have reached a level of maturity that
11 they're dying off.

12 So over the past two-plus years, we've had
13 about 150, 160 meetings with neighborhood groups,
14 community meetings with yourselves, residents, City
15 agencies, and others. And it's been a really great
16 process, because we've learned a lot. We've heard a lot
17 from you and we have taken note of everything that
18 everybody has said. And just to kind of give you some
19 categories of topics of the main things that we've been
20 hearing, a lot of the things we've heard include things
21 such as families, being people would love to have homes
22 where they could have their families. And, in
23 particular, one of the things that sort of surprised us
24 is that when we first started the process it was
25 intended to be all rental. We've been hearing that
0010

1 there's a desire to have some for-sale properties here.

2 The other thing -- I think this is probably
3 the biggest concern that a lot of you are here tonight
4 about is obviously our concerns about traffic on 19th
5 Avenue and in the area in general. It is something that
6 we are very, very keenly aware of. I myself live in the
7 area so, you know, every weekend I'll experience the
8 traffic directly myself. And we've been working with
9 City agencies looking up and down the entire 19th Avenue
10 corridor to try and help create a comprehensive plan for
11 the 19th Avenue corridor so that we can try to address
12 these issues.

13 But I think the potential behind Park Merced,
14 what got us very excited about the project that has the
15 potential to be unlike any other project that you
16 typically see at these meetings, which is that it has a
17 scale that allows us to start to address issues that go

18 beyond the project itself. So we can start to look at
19 things up and down the entire 19th Avenue corridor. We
20 can start to address issues of sprawl in the entire Bay
21 Area. In fact, we can actually even start to show
22 measurable impact on the City's goals for reducing the
23 City's carbon footprint, which is actually something
24 that has been legislated by the City and is actually now
25 backed up but legislation at the State level as well.

0011

1 So it's -- the City's goals are actually much
2 more aggressive than the Kyoto protocols, which is
3 actually to bring Park Merced -- or actually San
4 Francisco's -- carbon footprint down below its 1998
5 levels within the next -- by 2012, actually.

6 So why is Park Merced different? Why is this
7 possible? And why can it make such a big difference?
8 Well, if you look at a map of Park Merced -- of the
9 city -- this is the entire city of San Francisco. Park
10 Merced is down here at the bottom left. Park Merced is
11 about the scale of a typical neighborhood in San
12 Francisco. The difference is it's all under one
13 ownership, which means that they can do things at the
14 neighborhood scale that no other developer can. So
15 there's an opportunity here to do some really great
16 things that can't be done in other projects. So when we
17 try to bring together all of the feedback that we've
18 getting, what we really see is an opportunity to create
19 what we would describe as a complete neighborhood, a
20 neighborhood the way you think of neighborhoods in San
21 Francisco, as opposed to just a bedroom community tucked
22 away in the corner. So what we're really looking at are
23 things that will create that neighborhood -- a social
24 heart, a diverse community, things that will connect
25 that neighborhood out to the rest of the city instead of

0012

1 being this little island that it is. And then lastly on
2 the ecological level, to really start to make a
3 significant impact on the environment and the
4 improvements that we can make.

5 So what are we going to do? The components
6 include, in terms of creating a complete neighborhood,
7 is actually to build a neighborhood retail street. If
8 you think about San Francisco neighborhoods, they all
9 have the retail street. And so we'll be introducing
10 along Crespi retail spaces, including a grocery store,
11 daycare, possibly preschool, then a fitness center, and
12 a community center. So all the components that you
13 would need to kind of create a complete neighborhood
14 will all be located here in part of the neighborhood.
15 In addition to that will be small neighborhood little
16 pocket parks that would include retail as well a little
17 corner cafe, perhaps dry cleaners but also things like
18 car share, bike share, community kitchen -- components
19 that are going to really help the knit the fabric of the
20 community together by creating places of interest,
21 places of common use for people to get together. These
22 spaces would be gathered around a little neighborhood
23 park that would have the use for recreation but also can
24 become community gardens so people have a place to
25 gather not only in indoor program spaces but also

0013

1 outdoor spaces.

2 A small component of what we're trying to do

3 also is that as a community we really want to be able to
4 make it so that people can access the broader community
5 and not just rely on the car. So one of the major
6 components that we're proposing is actually to bring the
7 Muni M line, which currently sits out on 19th Avenue,
8 into Park Merced. This is something that would be
9 provided by the ownership of the project. And what we
10 have been doing has been working with Muni's TEP plan,
11 their transit effectiveness plan, to actually bring the
12 M and the J to the site. And what we would be able to
13 do is actually introduce three new stops that are
14 actually in Park Merced, move the dangerous stop that's
15 out in 19th Avenue at State, bring that onto the site
16 right where the leasing offices for Park Merced are
17 right now so there's plenty of land around it so that
18 people can stand there. There will be services and
19 amenities and it becomes a much more desirable place to
20 be and also, most importantly, makes it much more
21 accessible.

22 We have actually done -- we sent out 16,000
23 surveys to local residents and got a very high response
24 rate. And one of the things that we found was that a
25 lot of people, although they're using public transit,

0014 1 they're driving to public transit. The other component
2 would be that once we moved the Muni line, we can
3 actually start to treat 19th Avenue as a landscape
4 boulevard.

5 The other component is that in addition to the
6 access one of the things about Park Merced is that right
7 now it has very few points of getting in and out. And
8 they are somewhat convoluted, as you can see here. This
9 results in bottlenecks. All the traffic from Park
10 Merced that's trying to get in and out of it are coming
11 to a very few points and it creates a lot of traffic at
12 those few nodes. So one of the things that we've been
13 doing is looking at creating more openings so that
14 traffic can be dispersed. And through multiple entry
15 points so that it's not all bottled up.

16 In addition, other kinds of access that we're
17 creating is we're proposing a shuttle that is going to
18 be providing a connection over to Daly City BART. Daly
19 City BART is actually one of the quickest ways of
20 getting downtown from this area of the city, but it's a
21 little difficult to get to. The owners will actually
22 provide a shuttle. And then, in addition, during the
23 off-hours that shuttle can support -- be a shopper
24 shuttle providing access to Stonestown and Westlake and
25 other areas. In addition, there are other components of

0015 1 the plan, including a very extensive bike plan that's
2 going to knit into the City's overall bicycle plan.

3 As part of that bike plan there's actually
4 going to be bike libraries which people can actually
5 borrow bikes and use them to get around the area so that
6 they don't have to rely on their car. They don't have
7 to rely on their own modes of travel. They can actually
8 borrow bikes.

9 Then in addition to that, one of the things
10 that we really also have been focusing on is improving
11 the pedestrian realm, where people are walking the
12 sidewalk -- what is it like to be walking around in this
13 neighborhood. Right now it's very exposed. One of the

14 things that we want to do is to actually introduce --
15 keep most of the street grid but actually introduce
16 smaller streets, create a smaller block so that you're
17 not having to walk as far as from block to block. And
18 then it also introduces a number of pedestrian-only
19 paseos that again help make it easy for the people to
20 move through the neighborhood. In addition to trying to
21 make the neighborhood more friendly for people to be
22 outside and actually be able to make the pedestrian
23 environment more pleasant, we're setting up the streets
24 so there are hedgerows that would knock down the wind.
25 You know how windy it can be out here -- and gray. And

0016

1 then on the days when it's sunny, the streets are
2 oriented to try and maximize access to the sun. So,
3 again, it's a friendly, inviting place to walk around.
4 A big part of what we're doing is -- I
5 mentioned about the sustainability. One of the things
6 we want to do is actually take -- right now what happens
7 is all the rainwater that falls onsite goes down into
8 your sewer system. All the water goes into the sewer
9 system and actually goes out to the Oceanside Treatment
10 Plant and goes through the full treatment, which is
11 pretty crazy. So what we're doing to do is actually
12 decouple that so that rainwater that falls onsite will
13 run through a series of streams and swales and ponds and
14 be cleaned the way nature would clean the water and then
15 recharge the aquifer underneath the site and actually
16 help to recharge Lake Merced, where the water originally
17 was going to be going; and then also connect the ecology
18 of Lake Merced back with a series of parks and open
19 spaces so that the ecology, which has kind of shrunk
20 down right around the perimeter of Lake Merced these
21 days, has the opportunity to expand out into the greater
22 area that it once was.

23 So these open spaces will also include a major
24 park along the south side here that will include
25 recreation spaces. So now the playing fields -- right

0017

1 now there are no structured playing fields. And so
2 we'll have several playing fields in the corner here.
3 And, in fact, there's actually and -- here's a view of
4 it. And then actually we're introducing a two- to
5 three-acre organic farm that will be commercially
6 farmed. And this farm will actually -- right here -- be
7 set up and that it's not actually run by Park Merced.
8 It will be run by commercial farmers; and they can tie
9 into a larger network of food distribution -- either
10 selling the produce at the grocery store in Park Merced
11 or the restaurants or even possibly as part of a CSA,
12 which is an agricultural -- community-serving
13 agricultural network.

