Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 4, 1990
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.
Chancellor's Conference Room (S118)

1. Chair's Report
2. Subcommittee Reports
3. GUEST SPEAKER: Bruce Spaulding
   Vice Chancellor
   University Advancement & Planning

Attachments: - Minutes of 3/7/90 Meeting
Members in Attendance: Kathy Balestreri, Chair, Ethel Adams, Bart Cohen, Karen Eldred, Linda Erkelens, Marsha Guggenheim, Martha Hooven, May Huang, Loretta Maddux, Karen Mah-Hing, Valli McDougle, Karen Newhouse, Deborah Pauley, Anne Poirier, Steve Reynolds, Isabel Romo, Elenor Shimosaka, Byron Sigal, Margaret Wilson, Chris Yee.

Liaisons: Janet Norton, Paula Carien Schultz

Guests: Karl Hittelman, Ph.D., Joseph Spinelli, DVM, Joy Becker, BA, and Zach Hall, Ph.D.


The meeting was brought to order by Kathy Balestreri at 12:05 p.m.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Community Outreach: The painting of the dining room and kitchen of the Hamilton United Methodist Church is scheduled on Saturday, March 11 from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Volunteers are needed. A Money Magazine article about the center was distributed.

Information & Advocacy: Valli McDougle noted that discussions about the implementation of a hotline are ongoing with Michela Reichman and her staff.

Staff Education: Anne Poirier noted that the subcommittee has met to discuss the logistics of Chancellor Krevans address to the Campus community which is scheduled on April 30th at 12:00 Noon in Cole Hall. SAC members who have suggestions for topics should contact Anne directly. The subcommittee is also discussing potential future educational forums on animal rights and Proposition 111.

Kathy Balestreri introduced the four guests who were invited to speak about animal research at UCSF: Dr. Karl Hittelman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Dr. Joseph Spinelli, Director of the Animal Care Facility; Joy Becker, Animal Resource Manager of the Animal Care Facility; and Dr. Zach Hall, Chair of Physiology. As a result of the comments at the last SAC meeting, the Executive Committee had prepared a list of questions for the guest panel (attached) to be used as suggested topics for the discussion.
Each member of the panel expressed their commitment to responsible animal research and alternately discussed their role as it relates to animal research at UCSF. Some of the major points covered by the panel included the following:

(1) The Committee on Animal Research which consists of faculty, staff and 2 outside community members, is charged with the review of protocols for the use of animals in research and reports to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It is a function of the committee to encourage tissue sharing for research projects.

(2) The Animal Care Facility is responsible for the purchase and housing of animals approved by the Committee on Animal Research and for the provision of veterinary care to prevent disease. The animals are protected from pain during experiments by anesthetics and are provided analgesics following surgery. All animals used for research are legally obtained.

(3) There are protocols, restrictions, and regulations which are strictly enforced at the Animal Care Facility and there is an internal system in place for correcting violations and preventing future occurrences. There is also a program to help staff to deal with feelings of attachment, sadness and fear associated with the use of animals in research.

(4) Only 30% of the research at UCSF requires the use of animals of any kind. At some point, humans become the test subjects, but it is essential that responsible scientists be able to test new techniques on animals before experimenting with human beings.

Additionally, Dr. Hall discussed the Synapse articles on the use of animals for educational purposes and gave suggestions for methods SAC might use to educate the campus community on the merits of animal research. All of the members of the panel agreed that discussion of this sensitive issue at small group or departmental meetings is more effective than trying to address questions in a large group setting. The panel members offered to attend such meetings as requested by SAC.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 4, 1990 -- 12:00 Noon - 1:30 p.m., S118.

Attachments:
- Questions submitted to guest panel
- Article on Staff Stress (Animals in Research)
QUESTIONs REGARDING ANIMAL RESEARCH AND ANIMAL RIGHTS

Karl Hittelman, Ph.D.

1. What is the organization of University & departmental committees designed to address animal research?

2. Describe the process an investigator goes through in designing and receiving approval of animal research protocol.

Joseph Spinelli, D.V.M.

3. How are animals treated in the Animal Care Facility? What protection from pain is available during experimental procedures? Where are animals obtained?

Zach Hall, Ph.D.

4. Briefly review the issues in Synapse's "dog articles".

5. Is there a program (or animal 'bank') for sharing animal parts so that fewer animals can be used? With the increase in biotechnology, why use whole animals or parts instead of cells?

Joy Becker, B.A.

6. Describe the internal quality control program? Are there unscheduled investigations of laboratories using animals (similar to PPD inspection of laboratories using radioactive materials); and if not, would this be worthwhile?

General Considerations

7. Provide statistics: 1) the number of animal research programs at UCSF; 2) has this number been increasing/decreasing; 3) the estimated dollar funding for these programs

8. Describe the public relations for pro-responsible animal research employed by the University. Do we have a brochure highlighting patients who have been directly/indirectly benefitted by animal research?

9. Are animal rights activist groups really a threat to responsible animal research or rather an opportunity for external quality control?

10. Can you suggest an approach for SAC to present a balanced educational forum for staff on this topic?
Letters

More on the dog lab
To the Editor:

There is an old trick in rhetoric, to pose a question with only two alternatives, one desirable, the other not. The listener often will not question the underlying assumptions. What are the underlying assumptions when the following question is posed: “Would you rather have the dog in the physiology demonstration die, or live a long, happy life as a pet?” Of course, one of the underlying assumptions is that the second alternative is possible or probable.

The Feb. 19 issue of the San Francisco Chronicle has an article that states that in the Bay Area alone, each year 100,000 sick or abandoned pets are euthanized and most are then recycled into pet food. This is many times the number of animals used in teaching and research at UCSF each year.

Does the answer to the question change when it is: “Would you think it better for this abandoned dog to die without pain, having been used in the physiology demonstration for the education of medical students, or prefer that it be painfully killed and rendered into pet food?”

Some animal pounds, because of cost and lack of skilled help, kill abandoned pets by placing them in a chamber from which the air is suddenly evacuated. This leads to death by asphyxiation, preceded by “the bends” (an extremely painful condition), as well as massive bloating of the bowel due to trapped gas — also painful.

The reality, as expressed in the Chronicle article, is “a mammoth pet-overpopulation problem.” How do those that oppose the use of these animals in research and teaching propose to deal with this problem? Indeed, one can wonder if there is some other “hidden agenda” behind “animal rights advocates” if they do not address this issue, or the known cruelty in the production of animals for meat.

I find it sad that by opposing the use of surplus, abandoned cats and dogs in medical research, these activists have forced some institutions to breed animals for research, with the result that none of such animals have a chance to be pets. The end result is MORE animal distress, not less. Yet, I know of no activists who address these issues, either.

Moral: Check the assumptions of the question (including what is realistically possible) before answering posed questions.

Question: Do you want to make an informed decision, or to be influenced by unstated assumptions?

Dr. Don L. Jewett
Professor, Orthopaedic Surgery

An attitude of gratitude
To the Editor:

I have a need to voice a nursing perspective regarding the disputed dog experiment for the medical physiology class. Having practiced critical care nursing for 18 years, my absorption of knowledge was not compromised due to my accrued, emotional immunity toward the “blood and guts” element of the experiment. Being in attendance for the entire event, I was able to learn quantitative principles of cardiovascular physiology in a controlled learning environment that provided a nonstressed atmosphere and excellent instruction. What was intensely demonstrated in a period of four hours would literally take years to observe clinically due to the diversity of principles and the extreme range of physiological responses demonstrated. Also contributing to this ideal learning environment was the diverse array of optimally-functioning invasive lines that captured multiple, sequential data points on hard copy. Being a clinical educator in critical care, such ideal situations do not always occur even in the best of critical care units due to noisy, stressed environments in which technology does not always cooperate and intervention often quickly ablates the realm of physiological

Continued on page 12

Dog from page 3

responses.

The alternative of videotaping the dog experiment is certainly a possibility that would be a technological feat to produce. If a quality film is produced, the department of physiology should consider conducting a three-armed study in which students could be assessed for learning via lab experiment, videotape, and formal lecture. Due to the diversity of opinion surrounding the use of animals in education, it is projected that sample selection would present no drawbacks.

Being a previous animal owner who has faced active euthanasia with a chronically ill feline, I am sensitive about the treatment of animals in research and education. Viewing that the dogs in these experiments were destined to die, I believe their lives were put to optimal use. A note of thanks goes to the department in continuing to provide quality education despite controversy. Contrary to Barak Gaster’s comment in a previous issue of Synapse that “…many were disappointed by how little they gained…,” I learned a great deal. Thank you, Dog, for you did not die in vain.

Nancy L Szaflarski
Doctoral Nursing Student
Department of Physiological Nursing
March 19, 1990

Dear Colleagues,

The Science and Health Education Partnership makes the resources of UCSF available to teachers and students in the San Francisco Unified School District to improve the quality of science and health education. The program has placed individuals in classrooms on an ongoing basis, arranges to give the schools surplus equipment, provides lectures to teachers and sponsors an annual Science and Health Lesson Plan Contest for middle and high school students.

The middle and high school teachers have also asked us to identify UCSF staff who would be willing to come to a school on a one-time basis and deliver lectures on a variety of topics. You may already have a lecture on a pet topic that can be given with little extra preparation. Teachers also frequently request judges for science and health fairs, and tours of UCSF facilities. We keep a list of such volunteers in our office and call on the people from this list once or twice a year to help us with these aspects of the program. If you are interested in participating in these areas, please fill out the bottom of this letter and return it to our office. We will handle scheduling and logistical aspects. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Stanton A. Glantz, Ph.D.
Director, Science and Health Education Partnership
Professor of Medicine

___ I will give a lecture to teachers or students.
___ I can provide role modeling for/talk to students on careers in health or science
___ I would be interested in judging/advising for science & health contests or fairs.
___ I can provide a tour of my lab or facility once or twice a year.

Name: ___________________________ Dept.: ___________________________
Phone: __________________________ Campus Box and Room #: __________________________
Topic of lecture: __________________________
If you are fluent in other languages, list them: __________________________
I am interested in working with kids from underrepresented minorities: __________________________
Check here if you would like more information on SEP: __________________________

Return to: SEP, Box 0905
August 10, 1988

TO: Julius R. Krevans, M.D.
    Chancellor's Office
    Box 0402

FR: Trinity Ordone and Stephen Reynolds
    Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

RE: 1987-88 Annual Report

On behalf of the Staff Advisory Committee, we are pleased to enclose our annual report for your review. It is a summary of activities and list of expenditures for SAC's work during the period of September, 1987 through August, 1988. As a group, we were all pleased to have been given this opportunity to contribute to UCSF and look forward to another year of continued support, especially in view of the plans for celebrating our 125th birthday!

cc: Vice Chancellor Thena Trygstad
The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was one of several initiatives of the UCSF campus taken in light of the unfavorable July 9, 1987 Appeals Court decision on Laurel Heights. After detailing the contending positions, including UC's history with the opposing Laurel Heights neighborhood group, Chancellor Julius R. Krevans called on interested campus community members to counter the University's prevailing negative image which had resulted from this conflict.

