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### 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 Venkatachari
- John Jweinat (1 of 2)
- John Jweinat (2 of 2)
- The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Melanie Macchio
- Henry Tyldsley
- Dr. Terence Faulkner
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, queueing 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 ongoing 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.
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[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 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
our department by sharing any information you may have
that will be useful in preparation of the EIR. This is
not a meeting about the merits of the proposed project
or about whether to approve or disapprove the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The way they laid out the plan -- the way that
the plan was laid out, a lot of the support services
were way off on the edges. So we have playing fields,
schools, retail -- they were all pushed to the edges.
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So what happened was that people that needed to use any
of these amenities had to get in their cars often or at
least walk potentially very long distances. What's
happened over the years is that those parcels are the
most difficult for the owners to sustain. So what has
happened over the years is that they have been sold off
by the previous owners one by one. So what we have
today in Park Merced is essentially a bedroom
community in the heart of the city. And that is one of
the real issues that we've been trying to address.

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

There's -- and then the other thing that I've
been talking about in the past a great deal is the
sustainability of landscapes. Park Merced uses potable
water to irrigate all those landscapes, so every year
55 million gallons of water is going into keeping those
lawns green and trying to keep the planting alive.

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

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

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

But I think the potential behind Park Merced,
what got us very excited about the project that has the
potential to be unlike any other project that you
typically see at these meetings, which is that it has a
scale that allows us to start to address issues that go
hearing 6-8-09

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

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

Why is Park Merced different? Why is this possible? And why can it make such a big difference? Well, if you look at a map of Park Merced -- of the city -- this is the entire city of San Francisco. Park Merced is down here at the bottom left. Park Merced is about the scale of a typical neighborhood in San Francisco. The difference is it's all under one ownership, which means that they can do things at the neighborhood scale that no other developer can. So there's an opportunity here to do some really great things that can't be done in other projects. So when we try to bring together all of the feedback that we've getting, what we really see is an opportunity to create what we would describe as a complete neighborhood, a neighborhood the way you think of neighborhoods in San Francisco, as opposed to just a bedroom community tucked away in the corner. So what we're really looking at are things that will create that neighborhood -- a social heart, a diverse community, things that will connect that neighborhood out to the rest of the city instead of being this little island that it is. And then lastly on the ecological level, to really start to make a significant impact on the environment and the improvements that we can make.

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

outdoor spaces.

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

We have actually done -- we sent out 16,000
surveys to local residents and got a very high response
rate. And one of the things that we found was that a
lot of people, although they're using public transit,
they're driving to public transit. The other component
would be that once we moved the Muni line, we can
actually start to treat 19th Avenue as a landscape
 boulevard.

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

In addition, other kinds of access that we're
creating is we're proposing a shuttle that is going to
be providing a connection over to Daly City BART. Daly
City BART is actually one of the quickest ways of
getting downtown from this area of the city, but it's a
little difficult to get to. The owners will actually
provide a shuttle. And then, in addition, during the
off-hours that shuttle can support -- be a shopper
shuttle providing access to Stonestown and Westlake and
other areas. In addition, there are other components of
the plan, including a very extensive bike plan that's
going to knit into the City's overall bicycle plan.
As part of that bike plan there's actually
going to be bike libraries which people can actually
borrow bikes and use them to get around the area so that
they don't have to rely on their car. They don't have
to rely on their own modes of travel. They can actually
borrow bikes.