14 Now, as far as the transportation goes, again,
15 it's a very detailed plan. But we've been looking at
16 different ways to look at technology and different ways
17 of having people have services so that they can find
18 alternatives to relying on their cars. One of the
19 important things is, for example, a transportation
20 coordinator. Because everybody at Park Merced comes in
21 as a rental, they have an opportunity to, when they sign
22 their leasing papers, to actually sit down with the
23 transportation coordinator, who will sit down with them
24 and help them find different ways of moving around the

25 city -- most efficient ways, which often doesn't mean

0018

1 rely on a car. After having studied this, one of the
2 things that we do believe is that on a per-unit basis
3 we're able to cut down the number of cars on a per-unit
4 basis by about half. Now, we know that there's still
5 going to be some additional car trips generated from
6 that. We're not going to try and deny that fact. And
7 that's where looking at the full corridor-wide
8 transportation is an important part of the study.

9 On a -- from an energy and water standpoint
10 the numbers are really dramatic. You have to remember
11 these homes were built in the '40s when energy was not a
12 major concern. We think that actually on a per-unit
13 basis we can actually reduce the energy used by each
14 home by 63 percent and the amount of water used by about
15 60 percent as well. That is a dramatic reduction in
16 demand. And what it means is that basically we can
17 build these additional homes with no new demand on the
18 City's infrastructure. So we'll be using basically the
19 same amount of water and the same amount of energy that
20 we're using today with the increased number of homes.
21 What that translates into is, in terms of helping the
22 overall City's goals, is that right now, for example,
23 the average resident produces about five tons of carbon
24 dioxide a year. We are able to reduce that by
25 60 percent. So that means that each resident will only

0019

1 be producing about two tons of carbon dioxide a year for
2 their home and their use of a car directly here at Park
3 Merced.

4 So over the next 20 years the way this will
5 go, it will be incrementally -- development will happen
6 incrementally. It will be about 200 to 300 homes built
7 a year. And we see that process, including moving of
8 any existing residents -- all existing residents will be
9 protected. Their rent control status will be protected.
10 If they have to move they will only have to move once.
11 And over that 20-year period it will have a completely
12 new transformed reinvigorated neighborhood in this
13 corner of the city, which we think is very exciting.
14 And we think it's an important step of what these kinds
15 of projects can do and contribute to our goals as a city
16 in terms of making it a better place for all of us to
17 live.

18 RICK COOPER: Folks who are sitting in the
19 back, there are plenty of chairs up front, if you so
20 desire.

21 I'd like to now just briefly describe to you
22 the CEQA process that we will be following for
23 preparation of this EIR.

24 The first step of the process was the issuance
25 of the notice of preparation and scoping meeting. This

0020

1 notice included a brief description of the proposed
2 project, a list of environmental effects the project
3 will study and indicate where written comments on the
4 scope of the EIR may be sent.

5 The next step of the process will be
6 publication of the draft EIR, which we anticipate will
7 occur early next year. The DEIR will be distributed for
8 public review for a period of 45 days. Oral comments
9 will also be accepted at the Planning Commission hearing

hearing 6-8-09

10 on the draft EIR, which will be held about a month after
11 publication of the draft. Following the close of the
12 draft EIR comment period, the Planning Department will
13 prepare a comments-and-responses document, which will
14 contain written responses to all substantive comments
15 received during the draft EIR review period. About two
16 weeks after publication of the comments-and-responses
17 document, a hearing will be held before the Planning
18 Commission, where they will be asked to certify the
19 final EIR, which will consist of the draft EIR together
20 with the comments-and-responses document.

21 Certification of the EIR would not mean the
22 project is approved or disapproved. Rather it would
23 satisfy the CEQA environmental review requirements for
24 the proposed project. Project approval or disapproval
25 is a completely separate consideration from the adequacy

0021

1 of the EIR. For each significant impact we identify in
2 the EIR the document will identify measures to avoid or
3 substantially reduce the project's effects. These
4 measures are called mitigation measures. The EIR will
5 also evaluate and compare the impacts of the
6 alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives
7 to be assessed should avoid or substantially lessen any
8 identified significant environmental effects. I
9 apologize for this microphone. These alternatives may
10 have not yet been developed. However, the EIR will
11 assess the no-project alternative, which allows
12 comparison of the impacts of approving the project with
13 the impacts of not approving it.

14 Okay. We're now ready to open up the meeting
15 for your comments. Could you all give me a show of
16 hands as to how many of you wish to speak tonight?
17 Okay. In consideration of the number of people that
18 want to make comments I'd like to ask that you limit
19 your comments to three minutes. And we'll be letting
20 you know when your three minutes are up.

21 We also this evening have a court reporter
22 present who is making a verbatim transcript of all
23 comments that are made. And so that he may make a good
24 transcript, I would ask that you please come to the
25 mike; speak into it; and speak slowly, loudly, and

0022

1 clearly so that his transcript will be accurate. When
2 you come to the microphone, please state your name and
3 address. If you're representing an organization, please
4 indicate the group and your official capacity. You may
5 be asked to spell your name for the benefit of the
6 reporter. All speakers are urged to refrain from making
7 any comments concerning the merits of the project but to
8 instead direct your remarks to the scope and focus of
9 the EIR.

10 Okay. It's now time for our first speaker.
11 I'd like to call up Maria Ingber.

12 MARIA ELENA GUERRERO INGBER: Okay. My name
13 is Maria Elena Guerrero Ingber. My family and I have
14 lived at Park Merced for the last 20 years. I am
15 definitely an interested party in this project. I have
16 been a resident of 310 Arballo Drive, Apartment 11-D,
17 since July 1st, 1993. For the last 16 years I have
18 lived in that apartment with my mother, Mrs. Maria Helen
19 Guerrero, who now is 90 years old and has Alzheimer's
20 disease.

21 For us, the residents living in the 3,221
22 units, including myself, my brother, and my mother, we
23 will be directly impacted by this project. Our quality
24 of life will be greatly affected by the demolition and
25 constant construction around us in the next 30 years.

0023

1 At the same time we will have to maintain a sense of
2 normalcy in our lives in the middle of the chaos that
3 will be forced upon us. The level of noise, the
4 pollution, and the air quality that are already bad in
5 San Francisco will be made even worse.

6 I'm asking what will happen to the renters of
7 the 170 two-unit buildings with 1,538 townhomes that
8 will be demolished?

9 I am opposed to this project. It will
10 directly affect my health and my well-being during the
11 last years of my life.

12 Thank you very much.

13 RICK COOPER: Thank you. If you could please
14 refrain from applause, I'd appreciate it.

15 The next speaker is Neil Topliffe.

16 NEIL TOPLIFFE: Hi. My name is Neil Topliffe.
17 I live at 128 Cardenas Avenue.

18 I'm in Phase 1 of the project. And from my
19 understanding, we will be moved only once to the open
20 areas of construction that are available on the west
21 south corner, the furthest area from public
22 transportation. I picked my current location to be
23 close to public access. And I feel like I'm being
24 forced into a location that would require me to own a
25 car. I'd like to get some consideration into this and

0024

1 other areas and other options that we may have and where
2 we're going to be moved and what circumstances are
3 available to us. I'd like to grow my family and have
4 Park Merced be my long-term residence over the next 10,
5 15 years. And in this situation I feel like I'm being
6 forced out of the community.

7 Thank you.

8 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

9 Next speaker, Reverend Dr. Albirda
10 Rose-Eberhardt.

11 REVEREND DR. ALBIRDA ROSE-EBERHARDT: Good
12 evening. It's spelled A-l-b-i-r-d-a Rose-Eberhardt,
13 E-b-e-r-h-a-r-d-t.

14 I'm not sure what I want to say. Some of this
15 I did not know was going on. I've been living here
16 since 1980. I've been teaching at San Francisco State
17 for 39 years. I will retire at the end of the year.
18 I'm very concerned. You said it would take 20 years to
19 do the work. I was sitting back there figuring I'd be
20 80. And I don't think -- I wasn't planning on moving.
21 I, too, feel like this will push me out. I walk the
22 lake every day -- five miles. I have raised both of my
23 children here. So some of what was said earlier I
24 disagree with. I did feel like I had community. I had
25 family; and that's why I stayed here. It was so

0025

1 difficult to leave.

2 Now, I must say I'm amazed at some of what
3 you're doing. It sounds great. It sounds fabulous, but
4 I'm not sure where it all fits in or where I have a
5 voice. I hear I have a voice now.

hearing 6-8-09

6 You said three minutes. I could talk forever.
7 I did say I was a reverend. So I preach for 20 minutes
8 at least.

9 It is just interesting to me. And I
10 appreciate -- I really do appreciate some of the thought
11 that's going into this, but some of it I think is just
12 out of line.

13 I'm also concerned what the university's part
14 in this is, as I have lived in Park Merced on Gonzalez
15 first, then Vidal. Then I woke up one morning and the
16 university had bought the property and no one informed
17 us. In fact, when we first started inquiring -- I'm
18 looking back at a friend in the back -- it was like it
19 was a big secret, that we weren't supposed to know the
20 university was buying it. So I'm really concerned how
21 that component, from 19th and Holloway all the way down,
22 how does that fit in the big picture? And I'm not sure
23 that I'm seeing that.

24 Thank you.

25 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

0026

1 Next speaker, John Jweinat.

2 JOHN JWEINAT: Hi. My name is John Jweinat,
3 J-w-e-i-n-at. I'm the owner of the Park Merced Shopping
4 Center at 35-111 Cambon Drive. And my main concern is
5 access to make sure the traffic flows throughout the
6 property for everybody. I hope you take that into great
7 consideration.