On August 28, Thena Trygstad, Vice Chancellor of Personnel and Student Relations, held the first informal meeting on this issue with concerned staff members. The initial feedback was very instructive to the Administration; most notably, we expressed our concerns about the future of UCSF and inquired about past efforts to inform the neighborhood of our plans, solicit input and resolve outstanding differences. We also voiced concerns as both staff and Bay Area citizens, about UC's compliance to health and safety standards for toxics and radioactive waste disposal.

This feedback led to the formation of the Staff Advisory Committee on September 25, 1987 and a series of meetings and activities over the next several months to address these concerns. The Staff Advisory Committee was initially composed of 32 members from a cross section of the campus community including liaisons from the offices of Vice Chancellor Trygstad, Community & Governmental Relations and News & Public Information Services. SAC meetings focused on obtaining updates on Laurel Heights and inviting various guest speakers to provide a wide range of background information to the issues. Speakers included:

- Dean Jere E. Goyan, School of Pharmacy -- School of Pharmacy, its faculty, research, facilities and plans for the Laurel Heights site;
- Asst. Chancellor Thomas W. Gwyn, Public Service Programs -- history of controversy with the Laurel Heights Neighborhood Improvement Association;
- Asst. Vice Chancellor Leroy J. Balzer, Environmental Health and Safety -- new plans for the modification of health and safety practices at UCSF;
- Dr. Henry J. Ralston III, Chair, Academic Senate -- final report of the Faculty Committee on the Future of UCSF.

On November 3 and 5, 1987, 13 SAC members attended issue training workshops provided by the Media Relations Department at the Office of the
The workshop was designed to prepare SAC members in how to respond to hostile questions, such as those generated by our neighborhood opponents in the controversy over Laurel Heights. We thought the workshop was very useful and recommended it for campus administration, all SAC members and others actively involved in handling controversial issues.

From the beginning, however, there was unclarity on the committee’s role and charge, the parameters of its initiative and its internal structure. The number of regular attendees at the meetings also dwindled to an average of 15 members. Several meetings addressed these concerns and on December 18, 1987 we began to meet on our own and an informal internal structure of a voluntary rotating chair and secretary evolved; the rotating chair prepared the agenda and led the meeting; the secretary took responsibility for writing and distributing the minutes. Ad hoc committees were also formed throughout the year on an as-needed basis to carry out particular SAC organizational plans. In addition, Vice Chancellor Trygstad provided funds for our activities (a detailed report is included). After many months of discussion, an internal organizational structure was formulated and finally approved at the August 3, 1988 SAC meeting. The Guidelines for the Staff Advisory Committee are included in this report and recommended for adoption.

Most of our service activities and contributions occurred between December, 1987 and June, 1988. As a result of several meetings, a series of eight recommendations for action were forwarded on January 17 to Vice Chancellor Trygstad. These proposals were accepted and the committee immediately began it preparations for a series of campus programs. The first was an informational noontime program on April 1 to bring the campus community up-to-date on the Laurel Heights issue. The featured speakers were Chancellor Julius R. Krevans, Dr. Henry J. Ralston III, Academic Senate chair, and Joy Becker, for the Staff Advisory Committee. Over 400+ attended the talk in Cole Hall while another 25 viewed the simulcast at CED. The Committee's next organizing tasks were two educational programs coordinated by the SAC Education Sub-committee: (April 20) Radioactivity: Its Use in Hospitals, In Research and the Hazards of Its Use and Disposal featuring J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Asst. Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety; and (May 26) Animal Research: Why? A Forum to Address Campus Questions Concerning the Use of Animals in Research featuring a panel of six speakers. Both educational programs provided basic information in lay terms on these subjects; they were very well attended, which indicated that the topics under discussion were generally of interest to the campus community.

Besides the programs, SAC also played an active role in several advocacy and public relations efforts. At the end of January, we participated actively in a
letter writing campaign to Supervisor Wendy Nelder; she was considering a proposal to the Board of Supervisors to file an amicus brief for the Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association lawsuit against UCSF. Supervisor Nelder received between 50-60 letters, an action that presumably prompted her to drop the plan altogether. In addition, SAC members proposed many ideas for positive visibility and more UCSF participation in community events. Several SAC members staffed the UCSF exhibit at the West Portal Merchants Fair in April and participated in the Haight-Ashbury Merchants Council "Clean Up the Haight" campaign in March. In May, SAC members, along with other campus units and staff and student organizations, staffed a voter registration table that registered more than 250 individuals during the UCSF "Promote the Vote Week."

Our most notable effort, however, was our role in generating campus interest and mobilizing members to attend the SF Sierra Club meeting on May 11. The Sierra Club Executive Committee, at the initiative of the Laurel Heights Improvement Association, was considering a draft resolution that would have imposed on UCSF a set of conditions, some of which were clearly inappropriate and others restatements of standards to which we already are subject. In response, both the offices of Community & Governmental Relations and News & Public Information Services prepared background information packets. SAC members contacted faculty, students and staff interested in the issue and at least 60 UCSF faculty, staff and students were present at the meeting. After lengthy testimony and discussion, the resolution was substantially amended to something much less punitive, more related to the facts about pollution and safety, and less misrepresentative of UCSF's position in this city. The opposition was countered with an effective articulation of the facts of the issues.

Overall, the Staff Advisory Committee has proven itself a key link in gauging staff concerns and mobilizing the enthusiasm of the UCSF campus community. Because we work at UCSF, we have both a special interest and intimate knowledge of its workings. Through SAC, this knowledge was effectively tapped and our efforts were joined with administration and faculty in meeting the challenge of the Laurel Heights crisis. The future of UCSF is our future too.

Trinity A. Ordoña
Acting Chair
Staff Advisory Committee
August 3, 1988
### Staff Advisory Committee
#### 1987 - 88 Expenses

**April 1, 1988 Event (Dr. Krevans)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>719.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Info. System for mailing labels</td>
<td>644.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Resources for Simulcasting &amp; Taping</td>
<td>371.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>979.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprographics</td>
<td>799.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-Lounge for space rental for lunch with Chancellor &amp; Staff</td>
<td>136.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>3650.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**April 20, 1988 Event (Radioactivity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>150.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Info. System for mailing labels</td>
<td>236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Resources for Simulcasting &amp; Taping</td>
<td>290.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprographics</td>
<td>181.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>857.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May 26, 1988 Event (Animal Research)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>170.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Info. System for mailing labels</td>
<td>234.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Resources for Simulcasting &amp; Taping</td>
<td>283.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprographics</td>
<td>457.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1145.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moffitt Catering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments for Sac Meetings &amp; luncheon with the Chancellor</td>
<td>701.20 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>6355.19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approximate figures for catering - billing still being processed.

Stephen Reynolds  
Acting Vice Chair  
Staff Advisory Committee
GUIDELINES

Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was established on September 25, 1987 to improve employee and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF in light of the adverse public attention generated by the Laurel Heights site controversy.

As the Staff Advisory Committee discussions progressed . . . it became clear that the issue went far beyond moving UCSF to Laurel Heights. The real issue was the University's basic right to conduct safe and important research. What started out as a discussion around a specific campus site soon became a discussion about the University as an institution, and its function and purpose. These discussions led us to consider the future of UCSF.

. . . In our dual role as staff and concerned citizens of the Bay Area, we can approach the issues raised by the Laurel Heights crisis by educating ourselves. . . . The future of UCSF is our future too.

Staff Advisory Committee Forum
"UCSF: Our Future"
April 1, 1988

The purpose of the committee is to:

1. Support the research, patient care, education and public service of UCSF
2. Improve communication between staff, community and administration
3. Educate the staff, administration and community

II. STRUCTURE

The SAC is a working group responsible to recommend and advise the Chancellor on staff concerns related to the improvement of staff and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF. The SAC will also act on any recommendations approved by the Chancellor and will make an annual report of its activities at the conclusion of its current year.

To accomplish its purpose, the SAC formed three standing committees with these goals and objectives. They are:

STAFF EDUCATION

a. Sponsoring lecture series and campus/community information forums
INFORMATION & ADVOCACY

a. Organizing campus information and mobilization network (phone tree; letter writing campaigns)
b. Reviewing campus communications

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

a. Joining neighborhood organizations
b. Publicizing UCSF (public relations campaigns)
c. Participating in civic activities
d. Attending public forums

The Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee and all SAC members are appointed by the Chancellor for a tenure of one year beginning September 1; vacancies on the SAC will be filled by new appointments made by the Chancellor, and will last until the end of the tenure of the current term. The SAC is composed of at least 30 members. The goal is to have a cross section of representatives of the Schools, Medical Center and support services from all campus sites. The composition of the committee will seek to reflect the racial, cultural and sexual diversity of the campus. In addition, the committee will also have a liaison from each of the following three offices: Vice Chancellor, Personnel and Student Services; Community & Governmental Relations; News & Public Information Services.

The SAC has the authority to organize itself, form committees and to adopt its own structure and rules for the conduct of its business. The responsibilities of the Chair and Vice Chair are:

1. Chair -- Provide overall leadership to the committee; call meetings, prepare agenda and chair regular meetings; prepare and present intramural and extramural reports of the SAC as needed; prepare annual summary to the Chancellor on SAC activities.

2. Vice Chair -- Appointed by the chair for one year and serves as chairperson in the absence of the Chair; through a staff person assigned from the Vice Chancellor's Office, Vice-Chair has the following duties: keep current roster of SAC members; schedule meetings; make and distribute agenda and summary reports of each meeting; and keep record of all expenses incurred.

Accepted: August 3, 1988
1. Advise Andy Pierson and Marty Gustafson to inform telephone operators that any calls from community or employees concerning questions about Laurel Heights, animal issues, radioactivity, etc should be directed to the Office of Public Service Programs number (63206).

2. A series of noon-time informational seminars be given every two weeks covering the following subjects: toxins; radioactive materials; animal issues; DNA/RNA; and a separate seminar on UCSF policy concerning research regulations on campus, acquisition of property, and other questions to be determined. (see minutes: B - first and third paragraphs attached for specific recommendations concerning these meetings, including the role of SAC members).

3. Chancellor Krevans be asked to give a campus-wide kickoff speech at the end of February. (See minutes: B - 2nd paragraph for specific recommendations concerning this meeting, including the role of SAC members).

4. The Chancellor should distribute to all employees the letter and rebuttal attachments written to the Chronicle Broadcasting Company accompanied by a cover letter giving update on Supreme Court hearings and encouraging employees to attend the upcoming seminars, giving a number and address for employees to respond to if they are willing to become further involved or have concerns or questions.

5. Members who were not given media/confrontation training should be given this training within the next two months.

6. Members and other employees should be organized into groups for community service complete with UCSF logo t-shirts, to make our presence visible.

7. A "button-month" should be established, with UCSF buttons of some type distributed to all employees. Employees would be encouraged to wear these buttons during work hours throughout the month to indicate our economic presence in the community.