Then in addition to that, one of the things
that we really also have been focusing on is improving
the pedestrian realm, where people are walking the
sidewalk -- what is it like to be walking around in this
neighborhood. Right now it's very exposed. One of the
things that we want to do is to actually introduce --
keep most of the street grid but actually introduce
smaller streets, create a smaller block so that you're
not having to walk as far as from block to block. And
then it also introduces a number of pedestrian-only
paseos that again help make it easy for the people to
move through the neighborhood. In addition to trying to
make the neighborhood more friendly for people to be
outside and actually be able to make the pedestrian
environment more pleasant, we're setting up the streets
so there are hedgerows that would knock down the wind.
You know how windy it can be out here -- and gray. And
then on the days when it's sunny, the streets are
oriented to try and maximize access to the sun. So,
again, it's a friendly, inviting place to walk around.
A big part of what we're doing is -- I
mentioned about the sustainability. One of the things
we will do is actually take -- right now what happens
is all the rainwater that falls onsite goes down into
your sewer system. All the water goes into the sewer
system and actually goes out to the Oceanside Treatment
Plant and goes through the full treatment, which is
pretty crazy. So what we're doing to do is actually
decouple that so that rainwater that falls onsite will
run through a series of streams and swales and ponds and
be cleaned the way nature would clean the water and then
recharge the aquifer underneath the site and actually
help to recharge Lake Merced, where the water originally
was going to be going; and then also connect the ecology
of Lake Merced back with a series of parks and open
spaces so that the ecology, which has kind of shrunk
down right around the perimeter of Lake Merced these
days, has the opportunity to expand out into the greater
area that it once was.
So these open spaces will also include a major
park along the south side here that will include
recreation spaces. So now the playing fields -- right
now there are no structured playing fields. And so
we'll have several playing fields in the corner here.
And, in fact, there's actually and -- here's a view of
it. And then actually we're introducing a two- to
three-acre organic farm that will be commercially
farmed. And this farm will actually -- right here -- be
set up and that it's not actually run by Park Merced.
It will be run by commercial farmers; and they can tie
into a larger network of food distribution -- either
selling the produce at the grocery store in Park Merced
or the restaurants or even possibly as part of a CSA,
which is an agricultural -- community-serving
agricultural network.
Now, as far as the transportation goes, again,
it's a very detailed plan. But we've been looking at
different ways to look at technology and different ways
of having people have services so that they can find
alternatives to relying on their cars. One of the
important things is, for example, a transportation
coordinator. Because everybody at Park Merced comes in
as a rental, they have an opportunity to, when they sign
their leasing papers, to actually sit down with the
transportation coordinator, who will sit down with them
and help them find different ways of moving around the
city -- most efficient ways, which often doesn't mean

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

On a -- from an energy and water standpoint
the numbers are really dramatic. You have to remember
these homes were built in the '40s when energy was not a
major concern. We think that actually on a per-unit
basis we can actually reduce the energy used by each
home by 63 percent and the amount of water used by about
60 percent as well. That is a dramatic reduction in
demand. And what it means is that basically we can
build these additional homes with no new demand on the
City's infrastructure. So we'll be using basically the
same amount of water and the same amount of energy that
we're using today with the increased number of homes.
What that translates into is, in terms of helping the
overall City's goals, is that right now, for example,
the average resident produces about five tons of carbon
dioxide a year. We are able to reduce that by
60 percent. So that means that each resident will only
be producing about two tons of carbon dioxide a year for
their home and their use of a car directly here at Park
Merced.

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

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

I'd like to now just briefly describe to you
the CEQA process that we will be following for
preparation of this EIR.
The first step of the process was the issuance
of the notice of preparation and scoping meeting. This
notice included a brief description of the proposed
project, a list of environmental effects the project
will study and indicate where written comments on the
scope of the EIR may be sent.
The next step of the process will be
publication of the draft EIR, which we anticipate will
occur early next year. The DEIR will be distributed for
public review for a period of 45 days. Oral comments
will also be accepted at the Planning Commission hearing
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on the draft EIR, which will be held about a month after
publication of the draft. Following the close of the
draft EIR comment period, the Planning Department will
prepare a comments-and-responses document, which will
contain written responses to all substantive comments
received during the draft EIR review period. About two
weeks after publication of the comments-and-responses
document, a hearing will be held before the Planning
Commission, where they will be asked to certify the
final EIR, which will consist of the draft EIR together
with the comments-and-responses document.