8 Thank you.

9 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

10 Next speaker, Monroe Jacobson.

11 MONROE JACOBSON: My name is Monroe Jacobson.
12 I've lived in Park Merced since 1979.

13 what I would really like to hear from -- the
14 person -- is the management of Park Merced. I would
15 like him to speak tonight and just tell us if we're
16 guaranteed the same rent when the new Park Merced is
17 built. Rent control will still be in effect? I want to
18 know what guarantees we have as tenants here now. And I
19 want to know where we're going to go.

20 I would also like to know when Castelo Avenue
21 plans to be moved -- the people on Castelo Avenue. So
22 if the -- if any representative from Park Merced -- the
23 rental units -- are here now, I would like them to speak
24 and give us some information.

25 Thank you.

0027

1 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

2 Next speaker, Stephen Heide. That's a good
3 idea. The next speaker will be Chris Manitsas.

4 STEPHEN HEIDE: Yes. I'm Stephen Heide from
5 Merced Extension Triangle Neighborhood Association. And
6 I live at 306 St. Charles Avenue. I'm not a resident at
7 Park Merced, but I'm very concerned about the effect on
8 the surrounding neighborhood, which I live in, for
9 traffic, water, electricity, sewage. I think there's
10 way too many people planned to live in this area. I
11 think it's way out of scale and I think it should be
12 scaled down.

13 Thank you.

14 CHRIS MANITSAS: I'm Chris Manitsas from
15 Lakeshore Acres, which is north of here between Sloat
16 and the lake.

17 The main concern we have -- and I think mainly
18 our concern will be how can this area support 6,000 or
19 even 3,000 new, additional homes, especially with regard
20 to traffic? 19th is blockaded most of the time.
21 Traffic -- increased traffic will be coming down Sloat
22 Boulevard, with backups coming from 280. Also, Skyline
23 Boulevard and Lakeshore Boulevard have become part of
24 the 19th Avenue highway traffic being diverted. And
25 with increased traffic being diverted from Park Merced

0028

1 to Lake Merced Boulevard, this is going to increase the
2 problem.

3 The other thing I'm concerned about is that
4 the study may be done during summertime, when San
5 Francisco State is out and all the schools along Sloat
6 Boulevard are out. And this happened to us before when
7 Stonestown had an EIR that was done at a time when
8 schools were out.

9 Also, consideration should be given to San
10 Francisco State is planning adding another 5,000
11 students. It's not going to be done now, because of the
12 budget; but in due time this will be on the agenda.

13 So I think that all this wonderful talk about
14 ecology and farming and so on, a lot of it could be done
15 with or without increased homes, if you're interested in
16 that. But the main -- the name of the game for many of
17 us is traffic. And can the area support 6,000 homes?

18 Thank you.

19 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

20 Please refrain from applause. Thank you.

21 The next two speakers, Kevin Chuck and Laura
22 M. Traveler.

23 NIMA GABBAY: It's actually Nima Gabbay,
24 speaking on behalf of Kevin Chuck. My main thing is
25 there's so much traffic on 19th that we really need to

0029

1 increase accessibility into Park Merced off of 19th.
2 Hopefully, that decrease of the traffic on 19th gets
3 backed up. So the big thing for me is the accessibility
4 off of 19th into Park Merced and Cambon Drive.

5 Thanks.

6 LAURA M. TRAVELER: My name is Laura Traveler.
7 I'm a resident here since 1986.

8 The scenario that's being painted here has
9 become very confusing to me. We already have 1,100
10 townhomes and you're talking about 6,000 more? And is
11 it my understanding that there will be -- some of the
12 existing townhomes will be torn down?

13 I really do believe that much more has to go
14 into getting the people here totally involved in this
15 process. Right now the bits and pieces and things that
16 are being spoken about just is not enough. But the
17 scenario -- it gets harder, it gets worse and worse, the
18 more that I hear -- the more I hear from the
19 presentation. So I'm hoping that at the end here we can
20 have more time, more facts about the presentation, about
21 the whole subject.

22 Thank you.

23 RICK COOPER: Next speakers, Mark Christensen
24 and Ronald Stovitz.

25 MARK CHRISTENSEN: Good evening. I am Mark

0030

1 Christensen. I am president of the Merced Extension

2 Triangle Neighborhood Association. I live at 60 Kempton
3 Avenue.

4 On Monday, June 1st, 2009, the Merced
5 Extension Triangle Executive Board took the following
6 position related to the Park Merced project. Merced
7 Extension Triangle Neighborhood Association Executive
8 Board supports the proposed improvements for housing and
9 retail at Park Merced. However, we have major concerns
10 regarding the size and scope of the project as it
11 relates to the overall infrastructure, traffic, parking,
12 sewers, water, electricity, views, and other related
13 issues. We want mitigation measures in place for all
14 environmental issues. There needs to be a continued
15 forum to present all community issues in dialogue form.
16 And at this time we are opposed to any change in the
17 planning code height and bulk maps.

18 This was presented by Mark Christensen,
19 president; Glen Hakatayama, vice-president; Richard
20 Zerga, treasurer; Jane Bailey, Steve Heide, Dwain Price,
21 and Terry Watson.

22 For those present, there are currently 3,221
23 units. This is supposed to be increased to 8,900 units.
24 That's an increase of 5,679 units. One of the most
25 important issues concerns the number of bedrooms

0031

1 planned. There's no mention of the number of bedrooms.
2 The number of bedrooms equates to the number of people.
3 I would like to know tonight how many bedrooms are
4 planned when the project is complete, because that is
5 really going to give you the number of new residents.

6 There are planned 15 35 [sic] tall buildings;
7 60 three- to six-story buildings, which will be 45 to
8 65 feet; 40 eight- to ten-story buildings, 85 to 105
9 feet. They plan to keep all the existing 13-story
10 towers and add an additional 11-story towers that are
11 going to go between 115 and 140 feet, which is actually
12 taller than the existing buildings. We need to look at
13 the height of the buildings; the total number of units;
14 and, most important, the number of bedrooms.

15 Also, the automobile use on their part is an
16 assumption that has no basis of fact. As a matter of
17 fact, people will continue to use their automobiles; and
18 when they're not using their automobiles, those
19 automobiles are going to be parked. And every time they
20 use it -- and let's face it, people are going to
21 increase and continue to use their automobiles --
22 there's no way around that.

23 So those are the issues. And we really need
24 to look at the height and we need to look at the number
25 of bedrooms and the number of people who will eventually

0032

1 live there.

2 Thank you.

3 RONALD STOVITZ: I'm Ronald Stovitz,
4 S-t-o-v-i-t-z. For 28 years I've lived about 300 feet
5 east of the east edge of the Park Merced property in the
6 Lakeside Village neighborhood. I also am very concerned
7 that the numbers -- population numbers -- have not been
8 put. Here we are in the NOP phase and we don't have a
9 population number. I urge the Planning Department as
10 quickly as possible to assign a population number at the
11 earliest EIR phase. I estimate very conservatively, to
12 the extent that the sponsor wishes to have families and

13 children -- a commendable goal; that there will be
14 11,350 additional citizens, because, as we know, units
15 don't drive cars on Highway 1 or compete for seats on
16 Muni. It is people who do it.

17 I urge that this project needs a holistic
18 rather than an incremental view, because as the speakers
19 have pointed out, contiguous to this project is a
20 5,000-person addition to the growth of San Francisco
21 State. These directly flow to traffic and
22 transportation issues. I urge the Planning Department
23 when it looks at transit and transportation issues to go
24 carefully through the mitigative measures proposed by
25 the sponsor to see whether they put one additional MUNI

0033

1 vehicle on the trackway or the streets or they put one
2 additional BART car on the BART line. As we know, those
3 are decisions that the sponsor has no competent legal
4 authority for. They are entirely invested within the
5 San Francisco MTA and the Bay Area Rapid Transit
6 District. Absent a commitment -- a written
7 commitment -- binding or effective commitment from those
8 transit agencies, the project is very risky to mitigate
9 transit effects. And given that the budgets for those
10 agencies has fallen off the proverbial cliff, I doubt
11 that we would see the transit effectiveness plan or any
12 further transit enhancement.

13 And, finally, I am very concerned about the
14 height and massing issues, because we would have
15 buildings of eight to fourteen stories that are in
16 numbers approximately four and a half to five times over
17 the current number of buildings above two stories. And
18 those have not only shadowing issues and visibility
19 issues but they also vitally affect all the
20 environmental -- they run the gamut of environmental
21 concerns. And I hope those issues of height and massing
22 get extraordinary scrutiny in the process.

23 Thank you very much.

24 RICK COOPER: Thank you. The next two
25 speakers, Genevieve Callejo and Jeannie Scott.

0034

1 GENEVIEVE CALLEJO: Yes. My name is Genevieve
2 Callejo. I'm a 41-year resident of Park Merced, the
3 most glorious place in the world that I have lived,
4 because I lived on Arballo for all those 41 years. And
5 I've never had to look for a parking place. I park
6 right in front of my house.

7 Now, my problem, as I view this, when I first
8 went to the first meeting, I looked at all the
9 gray-hairs and I said, Oh, my gosh, what I am doing
10 here? I'm not going to be around five years, ten years.
11 They're preaching to all the older people and what do we
12 really care? Do we really care? Yes, I do.