8. SAC to hold meetings every other Friday, preferably in the same room, and be provided with refreshments.
February 12, 1988

STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Thank you for your thoughtful recommendations from your January 15, 1988 meeting. They are all good ideas and I support doing them.

1. Your first recommendation has been passed on to the Telecommunications Office.

2. I am asking Janet Norton and Paula Carien Schultz to assist in coordinating a series of noon-time speakers. They will work with you on developing and prioritizing a list of topics and speakers.

3. Shortly after March 8th should be excellent timing for Chancellor Krevans to give another campus-wide noon talk. Barbara Atkinson can explain why that timing.

4. The rebuttal and attachments have already been sent; we can invite/encourage involvement with the announcement of the Chancellor’s next talk.

5. I have asked Janet Norton to contact the media/confrontation trainers to schedule the next series of training sessions.

6. & 7. Both great ideas which Barbara Atkinson will work with you to coordinate.

8. Go for it--my budget will cover the refreshments!

Your energy and commitment is very much appreciated. We look forward to your continued involvement as critical and exciting decisions about UCSF’s future are being made.

Thena Trygstad

TT/fmc

Attachment: UCSF Economic Impact Report

cc: Chancellor Julius R. Krevans, M.D.
Barbara Atkinson
Janet Norton
Paula Carien Schultz
THE STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Invites you to a noontime informational program

WITH

Julius R. Krevans, M.D., Chancellor
Henry Ralston, III, M.D., Chair, Academic Senate
Joy Becker, Staff Advisory Committee

UCSF: OUR FUTURE

Friday, April 1, 1988
12:00 noon in Cole Hall
Simulcast to HSW 301 & CED 3rd Floor

Administration, faculty & staff perspectives on the future of UCSF since Laurel Heights

BE THERE!

BE INFORMED!

PLEASE POST

University of California, San Francisco...A Health Sciences Campus
THE STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVITES YOU TO GET INVOLVED:

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was established in late September, 1987, with its primary focus being the improvement of employee and community understanding of the purposes and contributions of UCSF. This is very important in light of the adverse public attention called to our institution by the issues surrounding the use of the Laurel Heights campus.

After the first few meetings it became apparent that the issues involved were much broader than those surrounding our initial purpose for gathering. As a result of this, we clarified our purpose as a committee and established four major goals. They are:

1. To support UCSF, specifically in the Laurel Heights matter
2. To educate the staff and the community
3. To improve communication between staff and community
4. To support research, patient care, education and public service

Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)
Box 0930

STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

If you are interested in working with us, please complete this brief questionnaire:

Name __________________________Box # and Room Address __________________________

I wish to be contacted by the Staff Advisory Committee (include your telephone number here). __________________________

I am interested in joining a subcommittee to produce a special seminar. ______

My specific seminar interest is: Toxins ______ Animal Research ______ Genetic Engineering ______ Other __________________________

I want to be called only when there is a special project. ______

I would like to help with: Campus staff networking ______ Developing educational seminars for staff ______ Assisting with public relations and community outreach ______ Graphics and production_______Other __________________________

You may drop this questionnaire in any of the boxes provided at the exits, or mail it to Box 0930.

4/1/88
Health and Safety Issues at UCSF:

**RADIOACTIVITY:**
Its Use in Hospitals, in Research and
The Hazards of Its Use and Disposal

by

J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice-Chancellor
Environmental Health & Safety

** Dr. Balzer will address the lay-person's questions on the uses and hazards of radioactivity at UCSF

Wednesday
April 20
HSW 302
12 Noon

Sponsored by:
The Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)
ANIMAL RESEARCH: WHY?

A Forum to Address Campus Questions Concerning the Use of Animals in Research.

PANEL

Joy Becker, B.A.
Animal Resource Manager
Animal Care Facility

Betty Carmack, R.N., Ed.D.
Consultant, Animal Care Facility

Julien Hoffman, M.D.
Professor of Pediatrics and Physiology
Senior Staff Member, CVRI

Lauren Jacobson, B.A.
Graduate Student Representative
Committee on Animal Research

Joseph Spinelli, D.V.M
Director, Animal Care Facility

Jan Wyrick, D.V.M
Head Clinical Veterinarian
Animal Care Facility

Sponsored by the Staff Advisory Committee.

Thursday, May 26 12:00 - 1:00 PM HSW 302
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Double Threat to Mendocino Coast

Dear Editor,

As your page one article on the Mendocino Coast is alarming, said the locals, Mendocino coast has been preserved partly by lack of major highway access. Now moneyed interests are lobbying for the development of the county. It is put forth by former Interior Department official Jared Carter, an attorney and the big lumber companies in the recent spate of timber harvest practices lawsuits which the environmentalists have won.

Carter's plan includes damming the Eel River to flood Round Valley and sending water south via Clear Lake and Cache Creek. It also includes a freeway from I-5 past these lakes to Westport on the Mendocino coast. Westport is a very small town—the first town south of Sinkhole Wilderness State Park.

The park takes up the northernmost fifteen miles of the coast. While it was NAMED Sinkhole Wilderness in 1977, the park is suffering from logging laws passed in 1980 allows the park to be designated a state wilderness during the current General Plan process. Meetings are scheduled in late April with more later this year, and the General Plan hearing in late 1989.

Sinkhole Wilderness designation. Others support vehicle use in all parts of the park, which would be in line with "cigar-cigar development" planned in conjunction with the freeway aimed at Sinkhole.

With our vigilance, we hope the Carter plan never gets off the drawing board. Meanwhile, to support state wilderness designation for the Sinkhole coast, please write to: Al Kolster, Planning Division, Department of Parks, P.O. Box 492096, Sacramento, CA 94209-0001.

Julie Verran, Chair
Sierra Club Sinkhole Task Force

Diapers

To the Editor,

Paula Altvater (May Yodeler) is right that environmentalists have not publicized sufficiently the solid waste and public health problems posed by disposable diapers. There is an excellent article on this subject, titled "Diapers: The Ecological Issue" by Susan Barrett in the 1983 issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin. In addition to eschewing disposables for one's own children and telling other parents and pregnant women why, Ms. Barrett makes the following recommendations:

1) When you see an advertisement for any children's product featuring disposable diapers, call your local library, ask for the company's address (Standard and Poor's is the index to use), write the company and tell them the deception of a child in a throwaway diaper offends you.

2) If you see a newspaper story in which disposable diapers are mentioned, particularly by brand name, write a letter to the editor.

3) The owner of Do-De-Wash in San Francisco, is in the process of marketing "Bibbing: A Blessed Mother's View" in the spring 1987 issue of Mother's Emphasis. She emphasizes the many health advantages of cloth diapers for babies. Less diaper rash, no allergic reactions, no danger from the powerful absorption process initiated by chemicals in its synthetic biodegradable disposables. The Empire State Consumer Association, which played an important role in the recall of the shock system described in the Sierra Club Bulletin, has petitioned three government agencies to prohibit the sale of synthetic disposable diapers.

If parents make use of a diaper service and of diapers with velcro closures (such as Red-i-Diapers, Bibbottoms and Nikk-Niks), changing baby can be just as fast and convenient as with disposables, with no risks to the baby or the environment.

Julie Verran, Chair
Sierra Club Sinkhole Task Force

UCSF advocates accused LIAH directors of being "woefully ignorant" to stop up the neighborhood by exaggerating toxic threats, detecting a proposed small-story-tall meteorological tower in a K-Ra-difficult derrick, associating biological warfare research without evidence and exaggerating traffic impacts. Through the heat of discussion and the XCom modified the proposed resolutions, various UCSF professor, administration, staff, and medical colleagues to improve the EIR, make UCSF more responsive to neighborhood concerns and improve UCSF's image in the city. They agreed to work with the Club to strengthen neighborhood participation in their campus advisory committees.

The resolution raised opposition on both sides and strove to build up the openness of UCSF staff to neighborhood concerns. The XCom's resolution supported UCSF staying in Laurel Heights, but urged them to keep the neighborhood leaders informed and accept their input, and offered the Club's help in making this a success.

The resolution further urged UCSF to fully evaluate the potential environmental impacts in an adequate EIR, and to withdraw their appeal of LIAH's victory in the Appeals Court. The resolution further gave the guarantee that harmful release of toxicns, the resolution urged an extrapolation on the area to a neighborhood level and all local public disclosure of their inventory of potentially toxic materials, quarterly unannounced inspections by the Department of Public Health Services with the results made public and a state-funded study of the incidence of cancer, and other diseases throughout the area.

The burden is now on UCSF and LIAH to provide the necessary study work together to improve campus planning, ensure neighborhood safety and mitigate campus impacts on the neighborhood.

John Holmes

Milvia to Slow Down

Joel D. Sterner and Richard Zagarinski invented the idea of a Slow Boat. Rather than promoting bicycling through the tradition method bike lanes, a Slow Boat slows down traffic so that bikes can travel at the same pace as cars.

In early May, Berkeley's transportation commission passed a resolution proposed by Joel Sterner, in the San Francisco General Hospital, Executive Committee to eliminate any release of toxicns from UCSF and more UCSF-Laurel Heights superimposed. "I feel stronger than them were less than 10 neighborhood activists from LPHA."

"As the road is now very close to the shore, we recommend that we do not build it on the bay area near the old fireman's Fund building at California and Presidio. They had defeated UC in the Appeals Court over the adequacy of its Environmental Impact Report and were now in the state Supreme Court with supporting beliefs from the state Supreme General Counsel. The "Bay Area Planning and Conservation League" UCS claims their EIR doesn't have to analyze the impacts of their lab, alternative proposals to Laurels Heights, or mitigation measures as thoroughly as an environmental EIR would.
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The following is excerpted from a longer letter

The Saga of UCSF

The hundred excited people, many from UC San Francisco, gathered in the Sierra Club library, agitated by a Laurel Heights Improvement Association (LIAH)—sponsored proposal before the San Francisco General Hospital, Executive Committee to eliminate any release of toxicns from UCSF and more UCSF-Laurel Heights superimposed. "I feel stronger than them were less than 10 neighborhood activists from LPHA."

"As the road is now very close to the shore, we recommend that we do not build it on the bay area near the old fireman's Fund building at California and Presidio. They had defeated UC in the Appeals Court over the adequacy of its Environmental Impact Report and were now in the state Supreme Court with supporting beliefs from the state Supreme General Counsel. The "Bay Area Planning and Conservation League" UCS claims their EIR doesn't have to analyze the impacts of their lab, alternative proposals to Laurels Heights, or mitigation measures as thoroughly as an environmental EIR would.

Economics

One of the considerations by which the INF judges this application is the likelihood of its successful operation and its contribution to the "sleep and natural" at UCSF, not-withstanding the conventional wisdom among resort consultants. While some believe the best BSA ratios that the best BSA ratio was not statistically significant. UCSF is on the bay area, it must

The Sierra Club

I would like to comment on the Sierra Club's position on the SAA. As the most influential environmental group supports development in the United States, the Sierra Club's views on any development in a semi-wild area must, of course, be rechecked with. The location of the SAA (and left-supported a marathon generally) is suggested in the following excerpt from the Sierra Club Bulletin.