Certification of the EIR would not mean the
project is approved or disapproved. Rather it would
satisfy the CEQA environmental review requirements for
the proposed project. Project approval or disapproval
is a completely separate consideration from the adequacy
of the EIR. For each significant impact we identify in
the EIR, the document will identify measures to avoid or
substantially reduce the project's effects. These
measures are called mitigation measures. The EIR will
also evaluate and compare the impacts of the
alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives
to be assessed should avoid or substantially lessen any
identified significant environmental effects. I
apologize for this microphone. These alternatives may
have not yet been developed. However, the EIR will
assess the no-project alternative, which allows
comparison of the impacts of approving the project with
the impacts of not approving it.

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

We also this evening have a court reporter
present who is making a verbatim transcript of all
comments that are made. And so that he may make a good
transcript, I would ask that you please come to the
mike; speak into it; and speak slowly, loudly, and
clearly so that his transcript will be accurate. When
you come to the microphone, please state your name and
address. If you're representing an organization, please
indicate the group and your official capacity. You may
be asked to spell your name for the benefit of the
reporter. All speakers are urged to refrain from making
any comments concerning the merits of the project but to
instead direct your remarks to the scope and focus of
the EIR.

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

MARIA ELENA GUERRERO INGBER: Okay. My name
is Maria Elena Guerrero Ingber. My family and I have
lived at Park Merced for the last 20 years. I am
definitely an interested party in this project. I have
been a resident of 310 Arbello Drive, Apartment 11-D,
since July 1st, 1993. For the last 16 years I have
lived in that apartment with my mother, Mrs. Maria Helen
Guerrero, who now is 90 years old and has Alzheimer's
disease.
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For us, the residents living in the 3,221
units, including myself, my brother, and my mother, we
will be directly impacted by this project. Our quality
of life will be greatly affected by the demolition and
constant construction around us in the next 30 years.

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

RICK COOPER: Thank you. If you could please
refrain from applause, I'd appreciate it.
The next speaker is Neil Topliffe.

NEIL TOPLIFFE: Hi. My name is Neil Topliffe.

I live at 128 Cardenas Avenue.

I'm in Phase 1 of the project. And from my
understanding, we will be moved only once to the open
areas of construction that are available on the west
south corner, the furthest area from public
transportation. I picked my current location to be
close to public access. And I feel like I'm being
forced into a location that would require me to own a
car. I'd like to get some consideration into this and
other areas and other options that we may have and where
we're going to be moved and what circumstances are
available to us. I'd like to grow my family and have
Park Merced be my long-term residence over the next 10,
15 years. And in this situation I feel like I'm being
forced out of the community.

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

Next speaker, Reverend Dr. Albirda

Rose-Eberhardt.

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

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

Now, I must say I'm amazed at some of what
you're doing. It sounds great. It sounds fabulous, but
I'm not sure where it all fits in or where I have a
voice. I hear I have a voice now.
You said three minutes. I could talk forever.
I did say I was a reverend. So I preach for 20 minutes
at least.
It is just interesting to me. And I
appreciate -- I really do appreciate some of the thought
that's going into this, but some of it I think is just
out of line.
I'm also concerned what the university's part
in this is, as I have lived in Park Merced on Gonzalez
first, then Vidal. Then I woke up one morning and the
university had bought the property and no one informed
us. In fact, when we first started inquiring -- I'm
looking back at a friend in the back -- it was like it
was a big secret, that we weren't supposed to know the
university was buying it. So I'm really concerned how
that component, from 19th and Holloway all the way down,
how does that fit in the big picture? And I'm not sure
that I'm seeing that.

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

Next speaker, John Jweinat.

JW-E-I-N-A-T: Hi. My name is John Jweinat,
J-w-e-i-n-a-t. I'm the owner of the Park Merced Shopping
Center at 35-111 Cambon Drive. And my main concern is
access to make sure the traffic flows throughout the
property for everybody. I hope you take that into great
consideration.