13 And as I have spoken with Mr. Pilacci
14 [phonetic spelling] and staff and "Call Me Reg"
15 Reggiano, I said, You know what? Now, I would like to
16 see in Park Merced some speed signs right now. Not in
17 the future. Right now. Because you go down Arballo --
18 not private Arballo -- you take your life in your hands
19 crossing the street. They shoot through there like a
20 bat out of hell. They try and tell me that it's going
21 to be better for the residents to have through parking
22 so they can get through like a crossword puzzle and they
23 don't have to go around these frigging circles, you

24 know. Does that make sense, sir? It doesn't make sense
25 to me.

0035

1 When I came to this meeting tonight I picked
2 up Ms. Traveler, my neighbor, with whom we have both
3 been in Park Merced resident organizations for so many
4 years we can't even remember and gone through Leona
5 Helmsley and all the way up to "Call Me Reg" Reggiano.
6 So why am I going on and on? I only want to
7 see some sense to the projected traffic through. What
8 is wrong with the beautiful circles? They make
9 everybody polite. You come to a circle. This one goes
10 first, if you're lucky, and et cetera. That is my -- I
11 hope -- at my age I ain't gonna be here. I probably
12 won't even live to see the first bashing going down.
13 But right now I would love for somebody to address the
14 speed in Park Merced at the moment.

15 Thank you very much.

16 JEANNIE SCOTT: I'm Jeannie Scott; and I live
17 at 769 Gonzalez. I've been there five and a half years.
18 And I love this project. When I first heard it I
19 thought it was great. It's like leaving the past behind
20 and we're moving into the future and we're all going to
21 have to go. It's addressing water issues. I walked --
22 and all of you will see all the rain coming down and
23 going into the storm drain and down into the sewers.
24 And it's like it should be in the lake. So I love this
25 whole project. I live in one of the garden apartments.

0036

1 I hear my neighbor below me as if they lived with me. I
2 have to heat water on the stove because I don't have
3 water that I can turn on the tap. So I waste water when
4 I shower because I'm not going to do that for the
5 shower. So I love it. I love the whole thing. That's
6 it.

7 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

8 Next speakers, Aaron Goodman, Richard LeConte.
9 I apologize for massacring your names.

10 AARON GOODMAN: My name is Aaron Goodman. I
11 am the vice-president of Park Merced Residents
12 Organization, but I'm here speaking as a tenant tonight,
13 because our organization has been not been able to make
14 a final decision yet on this issue.

15 I'd like to speak about a lot of issues;
16 however; due to the time limits we're not able to go
17 over that tonight, although the planner and the
18 proponent of the project is able to speak for 15 minutes
19 and there's only one scoping hearing to solicit comments
20 from a large swath of the community that is not able to
21 attend such hearings because of the distance and the
22 ability to get to this place -- the limited access for
23 tenants to be able to have an adjacent place to attend
24 the hearing. The SFSU master plan had two such
25 hearings. I think this scoping hearing should have

0037

1 another one so that people who are tenants that are not
2 able to attend tonight during a weeknight are able to
3 attend and give comments.

4 In regards to a couple of issues I'd like to
5 mention, an issue that is not mentioned by this
6 organization, the ownership, or the Planning Department
7 currently on this; and that is preservation. In 2006 I
8 submitted Bulletin No. 19, to the Landmark Preservation

9 Advisory Board. This thing has been tabled. I have not
10 heard back; I haven't heard anything. The Historic
11 Preservation Commission isn't even listed. Based on
12 Prop J, they should be the ones looking at this, not
13 just the Planning Commission. It's not even listed as a
14 reviewing group in this document.

15 There's a lot of questions in terms of what is
16 shown in these documents. And I will submit a formal
17 letter on this. But in terms of a historical resource,
18 Park Merced constitutes a historical resource. It is
19 one of four garden-apartment communities. It is a
20 significant master planned community and in landscape
21 design. It is important to look at -- the EIR must
22 contain a fair and thorough discussion of the historical
23 nature and values of this resource and the degree to
24 which the proposed project will affect a significant
25 adverse change in the significance of the resource. It

0038

1 is important that the larger issues of density and
2 design and the housing element are addressed, because
3 currently in the last ten years we've seen very little
4 rental housing being built for low- to middle-income
5 tenants. Per CEQA guidelines, section 15064, public
6 agencies must carefully consider any potentially
7 feasible alternative which may avoid or minimize a
8 significant environment impact. California Public
9 Resource Code Section 21002 and CEQA Section 15126.6
10 note that the EIR must contain a fair and thorough
11 discussion of potentially feasible alternatives which do
12 not involve demolition.

13 When we talk about sustainability, what is a
14 wholesale tear-down of this community,
15 sustainability-wise? The Park Merced ownership has
16 already embarked on a huge renovation project. Per the
17 Department of Interior standards, if this was actually a
18 local, state, or national landmark, they would not have
19 been allowed to do any of it. But they would have been
20 able to acquire Millzack [phonetic spelling] funding
21 which could have been used to properly maintain and
22 restore areas that due to negligent and poor maintenance
23 could have been kept up at a decent level.

24 I think part of the open-space diagrams that
25 are shown do not accurately take into account the open

0039

1 space on the site. In the diagrams that are shown the
2 amount of footage on the site is not accurately shown or
3 calculated. There is a number of open-space triangles
4 in the internal courtyards as well as the overall
5 sold-off land and open space to other purchasers of
6 sites around Park Merced. That is what should be
7 considered the overall density levels -- original 191.5
8 acres of the site. It should not be looked at as 112 or
9 116.

10 And the San Francisco State University master
11 plan also should be looked at. They need to look at it,
12 not just as a programmatic or cultural overview EIR, but
13 in terms of project-specific EIRs that affect the
14 master-plan community of Park Merced.

15 RICK COOPER: Thank you for your remarks.

16 Next speakers, Andrew Wolfram, John S Scott.

17 RICHARD LECONTE: I believe Richard LeConte.

18 If I may have an opportunity, sir.

19 RICK COOPER: I apologize. Yes.

20 RICHARD LECONTE: That's okay. Apology
21 accepted.

22 My name is Richard LeConte. And I want to say
23 good evening to my Park Merced residents and I want to
24 thank the Planning Commission for giving me a few
25 moments to speak about the project.

0040

1 I could go into the personal reasons why Park
2 Merced is so close to me in my heart. I've been a
3 life-long San Francisco resident; and my relative Joseph
4 LeConte was one of the founding fathers of the Sierra
5 Club, a personal friend of John Muir. And it continues
6 in my family. My brother has been a naturalist at
7 Yellowstone for over 20 years; and I have been an avid
8 botanist and hiker, among other things. And looking at
9 the Park Merced project, I have to chime in and give my
10 two cents.

11 I think that there's a lot of emotion here;
12 and it's understandable because of the place that we're
13 at. When I wake up in the morning I can hear the birds
14 singing and I can walk out and let my pet out the door
15 without fear of it being struck. I can leave my family
16 at home without fear of opportunistic crime because of
17 the location and the residential quiet and enjoyment
18 that the property affords.

19 Now, getting to the architectural model that
20 was built in 1939. My three recommendations would be
21 that the Planning Commission take a look at the original
22 architectural model that was built; and, of course, the
23 historical society is also involved. And I'm sure that
24 in the spirit of San Francisco as always has been that
25 calmer heads will prevail in this situation. I think

0041

1 that the people who were involved in the project the
2 three years I've been a resident here at Park Merced
3 have been very cooperative and they have been very good
4 as far as keeping the property maintained and keeping
5 their responsibilities.

6 Now, we all know how old Park Merced is; and
7 we'd like to hang on to the past. And, of course, I
8 would like nothing to change; but it's not about me.
9 It's about the environment. I'll be long gone, as one
10 of our residents said, when this is all completed.

11 The real reason I'm speaking to you now this
12 moment is this is an environmental hearing; and I want
13 the environmental impact study, of course. I want the
14 Planning Commission to consider the environmental impact
15 on the avian corridor at Lake Merced. And I think my
16 recommendation -- humble recommendation -- would be for
17 both the owners and the Planning Commission to bring the
18 Audubon Society on board on this. I've spoken with them
19 a number of times and they are more than willing to
20 cooperate. And I think also the Strybing Arboretum
21 might be a great place to go. It's been a -- John
22 McLaren planted one of the first trees there in Golden
23 Gate Park and any of our residents here can walk down
24 there and see it tomorrow at the beautiful arboretum.
25 They are, of course, the definitive botanists and

0042

1 agriculturalists. And I know that Park Merced has had a
2 number of arborists here and they have looked over the
3 situation.

4 So those are my two -- three --

5 recommendations, sir. In closing, I thank you for your
6 time.

7 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

8 ANDREW WOLFRAM: Good evening. I'm Andrew
9 wolfram. I'm the president of the Northern California
10 chapter of DOCOMOMO, which is an international
11 organization dedicated to the preservation and
12 documentation of significant works of modern
13 architecture and landscape.