The Forest Service is pushing SAA because they say they need to "provide recreation. The plan should give greater thought to the benefit of the public, with the results that the public would appreciate appropriate on our public lands, that which drastically alters the natural environment and is dependent on high-finance industrial
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West Portal Fair

Officer McGruff, the crime-fighting dog, joined UCSF staff and pharmacy students to inform neighbors about poison control and crime prevention at the West Portal Merchants' Fair last weekend.

Photos by Dale Kummerle
California Supreme Court to Hear UCSF-Laurel Heights Appeal

The California State Supreme Court last week agreed to review the July 9 ruling of the California Court of Appeal which declared our environmental impact report for the Laurel Heights campus to be inadequate.

The Appellate Court reversed a decision by the San Francisco Superior Court in September 1986 which had upheld the EIR.

Although the Appellate Court held in July that the EIR should have contained more detailed information, it did not find that UCSF's research activities have ever posed any risk to the environment or to the health of campus employees or the community, according to UCSF attorney Ethan Schulman.

Meanwhile, on our Parnassus campus, the Staff Advisory Committee, composed of staff employees who wanted to get involved in the Laurel Heights issue, has formed subcommittees, including ones for neighborhood outreach and employee education. Material now is being prepared to help educate members of the committee on the various issues facing the campus. The committee is being chaired by Vice Chancellor, Personnel and Student Services Thena Trygstad, with assistance from Barbara Atkinson, our new community and government relations director on campus, who is coordinating the subcommittees.
Emissions Study Shows Laurel Heights Research Labs are Safe; UC Gears Up to Help Secure UCSF’s Future

A recent analysis of potential toxic emissions from two School of Pharmacy laboratories conducting research on these issues found no evidence of any significant health risks. The UCSD laboratories now in operation at Laurel Heights has concluded that emissions pose no health risk to the community.

The study, conducted by the UCSD Environmental Health & Safety Department, analyzed emissions from 20 laboratories in the school. The research laboratories were found to emit levels of toxic substances that are far below the levels considered safe by health agencies. The study also found that emissions from these laboratories are not likely to pose a significant health risk to the community.

The results of the study are being used to help develop a comprehensive plan to protect the health and safety of employees and the public. The plan includes the development of new emission control technologies and the implementation of more stringent emission standards.

The study was conducted by a team of researchers who used advanced analytical techniques to measure emissions from the laboratories. The results of the study are being used to develop a comprehensive plan to protect the health and safety of employees and the public.

The study was conducted by a team of researchers who used advanced analytical techniques to measure emissions from the laboratories. The results of the study are being used to develop a comprehensive plan to protect the health and safety of employees and the public.
October 21, 1988

Dear [Name],

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) 1987-88 Annual Report. It contains background information and guidelines on our structure and purpose. I have already informed the respective committee chairs that you may be attending the first meeting; if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at x68180, Department of Pharmacy, Box 0446.

Sincerely,

Trinity Ordona
Chair
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

P.S. A reminder:

**Staff Education**
Susan Heath, Chair (x64240)
Thursday, October 27
12:00 - 1:00 pm
S-118 Chancellor's Conference Room

**Community Outreach**
Byron Sigal, Chair (x61616)
Wednesday, November 2
12:00 - 1:00 pm
C-144 (Clinical Sciences bldg)
SAN FRANCISCO FOOD BANK
MISSION STATEMENT

Millions of Americans go hungry each year, yet the USDA estimates that 20 percent of our nation's food supply is wasted on an annual basis. The goal of the San Francisco Food Bank since its beginning in 1981 has been to address this problem. By redeeming large quantities of edible food that otherwise would be thrown away, and distributing such food to human service programs, the Food Bank helps the community lower the cost of providing nourishing food to those in need.

Each year the San Francisco Food Bank salvages over 2,250,000 pounds of edible but unsalable food that would otherwise be discarded by the food industry. At the Food Bank food is sorted and warehoused, and inedible food is discarded. The Food Bank then distributes food at 12 cents per pound to over 100 community service agencies that feed people, thus enabling those programs to significantly lower the cost of their food budgets and to redirect funds into programs designed to help people become more self-sufficient.

The San Francisco Food Bank is a member of Second Harvest, a National Food Bank Network which mobilizes food on a national corporate level and standardizes local food banking practices. The Food Bank's operations must therefore conform to food industry health and safety standards. We monitor how food is distributed by local programs in order to assure donors and the community that food is being handled safely and properly.

The Food Bank relies heavily on volunteer labor, and could not accomplish what we do without their assistance. Our Volunteer Program gives meaningful work and job experience to 40 regular volunteers. Youth, retirees, and individuals in vocational rehabilitation programs work alongside others who just like the good feeling of helping others in a practical way.

Specifically responding to the needs of San Francisco's sizeable elderly poor population, the Food Bank created the Senior Brown Bag Program. This program provides food to 500 seniors twice a month, and is supported in part by the State Department of Aging.

There are six Food Banks in the Bay Area, each of which serves its respective county. Alameda, Marin, Concord, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Food Banks all joined together in 1984 to create the Bay Area Food Mobilizer Project, which allows us to obtain and equitably allocate food donations among the six Food Banks.
COMMENTS FROM A FEW OF OUR AGENCIES

"Project Open Hand prepares and delivers a hot dinner entree and a bag lunch to over 400 people with AIDS and severe ARC. The San Francisco Food Bank helps us keep our costs down so we have been able to serve the population that so desperately asks for our help. It would be difficult, if not totally impossible, to conduct our program without your help."

Ruth Brinker, Director, Project Open Hand

"The importance of the Food Bank in the fight to alleviate the deplorable conditions in which our families are forced to live cannot be overemphasized. The Food Bank is a vital service which saves lives, literally."

Julie A. Kavanagh, Director, Visitacion Valley Community Center (Low Income Seniors Program)

"The Recreation Center for The Handicapped, Inc. regularly utilizes the services of the Food Bank-- and if it were not for your existence, we could not offer three hot meals per day to 200 people with disabilities."

Janet Pomeroy, Director, The Recreation Center for the Handicapped, Inc.

"Since opening our shelter in January 1984, the Food Bank has been one of our main sources of food products. The youth we see are runaway and homeless children; many come to our door not having eaten for several days. The San Francisco Food Bank has been a stable provider of quality food."

Susan Wilder, Program Director, Catholic Charities - Services for Homeless Youth

"The Good Samaritan Community Center has worked with the San Francisco Food Bank for nearly four years now in the Senior's Brown Bag Program. Through this program we have fed over 250 needy seniors each week. We appreciate the good business practices of the Food Bank. Our food comes in on time and in sufficient amounts."

The Rev. Will Wautera, Director, Good Samaritan Community Center (Low Income Seniors Program)

"We help 100-125 families (approximately 400 people) each month. Since we have been shopping at the Food Bank, we are able to provide nutritious food at a very low cost."

Beatrice M. Boland, St. Teresa's Conference, St. Vincent de Paul (Emergency Food Box Program)

"The Food Bank has sustained us for four years. It is an enormously important resource for a lot of struggling non-profits. They are a major source of food for our program."

Cary Norsworthy, Coordinator, San Francisco AIDS Foundation Food Bank

"Vaugirard, an alcohol and drug recovery center, has been using the Food Bank for about five years. The Food Bank saves us about $1,000 a month in food expenses. Without their services we would probably not be in existence in our current form."

Harry Morgan, Director, Vaugirard

"Erickson School is a non-public school which provides educational services to children ages 7 to 18 who are learning disabled/emotionally disturbed. Without the assistance of the San Francisco Food Bank, it would be impossible to fund such a program because of the high operational costs."

Shelley Lobell, Executive Director, Learning Services of California

"The San Francisco Food Bank has provided our emergency shelter with irreplaceable benefits to homeless families. Because the Food Bank acts as a clearinghouse for surplus food, our agency can put its time and money into directly serving our families."

Rev. Mark Story, Raphael House
### SAN FRANCISCO FOOD BANK

#### FOOD DONORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Tarantino &amp; Sons</th>
<th>Columbus Distributing</th>
<th>Imperial Produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acme Foods</td>
<td>Commodity Reserve</td>
<td>Inlaks Seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adohr Farms</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
<td>Innovative Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Krosnick Studio</td>
<td>Continental Avard</td>
<td>Institutional Produce Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Hospital Supply</td>
<td>Continental White Cap Co.</td>
<td>Inter American Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Hot Coffee</td>
<td>Corn Nuts</td>
<td>Inter Ocean Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Poultry</td>
<td>Cost Plus Imports</td>
<td>It's It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armanino Sales, Inc.</td>
<td>Country Skillet Catfish Co.</td>
<td>Italfoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour Meats</td>
<td>Crate and Barrel</td>
<td>ITT Continental Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Foods</td>
<td>Crivello Oyster Bar</td>
<td>J. Sosnick &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azumaya Inc.</td>
<td>Cut &amp; Ready Foods</td>
<td>Jacobs Malcolm &amp; Burtt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Cakes Bakery</td>
<td>Deer Park Baking Co.</td>
<td>Jean Pierre Berthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers of Paris</td>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>Jerome Foods Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Girl Scout Council</td>
<td>Dispenser Juice Inc.</td>
<td>Jim Bymes &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Pie Co.</td>
<td>Dole Packaged Foods</td>
<td>John Demartini Co. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Brokerage</td>
<td>Domenico's Meats</td>
<td>Just Desserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon St. Kitchen</td>
<td>Domestic Cheese</td>
<td>Kellogg Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice/Hunt-Wesson</td>
<td>Double Rainbow</td>
<td>Kraft, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech-Nut Nutrition Corp.</td>
<td>Doug Warne</td>
<td>Kunkel Studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram's Seafood Masters</td>
<td>Dreyer's Ice Cream</td>
<td>La Mousse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best California Transportation</td>
<td>Eden Foods</td>
<td>Lamb Weston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Foods</td>
<td>Eduardo's Pasta Factory</td>
<td>Landmark Coffee Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Rite Restaurant Supply</td>
<td>Esprit Cafe</td>
<td>Les Baguettines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pruzan</td>
<td>Farwest</td>
<td>Les Boulangers Associes. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ostrow</td>
<td>First Pasta</td>
<td>Levi Strauss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boboli, Inc.</td>
<td>Florence Distributing Co.</td>
<td>Lilly Tulip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Appetit</td>
<td>Food Sales West</td>
<td>Long Fish Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borden Inc.</td>
<td>Food Service Trade Center</td>
<td>Lucca Packing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud's Ice Cream</td>
<td>France Foods</td>
<td>Lucky Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Whole Food &amp; Grain Co.</td>
<td>Fred's Liquor &amp; Deli</td>
<td>Lucky's (Salvage Ctr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>Freed, Teller &amp; Freed</td>
<td>M &amp; J Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;E Produce</td>
<td>Gaines Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>Marsha's Marvelous Soups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Culinary Academy</td>
<td>Gallo Salami</td>
<td>Metro Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Meat Co.</td>
<td>General Biscuit Brands</td>
<td>Millmen's Local #42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Sunshine Fine Foods</td>
<td>General Foods</td>
<td>Mitchell's Ice Cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Soup Co.</td>
<td>General Mills Inc.</td>
<td>Mother's Cakes and Cookies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carni Sausage</td>
<td>Ghiselli Brothers Inc.</td>
<td>Mott's U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House Foods</td>
<td>Golden Gate Seafood</td>
<td>Mrs. Smith's Frozen Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Distributing</td>
<td>Golden Grain</td>
<td>McKesson Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalet Desserts</td>
<td>Golden Sea Fisheries Serv.</td>
<td>Nabisco Brands Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charla Grocery</td>
<td>Green Leaf Produce</td>
<td>Nancy's Specialty Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef Francisco, Inc.</td>
<td>H &amp; N Fish</td>
<td>Nature Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef Pierre Inc.</td>
<td>H. Shenson International</td>
<td>Near East Food Products, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesebrough-Pond's Inc.</td>
<td>Haagen-Dazs Company Company Inc.</td>
<td>New Zealand Lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiquita Brands, Inc.</td>
<td>Half Moon Seafoods</td>
<td>Night Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church &amp; Dwight</td>
<td>Harvest Day Bakery</td>
<td>Nippon Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Fish</td>
<td>Hickory Farms</td>
<td>Ocean Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clorox Company</td>
<td>High Health Shop</td>
<td>Old Country Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Co.</td>
<td>Honey Hill Farms</td>
<td>Ore Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohan Seafood Co.</td>
<td>Hormel</td>
<td>Oroweat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pace Foods, Inc.
Pacific Rim Seafood, Inc.
Paladini Seafood Co.
Parisan Bakery
Patisserie Francaise
Patterson Frozen Foods
Peatco, Inc.
Peninsula Fish
Pepsi Cola Bottling Co.
Perche No
Petrini's
Pillsbury Company
Procter & Gamble Co.
Ragu Foods Inc.
RC Bigelow
Rex Sales Co.
Riviana Foods, Inc.
Roldan Produce
Rolling Pin Donuts
Ross Laboratories
Roth Manufactures
S.E. Rykoff & Co.
Safeway Beverage Plant
Safeway Grocery Wholesale
Safeway Spoils Recov. Center
San Francisco Sausage
San Francisco Sweets
Sandoz Nutrition
Seafood Marketing, Inc.
See's Candies
S.F. Sweets
SHARE Project
Sicilian Sausage Connection
Sierra Natural Foods
Simpot Foods Inc.
Spreckles Company Inc.
Sun Snaks
Sun West Export
Super Nutrition
Taylor United
Tetley Inc.
TGT
Thermicold Corp.
Thomas J. Lipton, Inc.
Traditional Medicines Inc.
Treasure Island Commissary
Tropicana
Van Wyk Culinary
Veronica Foods Co.
Vertible Vegetable
Vie De France
Vitasoy
Westbrae Foods
Wilcox Frozen Foods
Wonder Bread
Zel R. Kahn & Son, Inc.
PROPOSITION MARKET PLACE '88