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

Next speaker, Monroe Jacobson.

MONROE JACOBSON: My name is Monroe Jacobson.
I've lived in Park Merced since 1979.
What I would really like to hear from -- the
person -- is the management of Park Merced. I would
like him to speak tonight and just tell us if we're
guaranteed the same rent when the new Park Merced is
built. Rent control will still be in effect? I want to
know what guarantees we have as tenants here now. And I
want to know where we're going to go.

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

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

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

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

Thank you.

CHRIS MANITSAS: I'm Chris Manitsas from
Lakeshore Acres, which is north of here between Sloat
and the lake.
The main concern we have -- and I think mainly our concern will be how can this area support 6,000 or even 3,000 new, additional homes, especially with regard to traffic? 19th is blockaded most of the time.

Traffic -- increased traffic will be coming down Sloat Boulevard, with backups coming from 280. Also, Skyline Boulevard and Lakeshore Boulevard have become part of the 19th Avenue highway traffic being diverted. And with increased traffic being diverted from Park Merced to Lake Merced Boulevard, this is going to increase the problem.

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

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

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

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

Please refrain from applause. Thank you.

The next two speakers, Kevin Chuck and Laura M. TRAVELER.

NIMA GABBAY: It's actually Nima Gabbay, speaking on behalf of Kevin Chuck. My main thing is there's so much traffic on 19th that we really need to increase accessibility into Park Merced off of 19th.

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

Thanks.

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

MARK CHRISTENSEN: Good evening. I am Mark Christensen. I am president of the Merced Extension
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Triangle Neighborhood Association. I live at 60 Kempton Avenue.

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

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

For those present, there are currently 3,221 units. This is supposed to be increased to 8,900 units. That's an increase of 5,679 units. One of the most important issues concerns the number of bedrooms planned. There's no mention of the number of bedrooms. The number of bedrooms equates to the number of people. I would like to know tonight how many bedrooms are planned when the project is complete, because that is really going to give you the number of new residents.

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

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

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

Thank you.

RONALD STOVITZ: I'm Ronald Stovitz, s-t-o-v-i-t-z. For 28 years I've lived about 300 feet east of the east edge of the Park Merced property in the Lakeside Village neighborhood. I also am very concerned that the numbers -- population numbers -- have not been put. Here we are in the NOP phase and we don't have a population number. I urge the Planning Department as quickly as possible to assign a population number at the earliest EIR phase. I estimate very conservatively, to the extent that the sponsor wishes to have families and
children -- a commendable goal; that there will be
11,350 additional citizens, because, as we know, units
don't drive cars on Highway 1 or compete for seats on
Muni. It is people who do it.
I urge that this project needs a holistic
rather than an incremental view, because as the speakers
have pointed out, contiguous to this project is a
5,000-person addition to the growth of San Francisco
State. These directly flow to traffic and
transportation issues. I urge the Planning Department
when it looks at transit and transportation issues to go
carefully through the mitigative measures proposed by
the sponsor to see whether they put one additional MUNI
vehicle on the trackway or the streets or they put one
additional BART car on the BART line. As we know, those
are decisions that the sponsor has no competent legal
authority for. They are entirely invested within the
San Francisco MTA and the Bay Area Rapid Transit
District. Absent a commitment -- a written
commitment -- binding or effective commitment from those
transit agencies, the project is very risky to mitigate
transit effects. And given that the budgets for those
agencies has fallen off the proverbial cliff, I doubt
that we would see the transit effectiveness plan or any
further transit enhancement.
And, finally, I am very concerned about the
height and massing issues, because we would have
buildings of eight to fourteen stories that are in
numbers approximately four and a half to five times over
the current number of buildings above two stories. And
those have not only shadowing issues and visibility
issues but they also vitally affect all the
environmental -- they run the gamut of environmental
concerns. And I hope those issues of height and massing
get extraordinary scrutiny in the process.
Thank you very much.
RICK COOPER: Thank you. The next two
speakers, Genevieve Callejo and Jeannie Scott.