14 We agree with the project sponsor's historic
15 resource evaluation report that says that Park Merced
16 should be considered a historic district and that it is
17 eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
18 and the California Register. We believe it's eligible
19 as a master-planned garden city with a significant
20 landscape design by the most renowned American landscape
21 architect, Thomas Church. It has great integrity of
22 location, design, setting, materials, workmanship,
23 feeling, and association. We recommend that the EIR
24 consider a real preservation alternative that
25 realistically supports the sponsor's project objectives

0043

1 of added density, economic benefit, environmental and
2 cultural sustainability; but rather than demolishing the
3 existing buildings and landscape, preserves them and
4 adds compatible new construction that respects the
5 character and feeling of the historic district and that
6 meets the Secretary's standards for historic
7 rehabilitation. This alternative should also include
8 sustainability measures that could be added and are not
9 contingent on demolishing the district, including
10 transit shuttles, bike share, car share, solar power,
11 cogeneration power, gray-water systems, and stormwater
12 management.

13 We recommend that the EIR also evaluate the
14 project's ostensible goals to include the energy usage
15 required to demolish and replace all the existing
16 buildings and infrastructure. We also recommend that
17 the EIR look at the project's impacts on neighboring
18 historic and natural resources. So this is specifically
19 the SFSU portions of Park Merced, which are also
20 eligible for the historic -- for the National Register,
21 and also Lake Merced. The EIR must evaluate the visual
22 and environmental impacts of the project's 50 new
23 high-rises; 11,000 parking spaces; and at over 100 units
24 to the acre probably the densest residential development
25 in the city on adjacent historic and natural areas.

0044

1 Thank you.

2 JOHN SCOTT: My name is John Scott. I've
3 lived at Park Merced in the garden apartments for 23
4 years. One of the reasons I came to Park Merced is
5 because of its garden apartments.

6 I am totally and completely opposed to the
7 demolition of garden apartments and the demolition of
8 other buildings, including the high-rise. It seems to
9 me that we are trying our best not only in this city but
10 now at Park Merced to Manhattanize this area. I lived
11 in Manhattan in high-rises. I know what it's like. I
12 never thought that I would stand up before my neighbors
13 to say, where the hell is Leona Helmsley?

14 Thank you.

15 RICK COOPER: Thank you. Next speakers, Jeff

16 Rocca and Brian Turner.

17 JEFF ROCCA: Good evening. My name is Jeff
18 Rocca; and I am here on behalf of St. Stephen's School
19 and Parish; and we're located down on Eucalyptus Drive
20 there. And the pastor couldn't make it tonight, but
21 we've attended several of the meetings that have gone on
22 that Park Merced has put on in trying to lay out a
23 little bit of what's going to happen in this project.
24 And, of course, our issue that we've looked at is
25 traffic.

0045

1 The reason I was asked to do this is that I've
2 been involved with 15 EIRs to date through different
3 organizations and different projects, not all of them in
4 San Francisco. And this meeting seems to me to be
5 pretty typical of a scoping meeting. We don't have any
6 real numbers or facts because a lot of the studies have
7 not been done. We've got projections out there. And I
8 think that that's pretty par for the course.

9 I know that my community wants as much
10 information as they can get as quick as possible. And
11 in some of our private meetings I've explained to them
12 that that is not how the process works. The process
13 works wherein the input from your modeling from all of
14 your fact-gathering will really be presented in the
15 draft EIR.

16 These are all good issues that are being
17 raised tonight. And I think out of all the issues that
18 we've seen, we've agreed that progress is not easy and a
19 lot of us are very hesitant and don't necessarily --
20 don't necessarily see the project necessarily the way
21 the sponsors are putting it out.

22 But one of the things that comes to the top
23 for all of us is just the deployment of the traffic
24 measures. If we could -- the mitigating traffic
25 measures as the project goes forward -- if we could

0046

1 really spell that out. I know that would help. I mean
2 our parish consists of 1,200 families. Many of them are
3 multiple generation in San Francisco. And except for
4 the odd one, no one is against progress. It's a matter
5 of getting the information out there in a useful form so
6 that we can all take a look at it.

7 And one of the other things I explained to our
8 group was that if we take either a positive or a
9 negative view on this at the start, a lot of times we
10 don't get the input that we really -- that this project
11 deserves, because it's such a wide, sweeping project.
12 This is definitely going to be -- it's exciting to see
13 the green aspects of it. I don't know that -- I've not
14 seen a project with this many -- and like I said, I've
15 been involved with many -- I've not seen one with this
16 many green aspects to it. And that's a positive thing.
17 But I've also not seen a project of this size developed.

18 So it's -- when you're doing this, just keep
19 in mind for us on an environmental level what that
20 traffic deployment mitigation measures are going to be,
21 how those are going to be phased. Are those going to be
22 tied economically or are those going to be driven by
23 population?

24 Thank you.

25 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

0047

1 BRIAN TURNER: Good evening. My name is Brian
2 Turner. I'm the regional attorney with the National
3 Trust for Historic Preservation in our western office
4 here in San Francisco. The National Trust is a
5 nationwide nonprofit membership organization committed
6 to saving the nation's historic places.

7 It goes without saying that we're alarmed at
8 the proposal to demolish virtually all the outstanding
9 features that make Park Merced a nationally significant
10 historic district. Park Merced was developed during
11 world war II and the immediate post-war era as a part of
12 MetLife's nationwide effort to provide for the nation's
13 housing needs. It is one of four such remaining
14 comprehensively planned residential communities in the
15 country. It is particularly unique in its integration
16 of housing, circulation, and landscape design. Park
17 Merced was constructed as a place for people of modest
18 means to live in a park-like suburban setting in the
19 heart of the city.

20 The landscape was created by Thomas Dolliver
21 Church, the celebrated founder of modern residential
22 landscape design in the United States. As noted in the
23 April 29th, 2009, historic resource evaluation report,
24 Park Merced is a nationally significant property
25 eligible for listing on the National Register of

0048

1 Historic Places and the California Register of Historic
2 Resources as an historic district. The EIR must discuss
3 the magnitude of the impact of the project to local,
4 state, and national history and evaluate feasible
5 alternatives.

6 We believe strongly that the project goals to
7 increase density and make the site environmentally
8 sustainable can be achieved without demolishing the
9 existing townhomes and landscapes. It is imperative
10 that the CEQA analysis for the project include a
11 feasible preservation alternative that meets a
12 reasonable number of the project's objectives and
13 complies with the Secretary of Interior standards.

14 Such an alternative may include the newly
15 proposed environmental contributions of Park Merced,
16 such as energy retrofits, water recapture, and
17 transaction improvements. Sustainability and historic
18 preservation are not mutually exclusive. The retention
19 and reuse of older buildings is an effective tool for
20 the responsible, sustainable stewardship of our
21 environmental resources. It makes no sense to recycle
22 newspapers and bottles and aluminum cans while we are
23 throwing away entire buildings -- or in the case of Park
24 Merced an entire neighborhood. This pattern of
25 development is fiscally irresponsible, environmentally

0049

1 disastrous, and ultimately unsustainable.

2 We are also concerned with the loss of open
3 space for residents, a key character-defining feature of
4 the Park Merced landscape. Net public open space per
5 residential unit is currently over 1,000 square feet and
6 would decrease to just over 300 square feet per unit.
7 The notice of preparation falsely indicates that the
8 project as proposed would increase open space for
9 residents.

10 In addition, we understand that the project
11 will require a Section 404 permit from the Army Corps of

hearing 6-8-09

12 Engineers, thus triggering Section 106 of the National
13 Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 prohibits
14 federal agencies from approving or engaging in any
15 federal undertaking unless and until the agency takes
16 into account the potential effects of the undertaking on
17 historic properties. As the project would clearly
18 adverse the eligible district, we look forward to
19 finding strategies to avoid, minimize, and mitigate
20 those impacts. We also encourage the City to
21 collaborate with the Army Corps of Engineers to initiate
22 the Section 106 review process as early as possible.

23 Thank you.

24 RICK COOPER: Next speakers, M.K. Venkatachari
25 and Dr. Terence Faulkner.

0050

1 M.K. VENKATACHARI: Good evening, ladies and
2 gentlemen. My name is M.K. Venkatachari. I live in
3 Park Merced, 355 Serrano, Apartment 12-C.

4 The documents so far presented somehow seem to
5 indicate that Park Merced developments are the only
6 things going on in this area. You have to take a
7 holistic attitude, because right next door we have an
8 800-pound gorilla. That is San Francisco State, which
9 is also building lots of extra facilities and also
10 shopping and all kinds of various things going on in the
11 same area. And this will have a very adverse effect on
12 the whole ecology of this area.

13 And as regards to Park Merced being a bedroom
14 community for the downtown, it's not a bedroom community
15 for the downtown. It's rather a student community area
16 for San Francisco State. I think maybe 50 percent right
17 now are occupied by students. And the demographics are
18 basically student-oriented. And if you count on 2.1
19 people per family, it doesn't work. You have students
20 at six or seven living in the house and not counting
21 people who are sleeping in the living room. So I think
22 all the demographics and conventional standards don't
23 apply.

24 And, also, there needs to be more transparent,
25 not only for this but -- for example, they tell us the

0051

1 student population is going up by 5,000. Actually, the
2 student population is going up by 5,000 equivalent
3 full-time students. That means there are 10,000 or
4 12,000 students taking two courses, three courses, and
5 four courses -- like that. So one equivalent student
6 may mean three people taking three units. So actually
7 the number of people are going to be a lot more than the
8 equivalent student number that we hear all the time. So
9 there are lots of issues that are being treated as a
10 holistic thing mainly in the context of the university
11 and also the other developments in this area.