Meet representatives from various S.F. and State ballot measures.

Ask Questions!
Pick-Up Literature!

DATE: Friday, October 28, 1988
TIME: 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
PLACE: Lobby
Medical Sciences Building

SPONSORED BY
UCSF Academic Senate • Staff Advisory Committee • ABOG
UCSF Council • Graduate Students Association • Associated Students, UCSF
Alumni Association of UCSF
October 27, 1988

TO: Members, Staff Education Subcommittee
    Staff Advisory Committee

FROM: Susan Heath, Chair, Staff Education Subcommittee

RE: Summary of meeting Thursday, October 27

PRESENT: Suzanne Gottschalk, Susan Heath (Chair), May Huang,
        Marie Lehrer, Loretta Maddux, Anne Poirier, Isabel Romo, Steve
        Reynolds, William Thomas, Colleen Trawick

Members and others who attended the first meeting of the 1988-89 year
brought enthusiasm and fresh ideas to the subcommittee. We look forward
to a productive year sponsoring events of interest and usefulness to the
staff of UCSF.

The group identified six issues of importance that will be addressed in
seminars, as well as educational mailings. These are:

Toxics (Francis Mycroft, Toxics Hotline, Nick Petrakis, epidemiologist,
as well as other panelists) Sick Building syndrome, toxic fumes in
library and other.

AIDS (including researchers describing what positive is being done - if
any relief is in sight, also responsibility for personal safety.
Development and Training is giving programs on AIDS in the workplace -
they may be included. This may need to be expanded beyond a one hour
lunch seminar).

Mt. Zion (although we would concentrate on what it means to us, concern
was voiced for the Mt. Zion employees who feel they will be "swallowed
up" and we will look into possibility of addressing this concern).

Repeat Animal Research (may also send out information in informational
mailing).

Biotechnology (Herbert Boyer, other?) Chancellor Krevans is interested
in this issue - UC as Biotechnology Center, etc. Expansion in this
field may effect staff by creating career opportunities. We would also
like to know the benefits and/or possible adverse effects of this center
to the community at large and the campus community in particular.

Work place issues: Communication within UC (let staff know what
newspapers come from where, how information is distributed to different
levels, etc.), how problems with space can be handled (ergonomics),
parking.

Six seminars - can be at times other than lunch. Informational mailings
- possibly monthly, to be "piggy-backed" with News Service mailings, if
possible. Group also wants to emphasize coordination with other campus organizations.

The next meeting will be on Thursday, November 10, 12:00-1:00, C-144. We will discuss the first seminar due in January - Toxics, and also the feasibility and logistics of informational mailings.

Please R.S.V.P. to me at (6-4240).

cc: Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations
    Valli McDougle, Chair, SAC subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
    Janet Norton, Liaison for New Services
    Trinity Ordonia, Chair, Staff Advisory Committee
    Paula Carien Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
    Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC subcommittee on Community Outreach
November 16, 1988

TO:      May Huang
         Isabel Romo
         William Thomas

FROM:   Susan Heath, Chair, Staff Education Subcommittee
        Staff Advisory Committee

After talking with William yesterday, I checked with members of
the executive board concerning attendance of volunteers at the
general membership meeting on Friday, November 18. You all
became active after the committee members were appointed and we
have a logistics problem. We have nearly forty appointed members
and have trouble finding space big enough to meet. This is only
the second general membership meeting of the year, and we hope to
be able to determine who will be active and who will not, so we
will know how many people to expect. If you continue to be
active in our subcommittee, and I certainly hope you will be, we
hope to be able to invite you to the next general meeting. There
will be another subcommittee meeting after Thanksgiving but I
haven't made a date yet. We really appreciate your interest and
participation.

cc:   Valli McDougle
      Trinity Ordona
      Steve Reynolds
      Paula Carien Schultz
      Byron Sigal
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee
Staff Education Subcommittee
December 15, 1988 1-2 PM C-158

Present: Susan Heath (Chair), Ethel Adams, Suzanne Gottschalk, May Huang, Anne Poirier, Duffy Price, Steve Reynolds
Absent: Joy Becker, Karen Eldred, Michele Graf, Loretta Maddux, Eunice Redondo, Barbara Wilson

TOPIC: TOXINS SEMINAR

DISCUSSION:
1. Steve Reynolds reported that the best date in January for the seminar which would not conflict with previously scheduled lectures and campus activities would be Friday, January 27 from 12-1pm. He has booked Cole Hall for that date from 11:30am-1pm; a 45-50 minute program should be planned to make sure Cole Hall is cleared punctually by 1pm.

2. Steve Reynolds reported that upcoming deadlines for campus publicity are as follows: Synapse (1/2/89), Newsbreak (1/3/89). The merits of a follow-up article in Synapse were discussed.

3. The committee decided that the advertising flier should be individually labelled and mailed to all staff (this excludes academic and clinical faculty), totalling 8,000 people @$1,000.

4. The committee agreed that the $200-250 expense for EMR to tape the seminar, as was done with prior seminars, was not warranted with budget constraints and limited use of previous tapes.

5. A moderator will have to be identified from this sub-committee. Anne Poirier agreed to stand in unless someone else is especially interested.

6. Susan Heath reported that Eunice Redondo had spoken with a representative from Labor Occupational Health Program and they are willing to provide a speaker and brochures. They will need direction as to whether to discuss rules and regulations or specific examples of toxins.

7. A discussion followed in an attempt to define toxins and concerns the campus community might have. Topics suggested were "Sick Building Syndrome", ventilation, and fumes and gases from laboratories.

8. Susan Heath announced that Anne Poirier will serve as subcommittee co-chair.

ACTION:
1. Steve Reynolds will submit the seminar title to Synapse and Newsbreak.
2. Each committee member will prepare topic ideas for the next meeting.
3. Ethel Adams will ask EHS to define most common complaints from campus and report back to the committee.
4. The committee will start thinking of questions to ask the seminar panelists.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 20, 1989 12-1pm C-158
cc: Trinity Ordona, Chair, SAC
Valli McDougle, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach
Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations
Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services
Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee  
Staff Education Subcommittee  
December 20, 1988  12-1 PM  C-158

Present: Susan Heath (Chair), Suzanne Gottschalk, May Huang, Anne Poirier, Steve Reynolds, Paula Schultz  
Absent: Ethel Adams, Joy Becker, Karen Eldred, Michele Graf, Loretta Maddux, Duffy Price, Eunice Redondo, Barbara Wilson  

TOPIC:  TOXINS SEMINAR

DISCUSSION:  
1. The committee agreed that this seminar should be presented by the following three panelists:  
   A. Roy Balzer, EHS, and support staff if possible to answer audience questions.  
      Topics to focus on:  
      i) Q fever (briefly)  
      ii) asbestos  
      iii) construction  
      iv) ventilation  
   B. CAL/OSHA representative, focusing on:  
      i) process of reorganization  
      ii) when they will be on-line  
      iii) general information about workplace toxin exposure  
      iv) how does agency service complaints  
   C. Dr. Don Jewett, Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, focusing on:  
      i) allergies in the workplace  
      ii) "Sick Building Syndrome"  

ACTION:  
1. Steve Reynolds will notify News Services of the title of the toxins seminar to meet printing deadlines.  
2. Steve Reynolds will contact Roy Balzer in EHS and invite him to participate in the panel.  
3. Anne Poirier will contact CAL/OSHA and Dr. Don Jewett.  

TOPIC:  COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP

DISCUSSION:  
1. Susan Heath announced that she would be stepping down from her post as Chair of this subcommittee after serving for the past year. Anne Poirier and Susan Gottschalk will assume the roles of Co-chairs.  

ACTION:  
1. Anne Poirier and Susan Gottschalk will meet next week to discuss subcommittee direction and review seminar progress.  

NEXT MEETING:  TBA for January 1989  

cc:  Trinity Ordonea, Chair, SAC  
     Valli McDougle, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy  
     Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach  
     Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations  
     Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services  
     Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
Most Successful Food Drive Ever in S.F.