GENEVIEVE CALLEJO: Yes. My name is Genevieve
Callejo. I'm a 41-year resident of Park Merced, the
most glorious place in the world that I have lived,
because I lived on Arballo for all those 41 years. And
I've never had to look for a parking place. I park
right in front of my house.
Now, my problem, as I view this, when I first
went to the first meeting, I looked at all the
gray-hairs and I said, Oh, my gosh, what I am doing
here? I'm not going to be around five years, ten years.
They're preaching to all the older people and what do we
really care? Do we really care? Yes, I do.
And as I have spoken with Mr. Pilacci
[phonetic spelling] and staff and "Call Me Reg"
Reggiano, I said, You know what? Now, I would like to
see in Park Merced some speed signs right now. Not in
the future. Right now. Because you go down Arballo --
not private Arballo -- you take your life in your hands
crossing the street. They shoot through there like a
bat out of hell. They try and tell me that it's going
to be better for the residents to have through parking
so they can get through like a crossword puzzle and they
don't have to go around these frigging circles, you
When I came to this meeting tonight I picked up Ms. Traveler, my neighbor, with whom we have both been in Park Merced resident organizations for so many years we can't even remember and gone through Leona Helmsley and all the way up to "Call Me Reg" Reggiano. Why am I going on and on? I only want to see some sense to the projected traffic through. What is wrong with the beautiful circles? They make everybody polite. You come to a circle. This one goes first, if you're lucky, and et cetera. That is my -- I hope -- at my age I ain't gonna be here. I probably won't even live to see the first bashing going down. But right now I would love for somebody to address the speed in Park Merced at the moment.

Thank you very much.

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

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

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

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

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

I'd like to speak about a lot of issues; however, due to the time limits we're not able to go over that tonight, although the planner and the proponent of the project is able to speak for 15 minutes and there's only one scoping hearing to solicit comments from a large swath of the community that is not able to attend such hearings because of the distance and the ability to get to this place -- the limited access for tenants to be able to have an adjacent place to attend the hearing. The SFU master plan had two such hearings. I think this scoping hearing should have another one so that people who are tenants that are not able to attend tonight during a weeknight are able to attend and give comments.

In regards to a couple of issues I'd like to mention, an issue that is not mentioned by this organization, the ownership, or the Planning Department currently on this; and that is preservation. In 2006 I submitted Bulletin No. 19, to the Landmark Preservation
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Advisory Board. This thing has been tabled. I have not
heard back; I haven't heard anything. The Historic
Preservation Commission isn't even listed. Based on
Prop J, they should be the ones looking at this, not
just the Planning Commission. It's not even listed as a
reviewing group in this document.

There's a lot of questions in terms of what is
shown in these documents. And I will submit a formal
letter on this. But in terms of a historical resource,
Park Merced constitutes a historical resource. It is
one of four garden-apartment communities. It is a
significant master planned community and in landscape
design. It is important to look at -- the EIR must
contain a fair and thorough discussion of the historical
nature and values of this resource and the degree to
which the proposed project will affect a significant
adverse change in the significance of the resource. It
is important that the larger issues of density and
design and the housing element are addressed, because
currently in the last ten years we've seen very little
rental housing being built for low- to middle-income
tenants. Per CEQA guidelines, Section 15064, public
agencies must carefully consider any potentially
feasible alternative which may avoid or minimize a
significant environment impact. California Public
Resource Code Section 21002 and CEQA Section 15126.6
note that the EIR must contain a fair and thorough
discussion of potentially feasible alternatives which do
not involve demolition.