12 Thank you very much.

13 DR. TERENCE FAULKNER: Hi. My name is Terence
14 Faulkner.

15 Some comments. I've lived in San Francisco
16 all my life. Actually, my great-grandfather and his
17 family went through the 1906 earthquake and they lived
18 South of Market; and our family's been here basically
19 since 1866. One of the things that hits me the worst in
20 all of this is the impact that's likely to happen when
21 we have a major earthquake. And statistically it's very
22 logical it's going to happen. The last major move on

hearing 6-8-09

23 the Hayward fault was 1868. The last major move on the
24 San Andreas fault was 1906. Normally the Hayward fault
25 has a major move every 140 years. Normally,

0052

1 Francisco -- the San Andreas fault has a major move
2 every hundred years. We are overdue from both
3 viewpoints.

4 The current building of Park Merced -- the
5 garden apartments are probably reasonably safe, given
6 the whole situation. Wood and stucco came out the best
7 in the 1906 earthquake. There was damage to it from
8 fire, mainly because they didn't have enough stucco and
9 too much wood. But the actual smash of an 8.6
10 earthquake -- that stuff can take it. Larger buildings,
11 where you're talking about 5- and 6-story buildings,
12 like what they're asking for at Park Merced, you could
13 well be setting up something like what happened in
14 Szechuan Province, China -- large buildings with huge
15 loads and eventual collapse in a major earthquake.
16 Light buildings that we currently have in the garden
17 apartments can take a pretty good hit, because they are
18 wood and they bend and there isn't a great deal of
19 weight involved. They could actually go through
20 something equal to 1906 or maybe even a little stronger.
21 But if you start building a lot of buildings like that,
22 you're dealing, frankly, with the basic engineering
23 problems and load factors. Even in the 1989 quake, one
24 of the tower apartments on Junipero Serra Drive, we had
25 major, major damage. If we were to build it to 1906

0053

1 proportions, several of the towers are going to be hurt
2 bad as they are. Any other buildings that are built
3 similarly are going to have a lot more problems.

4 What this is calling for is basically a
5 hundred units per acre. Now, that might not seem like
6 much; but what it really means is about two and a half
7 people per unit. Multiply that times 116 acres, we are
8 talking about 29,000 people. At that point we're
9 getting into densities far above that of downtown Hong
10 Kong. And, fortunately, Hong Kong is not as subject to
11 earthquakes as we are. We're setting up a population
12 disaster.

13 I know, frankly, Park Merced management are
14 nice guys. A lot of their leadership comes from New
15 York. New York does not have earthquakes. The last
16 time they had a major earthquake was the New Madrid
17 earthquake of 1832, I believe it was, when the
18 Mississippi River burst; and there all that happened in
19 New York City was they heard a few church bells moving.
20 I can assure you that if we get a 1906, a lot more is
21 going to come down than church bells.

22 This thing needs to be looked at. It needs to
23 be looked at by soil engineers. It needs to be looked
24 at by geologists. I'm frankly saying, you people that
25 are involved in this, I think the whole concept is very

0054

1 unsound; and it could well result in serious losses of
2 both people and property.

3 Thank you.

4 RICK COOPER: The last speaker card I have is
5 Judith Flynn.

6 Is there anybody else who wishes to speak
7 tonight? Okay. Please come up following Ms. Flynn.

8 JUDITH FLYNN: Good evening. Thank you very
9 much for the opportunity to address you. My name is
10 Judith Flynn. I'm the directress of the Montessori
11 Children's Center, which is located in Park Merced at 81
12 Bautista Circle.

13 I would like to give you two sentences of
14 history before I give you my point. In the year 2000
15 under previous management, the preschool was given a
16 30-day eviction notice. With the support of parents and
17 the community and politicians in San Francisco we were
18 able to get that reversed. And management of Park
19 Merced built us a new facility, which we moved into in
20 approximately 2005. That building at 81 Bautista Circle
21 is shown on all of your existing maps in your document.
22 It is not shown in any of these maps over here. I don't
23 know what's happened to the school. There is in your
24 document a statement which says that a new pre-K,
25 grammar, and daycare center will be built. But that's

0055
1 over on Bucarelli.

2 Now, I happen to know the cost of the building
3 that we are in, which was purpose-designed as a
4 preschool, was several million dollars -- about
5 3 million.

6 I am concerned about two major factors --
7 well, three. First, what happened to the preschool?
8 Number two, community. The preschool serves the Park
9 Merced community. That doesn't seem to be addressed in
10 the document. But, three, more than that, I am very
11 concerned about the concept of sustainability. You
12 build a brand-new building and then you take it down,
13 then you destroy it. That doesn't make a lot of sense
14 to me. I don't know if San Francisco's building
15 department -- the regulations allow a building to be
16 demolished for its footprint to build more units. I'm
17 seriously questioning this. So I'm just bringing that
18 point up because, again, I was very surprised. I wasn't
19 notified of this meeting. The center has been in Park
20 Merced since 1976. We celebrated our 30th anniversary
21 several years ago. So I do feel that we are owed the
22 courtesy of notification and I also feel we are owed the
23 courtesy of what kind of continuation plans there is for
24 the school.

25 Thank you very much.
0056

1 MARIA ELENA MESTAYER: My name is Maria Elena
2 Mestayer. I live at 204 Garces. I am actually a
3 graduate from San Francisco State University and I
4 actually moved here from New York. I have --

5 RICK COOPER: Did you fill out a speaker card?

6 MARIA ELENA MESTAYER: It's right here.

7 RICK COOPER: Oh, great. Thank you.

8 MARIA ELENA MESTAYER: I have a friend in New
9 York. Her parents live in Cooperstown. That was a
10 project that they wanted to demolish; but what ended up
11 happening in Cooperstown is they kept the actual
12 building because it became a historical site. What is
13 sort of appalling to me is that I only heard one
14 person -- the speaker two speakers before me -- talking
15 about the San Andreas fault, which is 0.25 miles from
16 Lake Merced into the ocean and then goes straight under
17 San Francisco State University. I think it's just very
18 telling that in the planning, the gentleman who spoke

19 earlier did not even mention the fact that we live in
20 San Francisco and the probability of an earthquake is 66
21 percent and every day that goes by it increases by 0.1
22 percent.

23 I'm just really amazed when I read the scope
24 of this planning, I thought do they either think that
25 we're stupid or do they think they're just going to get

0057

1 one under? Because it's really, really -- to me --
2 insulting to me as a -- I've been living in San
3 Francisco since I moved from New York for five years at
4 Park Merced; and I think that what I heard -- I think
5 three gentlemen suggesting was that how can we
6 reinforce -- make the structures that are there now --
7 currently there -- environmentally green, et cetera, et
8 cetera. And I just want you to take that into
9 consideration -- that I am going to be here in 20 years.
10 And I love the city of San Francisco. And San Francisco
11 can never become Manhattan, because San Francisco has
12 earthquakes. I don't know if you noticed, but in 1989
13 all the Marina went down and that earthquake was 50
14 miles away from here. So imagine what's going to happen
15 when it's 2.5 miles away from here. So I just want to
16 reiterate that if the Planning Commission can please
17 take that into account and please don't underestimate
18 the people who live in Park Merced, because we are very
19 educated, we can read, and you're not just going to pass
20 one under.

21 Thank you.

22 RICK COOPER: Next speaker, Mike Vezzali.

23 MIKE VEZZALI: Hi. Thank you. My name is
24 Mike Vezzali. And I am a fourth-generation born San
25 Francisco and a long-time resident of Park Merced. My

0058

1 family has been in Park Merced since 1971. And sorry to
2 all the elders here, my brother back there and I
3 probably terrorized you guys for a good part of our
4 childhood, but we are sorry now. Sorry about that.
5 Good to see you.

6 I am amazed at the thought and the
7 eco-friendliness that's gone into this project. And I
8 think that is to be commended. But I also am worried
9 about the elders in our community particularly and the
10 people -- the most vulnerable, the people that can't
11 take care of themselves or that will be most affected by
12 this project. And I think that really needs to be taken
13 into consideration.

14 The big issue is, again, the traffic and the
15 amount of people that in units that are being proposed
16 for this project. There's just no way you can fit 8,500
17 units in that area. And it seems to be me to be very
18 counter-intuitive to the ecological planning that's gone
19 on behind it. So that's my big concern is the effect
20 and adverse impact, especially on the most vulnerable in
21 our community. And there might not be a legal
22 obligation to take care of them, but there's certainly a
23 moral obligation on the part of Park Merced management
24 and on the part of the sponsors of the project.

25 And the last thing is the planning that's

0059

1 going into San Francisco State's master plan definitely
2 needs to be taken into consideration because that seems
3 to be a separate thing going on and the two should be

4 looked at holistically, as others have stated.

5 Thank you very much.

6 RICK COOPER: Thank you. I have two more
7 speaker cards. Anna-Maria Brattan followed by John Kim.

8 ANNA-MARIA BRATTAN: Hi. I would like to
9 congratulate you on the green efforts and the ecological
10 thoughts. And the green aspects are absolutely
11 fantastic. I consider myself an environmentalist. When
12 you were talking about the carbon use, energy use in the
13 apartments, my last PG&E bill was \$10.76. So that can
14 be done with consciousness and with help from the
15 management without having to tear down all the
16 apartments.