By Perry Lang
Chronicle Staff Writer

The employees of more than 100 San Francisco businesses opened their hearts and cupboards this holiday season and gave a record 64,000 pounds of food to the San Francisco Food Bank.

"It's the largest food drive ever held in San Francisco," said Judy Belohlavek, speaking for the organization. Belohlavek said overwhelming donations forced the bank to seek trucking help from the Teamsters union just to pick up all the food.

The Food Bank, which raised 18,000 pounds of food from 28 companies during its 1987 holiday food drive, raised 64,000 pounds from more than 100 companies.

Big donations came from Bechtel Corp. with 11,585 pounds, Del Monte with 6,676 pounds, McKesson with 5,000 pounds, University of California at San Francisco with 4,730 pounds, the Grubb & Ellis real estate firm with 3,700 pounds, Pacific Gas and Electric with 2,740 pounds, Wells Fargo Bank with 2,680 pounds and Chevron U.S.A. with 2,160 pounds.

Two local food producers, Nancy's Quiche and Allied Foods, gave substantial donations of their products to the drive.

In addition to food, some longtime corporate supporters, such as Transamerica, McKesson and the Haas foundations, donated more than $20,000 each.

All food collected by the food bank will be distributed to the needy through more than 100 human service agencies. These programs include homeless shelters, AIDS relief programs, soup kitchens, low-income senior centers, emergency food box programs and other agencies serving needy individuals.

The mission of the food bank is to act as a central food provider of donated food to local hunger relief agencies. The organization is one of two Bay Area groups that are part of the national food bank group called Second Harvest, which receives donations from grocery stores and food manufacturers.
How to Avoid Boring Meetings

By BETH ANN KRIER, Times Staff Writer

Congratulations. You've just survived the first round of your local executive ability sweepstakes. You now get to give rather than take meetings.

Have you had your lessons yet?

If you haven't—and your instruction in this delicate art comes exclusively from observing all the other meetings in your life—don't be surprised if your gatherings are as ineffective, boring and probably as unnecessary as all those were.

That's the view of meeting expert Virginia Johnson. She reports that typical business meetings, whether they're given by charity groups or companies in the Fortune 500, are "memorials to dead issues in which we spend most of the time assessing blame and establishing the status quo.

"Meetings have such a bad reputation that people who come to seminars on meetings come in defensive. " Johnson said during a recent trip to Los Angeles, "Nothing could be less appealing to them. But if they knew how many careers are made or broken on the basis of participation—or lack of it—in meetings, and on the basis of presentation skills, they'd probably feel differently.

Johnson, a market development supervisor for 3M (Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.) travels the country lecturing on how to run better business meetings. This includes dropping a few words on behalf of audio-visual aids that her company creates and distributes and visiting local 3M staffers who comprise the firm's national workshop program and who regularly provide free talks on meeting improvement and related subjects.

What Other People Do

"The problem with meetings is that people who run them do what they've seen other people do and that generally isn't good," Johnson offered, adding that she frequently asks audiences the question, "Have you ever attended a bad meeting?" (She has never received a "no" response.)

One of the chief reasons for this, she continued, is that too many meetings convene just because they're regularly scheduled; and often these gatherings are simply vehicles for announcements, which might be better handled through memos, phone calls or even guest-edged stationery.

"To really prove your executive ability," Johnson advised, "cancel a meeting once a while and never hold a meeting merely because it's been scheduled. Think how nice it would be to tell people you've discovered there were only two items on the agenda, both of which could wait, and you thought they might appreciate a gift of time."

All this comes under meeting preparation, the absence of which is the greatest breach of meeting etiquette, in Johnson's opinion.

"Meetings should not take place unless the objective can be defined in one sentence. The biggest mistake with meetings is that they often have no specific objective. We cannot solve all the problems of the world in one meeting," she insisted.

"In preparing an agenda, you have to first analyse, organise and condense the issues you're going to cover."

The unprepared meeting leader is most likely to be done in by the fact that his or her listeners can think four times faster than the speaker can talk—and are likely to be distracted by the slightest delay or interruption, said Johnson. For this reason the added speakers never come to stand with their backs to an access door. Otherwise every time someone comes through it the audience will take a mental vacation to check who's coming and going.

Minutes of Meetings

Johnson also cautioned against distributing lengthy minutes from previous meetings, specifically minutes which include descriptions of discussion. "Include only the decisions that were reached. Minutes with descriptions of discussions just reward the people who weren't at the meeting."

No decisions reached?

That's probably because the meeting was a tribute to complaints of the past instead of solutions for the future, said Johnson. "We recommend focusing on the future—where are we going from here?—and letting people criticize only if they have solutions."

One of Johnson's favorite solutions for improving meeting performance is also one of her most simple: telling people what time the meeting will end as well as when it will start. In her experience, "one of the reasons meetings have such a bad reputation is that they never seem to end."

In addition, she recommended avoiding what she terms the "Seven Deadly Sins" of meetings:

—Monopolizing. "Your role as a meeting leader is to manage the participation of others, not to provide a monologue."

—Playing the comic. "Don't play the comedian but allow humor. If you're always good at laughable Harry, it's difficult to deal with serious issues if that's your permanent stance."

—Losing control. "Don't let the participants take the meeting away from you by letting them go off on tangents. Use the agenda as a control mechanism."

—Publicly chastising people. "If you embarrass any one person, all those present will feel the potential of being placed in that same position and will become defensive."

—Allowing interruptions. "Don't allow outside distractions such as noise, dishes being removed, people moving through the room. Alert your staff and be sure there are no phone messages or other interruptions."

—Resenting questions. "Questions are compliments. Be sure to acknowledge all questions, speak to their intent and ensure the person that if you don't know the answer to the question that you or someone else will get the answer for them. Never answer a question with just a 'yes' or 'no.' It's something difficult for people to get on their feet to ask a question and that kind of an answer can be very deflating."

—Being unprepared. "This is the deadliest sin and the most common. If you don't come prepared, your meeting will probably last too long, will have no logical flow and you will waste people's time."

With all that in mind, concluded Johnson, meetings should become "success experiences" for both the participants and the leaders.

As she put it, "Part of the obligation of leadership is to encourage people to participate, to feel as if their participation in a meeting made a difference. You can never leave a meeting saying, 'They did not want to listen.'"
GUIDELINES

Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was established on September 25, 1987 to improve employee and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF in light of the adverse public attention generated by the Laurel Heights site controversy.

As the Staff Advisory Committee discussions progressed...it became clear that the issue went far beyond moving UCSF to Laurel Heights. The real issue was the University’s basic right to conduct safe and important research. What started out as a discussion around a specific campus site soon became a discussion about the University as an institution, and its function and purpose. These discussions led us to consider the future of UCSF.

...In our dual role as staff and concerned citizens of the Bay Area, we can approach the issues raised by the Laurel Heights crisis by educating ourselves. ...The future of UCSF is our future too.

Staff Advisory Committee Forum
"UCSF: Our Future"
April 1, 1988

The purpose of the committee is to:

1. Support the research, patient care, education and public service of UCSF
2. Improve communication between staff, community and administration
3. Educate the staff, administration and community

II. STRUCTURE

The SAC is a working group responsible to recommend and advise the Chancellor on staff concerns related to the improvement of staff and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF. The SAC will also act on any recommendations approved by the Chancellor and will make an annual report of its activities at the conclusion of its current year.

To accomplish its purpose, the SAC formed three standing committees with these goals and objectives. They are:

STAFF EDUCATION

a. Sponsoring lecture series and campus/community information forums
INFORMATION & ADVOCACY

a. Organizing campus information and mobilization network (phone tree; letter writing campaigns)
b. Reviewing campus communications

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

a. Joining neighborhood organizations
b. Publicizing UCSF (public relations campaigns)
c. Participating in civic activities
d. Attending public forums

The Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee and all SAC members are appointed by the Chancellor for a tenure of one year beginning September 1; vacancies on the SAC will be filled by new appointments made by the Chancellor, and will last until the end of the tenure of the current term. The SAC is composed of at least 30 members. The goal is to have a cross section of representatives of the Schools, Medical Center and support services from all campus sites. The composition of the committee will seek to reflect the racial, cultural and sexual diversity of the campus. In addition, the committee will also have a liaison from each of the following three offices: Vice Chancellor, Personnel and Student Services; Community & Governmental Relations; News & Public Information Services.

The SAC has the authority to organize itself, form committees and to adopt its own structure and rules for the conduct of its business. The responsibilities of the Chair and Vice Chair are:

1. Chair -- Provide overall leadership to the committee; call meetings, prepare agenda and chair regular meetings; prepare and present intramural and extramural reports of the SAC as needed; prepare annual summary to the Chancellor on SAC activities.

2. Vice Chair -- Appointed by the chair for one year and serves as chairperson in the absence of the Chair; through a staff person assigned from the Vice Chancellor's Office, Vice-Chair has the following duties: keep current roster of SAC members; schedule meetings; make and distribute agenda and summary reports of each meeting; and keep record of all expenses incurred.

Accepted: August 3, 1988
Appointments to the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee are made annually by the Chancellor. In order to maintain an actively functioning group, participation is vital. The following expectations have been developed for members of the Committee:

(1) Members will attend nine out of twelve general membership meetings annually; and

(2) Members will be active on at least one of the three subcommittees:

(A) Information & Advocacy

(B) Staff Education

(C) Community Outreach

Please contact the Chair if you are unable to attend a general membership meeting, and contact one of your Co-chairs if you are unable to attend a subcommittee meeting.
CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kathleen Balestreri, Chair

Subcommittees:

Information & Advocacy
Carolyn Koster
Valli McDougle

Staff Education
Suzanne Gottschalk
Anne Poirier

Community Outreach
Elenor Shimosaka
Byron Sigal
Christine Yee

2316
5415
2342
1373
7033
2000
1616
5683
I. HISTORY and BACKGROUND:

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was formed on September 25, 1987 when Chancellor Julius R. Krevans called on interested campus community members to counter the University's prevailing negative image resulting from the unfavorable July 9, 1987 Appeals Court decision on Laurel Heights.

During its first year, SAC held a series of meetings and activities to address various campus and community concerns. Three informational noontime programs were held on the Laurel Heights court developments, the use and disposal of radioactivity, and questions concerning the use of animals in research. Several advocacy and public relations tasks were also accomplished. Most notably, SAC mobilized campus members to attend the SF Sierra Club meeting on May 11, 1988 when an anti-UCSF draft resolution was under consideration. At least 60 UCSF faculty, staff and students attended and after lengthy testimony, the opposition was countered with an effective articulation of the facts.

II. 1988-89 CURRENT STATUS

A. Transitional Period, July 1 - September 30, 1988: On June 17 at a general membership meeting of SAC, Trinity Ordona was voted as Acting Chair and The Guidelines for the Staff Advisory Committee were adopted. A transitional leadership group composed of Valli McDougle, Byron Sigal and Susan Heath (each representing the three working subcommittees) joined Trinity to steer the group through the rest of the summer.