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

I think part of the open-space diagrams that
are shown do not accurately take into account the open
space on the site. In the diagrams that are shown the
amount of footage on the site is not accurately shown or
calculated. There is a number of open-space triangles
in the internal courtyards as well as the overall
sold-off land and open space to other purchasers of
sites around Park Merced. That is what should be
considered the overall density levels -- original 191.5
acres of the site. It should not be looked at as 112 or
116.

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

RICK COOPER: Thank you for your remarks.
Next speakers, Andrew Wolfram, John S Scott.
RICHARD LECONTE: I believe Richard LeConte.
If I may have an opportunity, sir.
RICK COOPER: I apologize. Yes.
RICHARD LECONTE: That's okay. Apology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So those are my two -- three --
recommendations, sir. In closing, I thank you for your

time.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

ANDREW WOLFRAM: Good evening. I'm Andrew
Wolfram, I'm the president of the Northern California
chapter of Docomomo, which is an international
organization dedicated to the preservation and
documentation of significant works of modern
architecture and landscape.

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

of added density, economic benefit, environmental and

-cultural sustainability; but rather than demolishing the
-existing buildings and landscape, preserves them and
adds compatible new construction that respects the
-character and feeling of the historic district and that
-meets the Secretary's standards for historic
-rehabilitation. This alternative should also include
-sustainability measures that could be added and are not
-contingent on demolishing the district, including
-transit shuttles, bike share, car share, solar power,
-cogeneration power, gray-water systems, and stormwater
-management.

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

Thank you.

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

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

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you. Next speakers, Jeff
JEFF ROCCA: Good evening. My name is Jeff Rocca; and I am here on behalf of St. Stephen's School and Parish; and we're located down on Eucalyptus Drive there. And the pastor couldn't make it tonight, but we've attended several of the meetings that have gone on that Park Merced has put on in trying to lay out a little bit of what's going to happen in this project.

And, of course, our issue that we've looked at is traffic.

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

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

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

But one of the things that comes to the top for all of us is just the deployment of the traffic measures. If we could -- the mitigating traffic measures as the project goes forward -- if we could really spell that out. I know that would help. I mean our parish consists of 1,200 families. Many of them are multiple generation in San Francisco. And except for the odd one, no one is against progress. It's a matter of getting the information out there in a useful form so that we can all take a look at it.

And one of the other things I explained to our group was that if we take either a positive or a negative view on this at the start, a lot of times we don't get the input that we really -- that this project deserves, because it's such a wide, sweeping project.

This is definitely going to be -- it's exciting to see the green aspects of it. I don't know that -- I've not seen a project with this many -- and like I said, I've been involved with many -- I've not seen one with this many green aspects to it. And that's a positive thing. But I've also not seen a project of this size developed.

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

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Thank you.
hearing 6-8-09

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, we understand that the project
will require a Section 404 permit from the Army Corps of
Engineers, thus triggering Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 prohibits federal agencies from approving or engaging in any federal undertaking unless and until the agency takes into account the potential effects of the undertaking on historic properties. As the project would clearly adverse the eligible district, we look forward to finding strategies to avoid, minimize, and mitigate those impacts. We also encourage the City to collaborate with the Army Corps of Engineers to initiate the Section 106 review process as early as possible.

Thank you.

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

M.K. VENKATACHARI: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is M.K. Venkatachari. I live in Park Merced, 355 Serrano, Apartment 12-C. The documents so far presented somehow seem to indicate that Park Merced developments are the only things going on in this area. You have to take a holistic attitude, because right next door we have an 800-pound gorilla. That is San Francisco State, which is also building lots of extra facilities and also shopping and all kinds of various things going on in the same area. And this will have a very adverse effect on the whole ecology of this area.

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

And, also, there needs to be more transparent, not only for this but -- for example, they tell us the student population is going up by 5,000. Actually, the student population is going up by 5,000 equivalent full-time students. That means there are 10,000 or 12,000 students taking two courses, three courses, and four courses -- like that. So one equivalent student may mean three people taking three units. So actually the number of people are going to be a lot more than the equivalent student number that we hear all the time. So there are lots of issues that are being treated as a holistic thing mainly in the context of the university and also the other developments in this area.