17 I firmly believe in dense housing around
18 transportation nodes. However, this has gone way over
19 the transportation limit that ought to be in this part
20 of town. Density and apartments can be spread around
21 town. There is the transportation that's available here
22 is not anywhere that would accommodate the additional
23 residents. And it's not -- there are students here,
24 correct. There are people who work downtown. There are
25 people who drive down the Peninsula from here. You're

0060

1 not going to get people out of their cars.

2 And I would also like to point out that on
3 page 11 of the form where it says, Project summary
4 table, it says, Uses: Structured parking; existing
5 gross square footage, 959,400. Proposed project totals,
6 2,900,000. Is that incorrect? You don't discourage
7 people from driving by increasing the parking.

8 So thank you very much.

9 RICK COOPER: Next speaker, John Kim.

10 JOHN KIM: My name is John Kim. I've lived in
11 Park Merced more than 30 years, so I think I am
12 qualified to speak one opinion here.

13 If we move to the new development -- developed
14 apartment -- I'm personally better off. Maybe by the
15 time I'll be 80 years old, I might live in the same
16 quarter easier. So I was debating whether I should come
17 here and speak or not, but I couldn't decide. You know
18 what made me decide? All of a sudden these birds, my
19 god. Tweet, tweet, tweet. You go and speak. Birds
20 were saying, where do we go? Where did we go? Call for
21 this. So I decide to come here and speak. My wife is a
22 birdwatcher and she is the director and I'm the
23 cameraman. So last five years I took a lot of bird
24 pictures. And some of the birds I took picture in the
25 Park Merced are brown towhee, Cooper's hawk, Oregon

0061

1 junco, American robin, black phoebe. These birds --
2 where are they going?

3 Now, when I made a trip to Paris and London
4 they're extremely urbanized, commercialized towns, but
5 we brought the camera to find some birds. Couldn't find
6 any birds. Only maybe one sparrow and pigeon. London,
7 Paris, Nice. These shows they are barren city. We
8 don't want to be like that. That's one point.

9 My second point is human -- human effect. I
10 have lived here and raised my daughter from elementary
11 school to become a very fine veterinarian doctor. Not
12 only me. There are hundreds of thousands of people who
13 raised their kids, became very responsible leaders and
14 citizens of this city. Now, when we open the back door

hearing 6-8-09

15 they had an open backyard. They could run into next
16 door and make friends and play ball. Now, if we live in
17 concrete jungle, you open the door, what do you see?
18 Dark holes and closed doors. If boys and girls live in
19 this environment, I know they will not be mentally and
20 physically as healthy as my daughter. So not only the
21 environment but human factor is the main thing.

22 That's all I want to say.

23 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

24 Does anyone else wish to speak tonight?

25 ADELE PASSALACQUA: My name is Adele

0062

1 Passalacqua. I live at 329 Font. We have been here 50
2 years. I can't believe it. 50 years in a couple of
3 months now.

4 My biggest concern and it's not -- maybe it's
5 not right, but I can't help it. I'm sorry. Maybe it's
6 not right. I can't help it. With the students, you
7 want to achieve community. I don't think that we're
8 ever going to have that out here. It's too diverse; and
9 I don't believe that the students -- some of them are
10 great and some of them -- God help me that they are
11 going to be running the country after the rest of their
12 brains are fried now they're so drunk. But anyway I
13 don't know how that group is ever going to want to be
14 staying in these pretty little parks with these people.
15 That sounds nice.

16 But everything that everyone said, with one
17 exception, I agree with. So I don't have to repeat it;
18 and I'm just really worried what's going to happen. So
19 I agree with everybody who went before.

20 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

21 Are there any other speakers tonight?

22 LIZ PRUIETT: Hello. My name is Liz Pruiett.
23 I have lived at 78 Gonzales Drive for 16 years.

24 When I received the notice, I was really
25 dumbfounded about it. I thought to myself, We chose a

0063

1 garden apartment not a tower. And I was really
2 horrified to read that you decided to tear down the
3 garden apartments -- all of them. The garden apartments
4 give us the ability to live in a home and not a tall
5 apartment building. You decided to keep the eleven
6 towers. And I thought to myself, why? You can get more
7 people in there. So I thought to myself -- I put this
8 down for a couple of days. And I thought to myself
9 again, Is this a back-handed way of turning Park Merced
10 into what we see now -- a college dormitory -- to get
11 more students here, most of whom have made our lives a
12 living hell? They drink. They party. We've had to
13 call the police so many times. So I thought to myself,
14 Is this what this is all about? Because once you move
15 people out, very rarely they are able to come back
16 again. I thought about the [inaudible] in many places
17 around the city. I thought to myself, The City has time
18 to do this kind of study? Aren't there other things the
19 City should be doing? Because around the city,
20 particularly in places where there are diverse groups,
21 once we move out we cannot come back again, because who
22 wants to pack up their bags and move into some place
23 where some of us will live for a couple of months and
24 move back in again.

25 To tear down all these units -- garden

0064

1 apartments, shame on you, Park Merced. Shame on you,
2 City of San Francisco planners. Our tax dollars you are
3 wasting. You are wasting. There are so many other
4 things to do -- build schools for children. Create jobs
5 for young people. Create jobs so when our children
6 graduate college they can get a job that doesn't pay
7 them \$10 an hour. Build less prisons.

8 So I think -- I think -- I personally
9 believe -- I hope it's not true that this is a back way
10 to get to turn this into a college dormitory. We are
11 finished college. When I was in college I was a good
12 student. I didn't cause any trouble to my neighbors.
13 Now the college students have caused us lots of
14 problems.

15 Eco-friendly? I live the back of 19th Avenue.
16 There was once a whole area of shrubbery there. For
17 some reason you tore it down and all the 19th Avenue was
18 dubbed once in the Chronicle the most dangerous city in
19 San Francisco. It is heavily traveled by all kinds of
20 cars and buses. So we say to them, Put the shrubbery
21 back. It helps us. I'd hate to have someone look
22 inside my body and look at my lungs, because we have to
23 breathe all the pollution down 19th Avenue.

24 So I beg of you. Someone told us tonight that
25 this is our place where we live, where we call home, can

0065

1 be considered a historical landmark. I believe it is
2 so. The circles -- the circles give a uniqueness about
3 it. So work with us. Ask us what we want.

4 What I want is to be able to turn on my tap
5 and get hot water. For five days last week I had no hot
6 water. So ask us what we want. In our unit in our
7 building in our block and block number whatever -- can't
8 think of it right now -- we need a new boiler. Ask us
9 what we want. We do not want our homes torn down. We
10 do not want the garden apartments torn down. Thank you.

11 RICK COOPER: Thank you.

12 Is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

13 Also, if the last speaker can fill out a
14 speaker card for us I would appreciate it.

15 I want to thank all of you who spoke. You had
16 very valuable comments and we will be taking all of them
17 into account in the scope of the environmental impact
18 report that we are now beginning.

19 I wanted to remind you of a few things. One
20 is that if you have further comments you'd like to get
21 in writing you can drop them off in back. Also, we have
22 until June 19th for you to provide written comments to
23 us and send them into the Planning Department.

24 Do you have a question, sir?

25 [Comment from audience out of range

0066

1 of microphone]

2 You know, that's not -- I'm sorry. I can't
3 respond to that question such as that at this time. But
4 I'd be happy to respond to you after the meeting.

5 You will have several opportunities to comment
6 on the environmental impact report, particularly
7 providing comments on the draft EIR that will be coming
8 out at the Planning Commission hearings on the draft EIR
9 as to the final EIR certification hearing.

10 If you wish to further supplement your

hearing 6-8-09

11 comments, please submit them by five o'clock on June
12 19th. Finally, if you have any further comments or
13 questions, you can contact me at the Planning Department
14 at (415) 575-9027. Again, I want to -- I'm sorry --

15 [Comment from audience out of range
16 of microphone]

17 No, it's not going to be made available
18 tonight. All the information that we're providing
19 regarding the project has been presented either in the
20 NOP or as part of the project sponsor's presentation.
21 However, as I suggested, we will be incorporating or
22 considering all of your comments in our preparation of
23 the draft EIR.

24 [Comment from audience out of range
25 of microphone]

0067

1 Unless there are any further questions about
2 the process, I would suggest that we conclude the
3 meeting and I'll be available after the meeting for you
4 to speak to me. Thank you.

5 [The meeting concluded at 7:51
6 p.m.]

7
8
9

10
11
12

13
14
15

16
17
18

19
20
21

22
23
24

25

0068

1
2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3
4

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

5
6 I, FREDDIE REPPOND, a duly authorized Shorthand
7 Reporter and licensed Notary Public, do hereby certify
8 that on the date indicated herein that the above
9 proceedings were taken down by me in stenotype and
10 thereafter transcribed into typewriting and that this
11 transcript is a true record of the said proceedings.

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand on
13 this 17th day of June, 2009.