During that time, they successfully enlisted volunteers from a wide cross-section of the campus community to recommend to the Chancellor for appointment to SAC in 1988-89. A greater diversity in representation of our off-campus community was achieved with 11 people of color, 11 men, and 6 individuals from the campus sites (VAMC, SFGH, CED, and Laurel Heights)
among the total 38 individuals. In addition, Parnassus Heights was more broadly represented with members from almost all the major campus buildings: Long Hospital, Medical/Clinical Sciences, Nursing, Dentistry, Langley Porter, Millberry Union, Laguna Honda, Irving Street and Medical Center Way. Representatives from ABOG, UCSF Council, and MAG joined the committee as well.

In addition, SAC organized UCSF participation in a community project to create a child care center for the Plaza East Housing Development in the Western Addition on September 24-25, 1988. Skilled UCSF labor including three electricians, three plumbers, and a carpenter from our Physical Plant Department donated their skilled labor. Forty other UCSF volunteers helped to clean, scrape, and paint the new child care center.

B. October 1, 1988 through September 30, 1989:

On September 30, 1988 Trinity Ordoña was appointed by Chancellor Krevans as Chair and 38 others were appointed members. Volunteers came forward from the committee to lead the three subcommittees: Valli McDougle, Kathy Balestreri -- Information and Advocacy; Byron Sigal, Elenor Shimosaka -- Community Outreach; and Anne Poirier, Suzanne Gottschalk (replacing Susan Health who later resigned) -- Staff Education. Trinity also named Steve Reynolds as Vice-Chair. These eight individuals made up the SAC Executive Committee which met monthly on the first Friday of the month. General membership monthly meetings were regularly held on the second Friday during noontime. In addition, Fred McEnroe from Paula Carien Schultz' office took the minutes and handled SAC financial accounting. Barbara Atkinson (Community & Governmental Relations), Janet Norton (News & Public Information Services), and Paula Carien Schultz (Vice Chancellor of Staff & Student Human Resources) continued as liaisons to SAC from their respective offices.

The general membership meetings were the mainstay for the organization, allowing members to give and receive reports on the activities of the working committees and, most importantly, discuss current issues with informed UCSF administration and outside sources. The information provided at these meetings enabled members to confidently respond to campus concerns and initiate activities during the year through the working committees. Relevant reports were regularly distributed and candidly discussed at meetings. In addition, the helpful and resourceful role of the liaisons often came into play. They kept the committee regularly informed of new developments, such as the EIR process for Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights, the 125th Anniversary Plans, Noe Valley community meetings about cancer clusters, etc.
causing leukemia cancers in Noe Valley. This discussion as well led some Information and Advocacy Committee members to attend their Noe Valley neighborhood community meeting on this issue (see specific report below). In addition, two general membership meetings on February 10 and March 10, 1989 were devoted solely to the concerns of toxics at the UCSF workplace. Dr. Balzer, and later Mr. Bruce Spaulding, candidly discussed these questions. The information they provided allowed the SAC Education Subcommittee to organize a very successful campuswide Q & A on this same topic. The Community Outreach Subcommittee, likewise, initiated and successfully organized two campus donation drives for food (November) and toys (May). Both campaigns brought recognition to UCSF and tapped the generosity of the campus community.

1. General Membership Meetings: The following is a list of the highlights of the general membership meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic, Guest Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 1988</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor Thena Trygstad: <em>Purpose and Goals of the Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1988</td>
<td>Working Committee Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 1988</td>
<td>Alfred L. Jin, Environmental Health &amp; Safety: <em>Facts and Issues on Q Fever</em>; Andrew R. Moss, Ph.D., Epidemiology &amp; International Health, UCSF: <em>The Noe Valley Cancer Cluster</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 1989</td>
<td>Lloyd H. Smith, M.D.: <em>125th Anniversary of UCSF</em>; George L. Kenyon, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate: <em>New Campuses for UC.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 1989 and March 10, 1989</td>
<td>Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement and Planning, J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety: <em>Questions and Concerns About Toxics at UCSF.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 14, 1989  
Attorney Anna Shimko (Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Robertson and Galk) and Barbara L. Atkinson, Community and Governmental Relations, UCSF: *The Environmental Impact Report Process, Laurel Heights and Mount Zion.*

May 12, 1989  
General membership meeting cancelled; *Toxins in the Workplace* seminar (May 18) and Toy & Book Drive (May 15-26).

June 9, 1989  
William B. Kerr, Director, UCSF Medical Center: *UCSF and Mount Zion Hospital.*

August 11, 1989  
Review and approval of the draft annual report; EIR process of campus/public information meetings for Mt. Zion/Laurel Heights to be discussed.

2. *Working Committee Reports:* All of the SAC members were asked to join a working committee (Information & Advocacy, Community Outreach, Staff Education). These committees were the nuts and bolts of SAC and the majority of our external activities were organized through them. Each set up its own internal structure, leadership, meeting schedule and decision making process. Staff volunteers who were interested in one of our projects joined that committee at any time throughout the year. (See Attachment i for list of working committee members.) Below is a brief report from the co-chairs of each working committee on their activities for the year.

a. *Information and Advocacy:* The goal of the Information & Advocacy subcommittee is to establish a campus information and mobilization network and to provide input, as requested, to campus communications regarding community/staff issues. During the course of the year, members of the subcommittee attended meetings of the established campus organizations to solicit participation in the mobilizations network. The network currently consists of over 60 members who may be solicited for letter-writing campaigns, attendance at community meetings, or participation in community-based projects. The network was used for attendance at the following public hearings:

(1) Friends of Noe Valley Community Meeting, January 23, 1989: Meeting confined to Noe Valley residents to discuss cancer clusters; members of subcommittee spoke in defense of UCSF.
(2) KQED-FM Radio-thon, February 10, 1989: Subcommittee recruited 8 staff volunteers from UCSF to participate in the radio-thon to raise funds for KQED-FM; during the radio-thon, UCSF was frequently mentioned on the air.

(3) Radiation License Hearing for Laurel Heights, April 21, 1989: The subcommittee helped to recruit faculty and staff to be present and/or submit testimony throughout the day; coordinated with the UCSF Office of Public Service Programs. (Please note: approval of license was subsequently granted on August 17, 1989.)

To enhance staff communication on issues affecting the campus, the subcommittee was responsible for:

(1) Development of a proposal for a UCSF "Rumor Hotline" for continuous updates on issues of interest to staff (Attachment ii). The proposal was submitted to campus administration and is included in the 1989-90 budget.

(2) Formulation of Campus Publications List of approximately 40 campus publications were compiled and forwarded to our News Services Office to enhance campus communication.

(3) Invitation on behalf of SAC to: UCSF President David Pierpont Gardner to address the campus community in the Fall of 1989; Atty. Anna Shimko (Howard Rice & Associates) to discuss the Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights EIR processes (May); UCSF Medical Center Director William E. Kerr to address the UCSF/Mt. Zion background, history and integration process (June); and review Chancellor's letter to the campus community on the on Laurel Heights court decision (December).

In the coming year, the goal of the subcommittee is to further develop the information & mobilization network by recruiting additional participants from the campus community at large.

b. Community Outreach: Representing UCSF, our subcommittee's goals are to provide community service and spread good will to our neighbors, community and targeted groups. To help accomplish these goals, we encouraged broad campus representation on the committee and selected community projects with the following criteria: "do-able" in a short period of time requiring people-power (no money would be donated or raised) and located in communities nearby UCSF or its off-campus sites and/or ethnic minority neighborhoods.
During the year, the committee met often to discuss projects, especially those that would link up with the upcoming 125th Anniversary Celebration plans. The committee sponsored its first project, *Holiday Food Drive for the SF Food Bank* (December 12-16). The campus collected over 5,000 pounds of food for the needy of San Francisco and was the 4th largest contributor in the city. This was our first effort and we plan to do this drive again next year. Since we found the campus community very giving, we sponsored a *Toy & Book Drive* in May and continued into June. Hundreds of toys and books were collected and are now being distributed to targeted day care centers and homeless shelters. (See Attachment iii-vii.) Next year, we also plan to carry out a renovation project and will solicit other projects/ideas from the campus community.

c. *Staff Education:* The Staff Education subcommittee began the year re-evaluating its mission to distinguish itself from other campus organizations or services also providing educational seminars. We decided that our task was to develop educational forums in immediate response to critical campus issues. This year, that topic is *Toxins in the Workplace.* This subject was selected after a process of holding two informal Q &A discussions with Dr. J. Leroy Balzer (Environmental Health & Safety) and Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding during our regularly scheduled general membership meetings in February and March. This preparation culminated in one of the best attended staff seminars on campus; over 130 people came to the standing-room only discussion. Of particular concern was the problems created by the noxious fumes from the ventilation system in the new spaces created in Millberry Union, Ambulatory Care and Medical Sciences. This proved to be an excellent forum for management-staff interaction and greatly increased staff understanding of the issues faced by a campus with severe space limitations in old buildings. The audience enthusiastically endorsed a follow-up seminar on the same topic. (See Attachment viii-x.) Next year, the subcommittee plans to organize another toxins seminar, including one at CED where staff strongly indicated interest in this topic.

E. *Budget:* All of these activities were done through volunteer time and effort. Many hours of meetings, designing graphics, making phone calls, writing and mailing letters, collecting food, toys and books and doing person-to-person outreach were entailed. Only $3,000 of the $6,000 SAC budget has been spent, to date. As in the past, publicity is our single largest expenditure item, costing approximately $1,000 a piece for the printing and mailing of campus publicity. (See Attachment xi for detailed report.)
III. FUTURE PLANS

In general, the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee has been active, involved and concerned about the current and future issues facing UCSF. These past two years have been crucial, formative ones. Basic organization and goals have been established and a good track record of service has been built. This annual report clearly demonstrates many creative examples of our loyalty and service, from tapping the generosity of the campus to provide needed community services and goods, to organizing educational forums on relevant campus issues, like toxins in the workplace, and mobilizing support from campus friends when needed.

We anticipate a continued need for SAC involvement in the coming years; already, the majority of members have indicated a desire to continue membership. Some plans have already been put into place for next year: SAC will help lead campus tours during the 125th Anniversary Celebration Kick-Off (scheduled for October 14, 1989) and mobilize for the upcoming community/campus informational meetings on Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights for the EIR process. Based on the past two years, we have confidence that we can effectively meet any new challenges ahead.