Thank you very much.

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

Some comments. I've lived in San Francisco all my life. Actually, my great-grandfather and his family went through the 1906 earthquake and they lived South of Market; and our family's been here basically since 1866. One of the things that hits me the worst in all of this is the impact that's likely to happen when we have a major earthquake. And statistically it's very logical it's going to happen. The last major move on
the Hayward fault was 1868. The last major move on the
San Andreas fault was 1906. Normally the Hayward fault
has a major move every 140 years. Normally,

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

The current building of Park Merced -- the
garden apartments are probably reasonably safe, given
the whole situation. Wood and stucco came out the best
in the 1906 earthquake. There was damage to it from
fire, mainly because they didn't have enough stucco and
too much wood. But the actual smash of an 8.6
earthquake -- that stuff can take it. Larger buildings,
where you're talking about 5- and 6-story buildings,
like what they're asking for at Park Merced, you could
well be setting up something like what happened in
Szechuan Province, China -- large buildings with huge
loads and eventual collapse in a major earthquake.

Light buildings that we currently have in the garden
apartments can take a pretty good hit, because they are
wood and they bend and there isn't a great deal of
weight involved. They could actually go through
something equal to 1906 or maybe even a little stronger.
But if you start building a lot of buildings like that,
you're dealing, frankly, with the basic engineering
problems and load factors. Even in the 1989 quake, one
of the tower apartments on Junipero Serra Drive, we had
major, major damage. If we were to build it to 1906

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

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

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

This thing needs to be looked at. It needs to
be looked at by soil engineers. It needs to be looked
at by geologists. I'm frankly saying, you people that
are involved in this, I think the whole concept is very
unsound; and it could well result in serious losses of
both people and property.

Thank you.

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

Is there anybody else who wishes to speak
tonight? Okay. Please come up following Ms. Flynn.
hearing 6-8-09

JUDITH FLYNN: Good evening. Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you. My name is Judith Flynn. I'm the directress of the Montessori Children's Center, which is located in Park Merced at 81 Bautista Circle. I would like to give you two sentences of history before I give you my point. In the year 2000 under previous management, the preschool was given a 30-day eviction notice. With the support of parents and the community and politicians in San Francisco we were able to get that reversed. And management of Park Merced built us a new facility, which we moved into in approximately 2005. That building at 81 Bautista Circle is shown on all of your existing maps in your document. It is not shown in any of these maps over here. I don't know what's happened to the school. There is in your document a statement which says that a new pre-K, grammar, and daycare center will be built. But that's over on Bucarelli.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

RICK COOPER: Did you fill out a speaker card?

MARIA ELENA MESTAYER: It's right here.

RICK COOPER: Oh, great. Thank you.

MARIA ELENA MESTAYER: I have a friend in New York. Her parents live in Cooperstown. That was a project that they wanted to demolish; but what ended up happening in Cooperstown is they kept the actual building because it became a historical site. What is sort of appalling to me is that I only heard one person -- the speaker two speakers before me -- talking about the San Andreas fault, which is 0.25 miles from Lake Merced into the ocean and then goes straight under San Francisco State University. I think it's just very telling that in the planning, the gentleman who spoke
earlier did not even mention the fact that we live in San Francisco and the probability of an earthquake is 66 percent and every day that goes by it increases by 0.1 percent.

I'm just really amazed when I read the scope of this planning, I thought do they either think that we're stupid or do they think they're just going to get one under? Because it's really, really -- to me --

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

Thank you.

RICK COOPER: Next speaker, Mike Vezzali.

MIKE VEZZALI: Hi. Thank you. My name is Mike Vezzali. And I am a fourth-generation born San Francisco and a long-time resident of Park Merced. My family has been in Park Merced since 1971. And sorry to all the elders here, my brother back there and I probably terrorized you guys for a good part of our childhood, but we are sorry now. Sorry about that. Good to see you.