14
15

16 _____
17 FREDDIE REPPOND

18
19

hearing 6-8-09

20
21
22
23
24
25

Summary of Parkmerced Written and Oral Scoping Comments

July 2, 2009

Written Comments

1. Public Utilities Commission, Vincent Kwong, June 18, 2009 (rail safety issues, Caltrans involvement, approvals process, light rail/motorist/pedestrian conflicts).
2. Marilia Powers, 405 Serrano Drive #9, June 20, 2009 (project scale, wildlife, water pollution, traffic congestion, historic designation, grading quantities, cost/benefit analysis needed, stormwater/swales runoff, tree impacts, cumulative impacts on services and utilities).
3. Maria Elena Guerrero Engber, 310 Arballo Drive, Apt #11D, June 8, 2009 (quality of life impacts from construction activities, rent control laws, historic district, Muni realignment will destroy neighborhood).
4. San Francisco Architectural Heritage, Jack A. Gold, June 12, 2009 (preservation alternative following Secretary of Interior Standards).
5. M. K. Venkatashari, 355 Serrano Drive Apt. #12-c, June 17, 2009 (altering codes and plans are bad precedent, carbon footprint of all construction activity, consider cumulative impacts of SFSU too).
6. John Jweinat, 111 Cambon Drive, June 17, 2009 (financial impacts- new neighborhood-serving core would force him out of business, desires more Muni lines and stops, phasing and sequencing).
7. John Jweinat, 111 Cambon Drive, June 1, 2009 (Muni realignment).
8. The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Melanie Macchio, June 17, 2009 (historic significance).
9. Henry Tyldsley, 810 Gonzalez Apt. #11E, June 14, 2009 (unit count, bedroom count, status of keeping Muni 17 bus, wants to see model, construction duration, additional population numbers).
10. Dr. Terence Faulkner, 106 Crespi Drive, June 16, 2009 (proximity to San Andreas Fault, earthquake impacts to existing and proposed buildings, tree removal / flyway impacts, population increase impacts, new Muni noise, retail needs assessment, historic significance).
11. Jeanie Scott, 769 Gonzalez Drive, June 13, 2009 (general support of the project).
12. Janet Karesh, 582 Arballo Drive, May 27, 2009 (too many units planned for size of site, congestion impacts).
13. Marty Walker, 100 Cambon Drive, May 22, 2009 (too many proposed units, taller buildings impact views and spaciousness, potential traffic impacts).
14. Parkmerced Residents Organization, Aaron Goodman, June 1, 2009 (multiple comments, including no mention of prior EIR's affecting the Parkmerced area as a Historic Resource)
15. Pruitt, Nguyen, Ala, Njau, Solyuna, 3, 5, 7, 7a, 9 Gonzalez Drive, June 16, 2009 (impacts to existing style and character, list of suggested upgrades to current development).
16. Kevin C. Kozminski, 150 Font Blvd Apt. #11J, June 17, 2009 (will destroy quality of life, increased congestion on 19th Ave, new Muni line will add new overhead electric wires and structures in the "heart" of the community, status of tree replacement plan, questions about practicality of wind turbines).

17. John J. Beeston, MD, 810 Gonzalez Drive Apt #12B, June 15, 2009 (density impacts, Muni re-routing would disrupt community).
18. National Trust for Historic Preservation, Western Office, Anthea M. Hartig, June 19, 2009 (need for historic preservation alternative, include a district-level evaluation of project impacts detailing the impact of the project and alternatives on the key features of the identified cultural landscape on the site, include a reduced scale alternative that includes some densification of Parkmerced but not to the extent proposed (that includes Mills Act and Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits), include a preservation alternative that complies with Secretary of the Interior's standards for treatment of historic properties (allows infill construction and selective demolition and new construction), cumulative impacts that includes SFSU campus master plan, Section 404 requires compliance with Section 106, general concerns about the maintenance of existing landscaping).
19. Parkmerced Residents Organization, Aaron Goodman, June 18, 2009 (27 pages, 33 topics - cumulative impacts with SFSU, housing, alternative locations, breakdown of units and bedrooms, rent control questions, affordable housing and loss of rental housing planned, parking shortage and gridlock [look at SFSU resource capacity], request for 20-year SFSU student enrollment data, request for confirmed use of open space [definition], open space vs. green space, global warming and environmental green space, proposed tree removal and status of landmark trees eligibility, need for tree survey, carbon off-set from existing trees, biological entities and natural habitats on site [loss of habitat], loss of green space impacts/ acid rain effects on Lake Merced, historic landscape design integrity and national landmark status, need to study effects of ad-hoc landscape work and need for a complete survey of the existing landscape elements and individual unique designs of the interior courtyards, illegal subdivisions of existing units, need for accurate population density, need accurate open space calculation, need for an accurate list of existing open space areas, need accurate calculations of impacts due to tearing down all of the townhouse units, discuss current practices of wasting water, request for a needs assessment study of commercial areas within walking distance of Parkmerced [overdeveloped and underutilized commercial and retail areas would have a negative impact throughout the neighborhood], Muni realignment impacts, need to consider different routes for Muni realignment, construction noise impacts, Muni track noise impacts, view corridor impacts, need for wind tunnel testing, wind impacts on avian migratory pathways, earthquake damage from 1989 and need for a comprehensive geological study, structural concerns of existing towers, insufficient outreach being done, existing tenant issues).
20. Aaron Goodman, June 18, 2009 (includes Appendices) (need for preservation, questions and concerns about the amount of open space and need for a cumulative discussion of open space based on the original Parkmerced community outline, references to original landscape configuration, questions of sustainability authenticity [why isn't preservation, renovation, rehabilitation and restoration considered?], SFSU impacts on parking, need for the Parkmerced project and SFSU master plan to look cohesively at rerouting Muni, concerns about practicality and manageability of bioswales, concerns about tree removal, current

status of existing tower seismic stability, air quality impacts and asbestos from demolition, wind, shadow, discussion of Parkmerced community and development in terms of the original layout of 191.5 acres must be considered in the EIR.)

21. The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Charles A. Birnbaum, June 17, 2009 (site is of national significance.)
22. docomomo, Chandler McCoy, June 19, 2009 (Parkmerced is Church's largest extant work, need to include a true preservation alternative, need to measure impacts of entire demolition on sustainability, evaluate impacts on parking 11,000 cars on site, questioning Muni ridership projections, need to study impacts on neighboring natural and cultural resources, need to evaluate quality of existing housing and open space vs. proposed, questions about scale of project, need to include a market analysis to determine if there is a demand for all the high- and mid-rise buildings in this weather-challenged part of SF.)
23. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Paula Kehoe, June 19, 2009 (need for the SFPUC to review and grant authorization for any groundwater withdrawals or use.)
24. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Vincent Kwong, June 26, 2009 (traffic study needs to include a methodology to identify mitigation measures in addressing rail safety-related impacts by the project, requests to review draft traffic study before it is finalized.)
25. Joe Desmond, June 23, 2009 (email) (concerns about constructing new retail when existing is doing so poorly, concerns about bird impacts.)
26. Julian Lagos (general opposition)
27. Department of Transportation, Lisa Carboni, June 18, 2009 (traffic mitigation and Muni realignment.)

Oral Comments

1. Maria Elena Guerrero Engber (concerns about changes to quality of life, increased noise and air pollution, dislocation of existing residents [particularly older generation].)
2. Neil Topliffe (questions about relocation of existing residents.)
3. Reverend Dr. Albirda Rose-Eberhardt (thinks the project is "out of line" and has concerns about purchasing of other parcels from Parkmerced.)
4. John Jweinat (questions about rent control for new units, where dislocated residents will move to.)
5. Stephen Heide (concerned about traffic, water, electricity, sewage use.)
6. Chris Manitsas (concerns about the additional new homes and additional traffic, timing of traffic studies being done[will they be done when SFSU is out of session?].)
7. Nima Gabbay (concerns about increased traffic.)
8. Laura M. Traveler (need more facts about the project.)
9. Mark Christensen (concerns about the overall size and scale of the project, need to know the number of bedrooms, concerns about building heights.)

10. Ronald Stovitz (need accurate population numbers assigned to the project, concerns about Muni realignment, height and massing.)
11. Genevieve Callejo (concerns about existing speeding within Parkmerced.)
12. Jeannie Scott (in support and wants to see the project built.)
13. Aaron Goodman (urges holistic planning, site is eligible for listing on the National Register, open space diagrams are not accurately identified. Has many concerns and will submit a formal letter.)
14. Richard Leconte (concerns about avian corridor at Lake Merced, need to bring in the Audubon Society for their review and input.)
15. Andrew Wolfram (EIR needs to consider real preservation alternatives that realistically support the project sponsor's objectives, need to evaluate visual impacts of 50 new high-rise buildings.)
16. John Scott (opposed to demolition of garden apartments and objects to high-rise buildings.)
17. Jeff Rocca (need for traffic mitigation.)
18. Brian Turner (EIR needs to include feasible preservation alternatives that meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, concerns about the loss of open space, need Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.)
19. M.K. Venkatachari (concerns about increased number of students at SFSU and overall cumulative impacts from the Parkmerced project.)
20. Dr. Terence Faulkner (concerns about the proximity to the San Andreas and Hayward faults.)
21. Judith Flynn (concerns about what will happen to the existing school, wasn't notified of the meeting, need for better communication.)
22. Maria Elena Mestayer (concerns about earthquakes, "Manhattanization" of the site.)
23. Mike Vezzali (concerned about what will happen to the elderly population currently living at Parkmerced, SFSU master planning needs to be accounted for when reviewing the Parkmerced project.)
24. Anna-Maria Brattan (project too dense and too many people will use cars.)
25. John Kim (concerns about impacts on birds if trees are removed.)
26. Adele Passalacqua (general concerns.)
27. Liz Pruiett (don't want people's homes torn down.)