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

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

And the last thing is the planning that's going into San Francisco State's master plan definitely needs to be taken into consideration because that seems to be a separate thing going on and the two should be
looked at holistically, as others have stated.

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

So thank you very much.

RICK COOPER: Next speaker, John Kim.

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

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

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

My second point is human -- human effect. I
have lived here and raised my daughter from elementary
school to become a very fine veterinarian doctor. Not
only me. There are hundreds of thousands of people who
raised their kids, became very responsible leaders and
citizens of this city. Now, when we open the back door
they had an open backyard. They could run into next
door and make friends and play ball. Now, if we live in
concrete jungle, you open the door, what do you see?
Dark holes and closed doors. If boys and girls live in
this environment, I know they will not be mentally and
physically as healthy as my daughter. So not only the
environment but human factor is the main thing.
That's all I want to say.
RICK COOPER: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak tonight?
ADELE PASSALACQUA: My name is Adele

Passalacqua. I live at 329 Font. We have been here 50
years. I can't believe it. 50 years in a couple of
months now.
My biggest concern and it's not -- maybe it's
not right, but I can't help it. I'm sorry. Maybe it's
not right. I can't help it. With the students, you
want to achieve community. I don't think that we're
ever going to have that out here. It's too diverse; and
I don't believe that the students -- some of them are
great and some of them -- God help me that they are
going to be running the country after the rest of their
brains are fried now they're so drunk. But anyway I
don't know how that group is ever going to want to be
staying in these pretty little parks with these people.
That sounds nice.
But everything that everyone said, with one
exception, I agree with. So I don't have to repeat it;
and I'm just really worried what's going to happen. So
I agree with everybody who went before.
RICK COOPER: Thank you.
Are there any other speakers tonight?
LIZ PRUIETT: Hello. My name is Liz Pruiett.
I have lived at 78 Gonzales Drive for 16 years.
When I received the notice, I was really
dumbfounded about it. I thought to myself, We chose a
garden apartment not a tower. And I was really
horrified to read that you decided to tear down the
garden apartments -- all of them. The garden apartments
give us the ability to live in a home and not a tall
apartment building. You decided to keep the eleven
towers. And I thought to myself, why? You can get more
people in there. So I thought to myself -- I put this
down for a couple of days. And I thought to myself
again, Is this a back-handed way of turning Park Merced
into what we see now -- a college dormitory -- to get
more students here, most of whom have made our lives a
living hell? They drink. They party. We've had to
call the police so many times. So I thought to myself,
Is this what this is all about? Because once you move
people out, very rarely they are able to come back
again. I thought about the [inaudible] in many places
around the city. I thought to myself, The City has time
to do this kind of study? Aren't there other things the
City should be doing? Because around the city,
particularly in places where there are diverse groups,
once we move out we cannot come back again, because who
wants to pack up their bags and move into some place
where some of us will live for a couple of months and
move back in again.

To tear down all these units -- garden
apartments, shame on you, Park Merced. Shame on you, City of San Francisco planners. Our tax dollars you are wasting. You are wasting. There are so many other things to do -- build schools for children. Create jobs for young people. Create jobs so when our children graduate college they can get a job that doesn't pay them $10 an hour. Build less prisons.

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

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

So I beg of you. Someone told us tonight that this is our place where we live, where we call home, can be considered a historical landmark. I believe it is so. The circles -- the circles give a uniqueness about it. So work with us. Ask us what we want.

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

RICK COOPER: Thank you.

Is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

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

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

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

Do you have a question, sir?

[Comment from audience out of range of microphone]

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

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

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

[Comment from audience out of range of microphone]

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

[Comment from audience out of range of microphone]

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

[The meeting concluded at 7:51 p.m.]
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Summary of Parkmerced Written and Oral Scoping Comments
July 2, 2009

Written Comments
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).
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).

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 Keohoe, 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.)