Respectfully submitted,

Trinity Ordoña
Chair

Steve Reynolds
Vice Chair

Kathy Balestreri
Information & Advocacy

Valli McDougle
Information & Advocacy

Elenor Shimosaka
Community Outreach

Byron Sigal
Community Outreach

Suzanne Gottschalk
Staff Education

Anne Poirier
Staff Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Ordona</td>
<td>x8180</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-834</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Baldwin</td>
<td>0579</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Balestreri</td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103</td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Becker</td>
<td>x2204</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Canfield</td>
<td>x3876</td>
<td>Box 0604</td>
<td>N-331B</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Ann Chou</td>
<td>x2298</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED 425</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>0544</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Emelia</td>
<td>221-4810</td>
<td>VA 116A</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED 145</td>
<td>AJS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x1373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td>Fac Alum, Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolynn Koster</td>
<td>5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>S-612</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McDougle</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>Box 0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Minvielle</td>
<td>8683</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-238</td>
<td>Millberry Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>8974</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
<td>Lab Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Connor</td>
<td>9014</td>
<td>Box 0640</td>
<td>C-734</td>
<td>Growth &amp; Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pauley</td>
<td>8808</td>
<td>Box 0910</td>
<td>HSE Annex</td>
<td>Material Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Poirier</td>
<td>7033</td>
<td>LPI-F-0984</td>
<td>LP-348</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>4592</td>
<td>Box 0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
<td>SFGH, 3C29</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>GI Division, SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Roma</td>
<td>8112</td>
<td>Box 0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Salazar</td>
<td>4373</td>
<td>Box 0934</td>
<td>145 Irv 1W</td>
<td>Assoc Dean, Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Santos</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>Box 0430</td>
<td>S-630</td>
<td>Dean's Office, S/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Shimosaka</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHS-150</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Sigal</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Box 0968</td>
<td>610 Parnassus</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>8095</td>
<td>Box 0288</td>
<td>MU 2nd fl E</td>
<td>VC-Bus &amp; Fis Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>7625</td>
<td>LPI-ACA-0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
<td>Psych/Acad Afrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-926</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yee</td>
<td>5683</td>
<td>Box 0238</td>
<td>MU 3rd fl W</td>
<td>Police Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred McEnroe</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Atkinson</td>
<td>x3206</td>
<td>Box 0930</td>
<td>1308-3rd Ave</td>
<td>Com &amp; Gov't Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Norton</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>Box 0250</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Carien Schultz</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 24, 1989
CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Trinity Ordona, Chair; Steve Reynolds, Vice-Chair
Kathy Balestreri, Suzanne Gottschalk, Valli McDougle,
Anne Poirier, Byron Sigal, Elenor Shimosaka

WORKING COMMITTEES

Information & Advocacy:
Kathy Balestreri, Co-Chair
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair
Tim Baldwin
Bart Cohen
Linda Erklens
Martha Hooven
Carolyn Koster
Karen Newhouse
Dorothy Price
Chris Slaboszewicz
Susan Stevens
Margaret Warren

Community Outreach:
Byron Sigal, Co-Chair
Elenor Shimosaka, Co-Chair
Karen Eldred
Rita Emelia
Suzanne Gottschalk
Marsha Guggenheim
Miles Hamada
Sue Hamill
May Huang
Marie Lehrer
Albert Minvielle
John O'Connor
Trinity Ordona
Deborah Pauley
Anne Poirier
Steve Reynolds
Eugene Salazar
David Santos
Colleen Tradwick
Barbara Wilson

Staff Education:
Suzanne Gottschalk, Co-Chair
Anne Poirier, Co-Chair
Ethel Adams
Joy Becker
Karen Eldred
Michele Graf
Susan Heath
May Huang
Loretta Maddux
Dorothy Price
Eunice Redondo
Steve Reynolds
Isabel Roma
Barbara Wilson

August 3, 1989
HOTLINE PROPOSAL

Due to the size of the UCSF campus, and dispersion of faculty, staff and students among its many sites, it is often difficult to obtain current, accurate information. This is particularly true during times of fast-breaking news, such as the Supreme Court's decision on Laurel Heights, or during troubling activities or in crisis situations, such as an impending nurses' strike, or responding to rumors about the spread of Q fever or cancer clusters in surrounding neighborhoods. In order to make sure that members of the UCSF organization have access to the latest, most accurate information, we are proposing a telephone hotline.

We believe that to be most effective, the telephone hotline should be kept as simple and as cost-effective as possible. And because News and Information Services is the main campus resource for accurate, up-to-date information, we propose that the telephone hotline become part of that office's operations and responsibility.

It is also important to have some means of feedback so that campus officials have a means of learning about new events or recent rumors, and have an opportunity to clarify or respond appropriately.

The telephone hotline would work in the following way:

1) A separate telephone line with a message/answering machine would be located in News and Information Services.

2) A message about breaking news, or responding to campus rumors, would be recorded on the answering machine, and would be updated daily, and more often when necessary.

3) The message would end with a phone number which individuals could call in order to report breaking news or give information about spreading rumors, such as "If you have something you'd like to share with us, please call ______ or leave a message following the tone."

4) The message recorded on the answering machine could also be displayed on the TV monitors throughout the campus.

5) After a period of six months, this activity should be evaluated as to use and effectiveness.
25% of San Francisco's population lives near or below the poverty level. The majority of these people are children and senior citizens. UCSF has joined the Corporate Challenge Food Drive to collect food for the San Francisco Food Bank which serves soup kitchens, emergency and homeless shelters, senior centers and day care programs.

Your donations will help provide 75,000 meals a week to needy people throughout San Francisco!

Bring your donations to the UCSF Corporate Challenge Food Drive December 12-16
FOOD DRIVE SHOPPING LIST SUGGESTIONS

ALL DONATED FOOD SHOULD BE CANNED OR DRY

• CORNMEAL
• TUNA
• SARDINES
• STEW
• CHILI
• PASTA
• BEANS
• BRAN
• SOUPS
• RICE
• WHEAT
• CORNMEAL
• OATMEAL

• FRUIT JUICE
• CONDENSED MILK
• EVAPORATED MILK
• SPAGHETTI SAUCE
• PEANUT BUTTER
• DRY CEREAL
• PUDDING OR CUSTARD
• CANNED NUTS
• CANNED VEGETABLES
• CANNED OR DRY FRUITS
• MUFFIN OR PANCAKE MIX
• RICE CAKES
• BAKING MIXES

Look for the Food-Drop Barrel in your campus area

Trinity A. ORDONA
Pharm
Bx 0446 (m), S 834
630040/S/8040/Y/8180

Sponsored at UCSF by the Staff Advisory Committee and the Office of Public Service Programs
Most Successful
Food Drive
Ever in S.F.

By Perry Lang
Chronicle Staff Writer

The employees of more than 100 San Francisco businesses opened their hearts and cupboards this holiday season and gave a record 64,000 pounds of food to the San Francisco Food Bank.

"It's the largest food drive ever held in San Francisco," said Judy Belohlavek, speaking for the organization. Belohlavek said overwhelming donations forced the bank to seek trucking help from the Teamsters union just to pick up all the food.

The Food Bank, which raised 18,000 pounds of food from 28 companies during its 1987 holiday food drive, raised 64,000 pounds from more than 100 companies.

Big donations came from Bechtel Corp. with 11,585 pounds, Del Monte with 6,676 pounds, McKesson with 5,000 pounds, University of California at San Francisco with 4,230 pounds, the Grubb & Ellis real estate firm with 3,700 pounds, Pacific Gas and Electric with 2,740 pounds, Wells Fargo Bank with 2,660 pounds and Chevron U.S.A. with 2,160 pounds.

Two local food producers, Nancy's Quiche and Allied Foods, gave substantial donations of their products to the drive.

In addition to food, some longtime corporate supporters, such as Transamerica, McKesson and the Haas foundations, donated more than $20,000 each.

All food collected by the food bank will be distributed to the needy through more than 100 human service agencies. These programs include homeless shelters, AIDS relief programs, soup kitchens, low-income senior centers, emergency food box programs and other agencies serving needy individuals.

The mission of the food bank is to act as a central food provider of donated food to local hunger relief agencies. The organization is one of two Bay Area groups that are part of the national food bank group called Second Harvest, which receives donations from grocery stores and food manufacturers.
UCSF TOY DRIVE

Sponsored by the
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

MAY 15-26

We are collecting toys for some of the needy children of San Francisco. Toys will be donated to neighborhood community agencies providing summer programs for disadvantaged children.

Bring Toys for Infants through Pre-Teens

- BOOKS
- PUZZLES
- DOLLS
- BALLS
- EDUCATIONAL TOYS

- COMPLETE GAMES
- STUFFED ANIMALS
- MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS
- SPORTS EQUIPMENT
- ARTS & CRAFTS MATERIALS

Donations should be in good, usable condition.

LOOK FOR TOY BARRELS IN YOUR LOCATION
Neighborhood child care agencies soon will have a large collection of toys thanks to the successful Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee's recent toy drive. At the time of this writing some 25 barrels had been filled and still more were being collected. Nestled among one of the several mounds of toys (and offering a big collective "thanks" to everyone who donated) are the key members of the drive: (Clockwise beginning with Fred Flintstone) Child Care Center's Bryon Sigal, CVRI's Suzanne Gottschalk, Dentistry's John O'Connor, Immunogenetics' Marsha Guggenheim, Psychiatry's Anne Poirier, Pharmacy's Trinity Ordoña, News Services' Karen Eldred and Stephen Reynolds, Personnel's Eleonor Shimosaka and Pharmacy's Barbara Wilson. Missing is Police Department's Christine Yee.
Harris Award Shared by Two

For the second time in its 11-year history, the John B. Harris Award will be shared by two outstanding School of Medicine graduating students: David R. Campa of Van Nuys and Darrell L. Edwards of Oakland. The award is given annually to the UCSF graduate who best exemplifies the qualities of Harris, the black faculty member, physician and civil rights advocate, who died in 1973.

During his years as a medical student, Campa elected to work as a psychiatric clerk in the intense environment of the jail ward at SFGH, where he dealt with very ill patients, mostly from lower socio-economic groups. With little spare time on his hands, he still managed to participate in several campus-wide and outside community activities geared to the medically underserved, including the School of Medicine admissions committee, the minority admissions panel, the registration fee advisory committee to the Chancellor, executive board of the Associated Students of UCSF, Chicanos in Health Education (CHE), and the California Chicano/Latino Medical Student Association, of which he currently serves as Northern California coordinator.

Campa received his BA in Human Biology in 1984 from Stanford, and graduated with honors in 1988 from the UC Berkeley School of Public Health with a MPH in Health Policy and Administration. He plans to do his resi-

(continued on page 2)

"Toxins and the Workplace," an Open Discussion May 18

"Is my building making me ill?"

That is one of several questions to be posed to University Advancement & Planning Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and EHS Assistant Vice Chancellor J. Leroy Balzer during "Toxins and the Workplace," an open discussion to be held on Thursday, May 18, from noon to 1 p.m. in HSW 302.

"This hour has been set aside for an open and frank discussion," says Department of Pharmacy's Trinity Ordona, chair of the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee, which is sponsoring the event.

As there will be no formal presentation, members of the campus community are asked to bring along their questions, concerns and fears. Maybe you would like to know: "What's the difference between a toxin and an irritant?" "Are we getting headaches and feeling dizzy from toxins in our ventilation system?" "Are some buildings more prone to this than others?" "Do we have an asbestos problem on campus?" "Are video displays harming us?" "What are the future plans for handling the UCSF 'space crunch'?"

So, keep your May 18th noon hour open, bring your questions and find out some answers! In the meantime, if you have any questions regarding the discussion, call Anne Poirier at x67033.
THE CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INVITES YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN

TOXINS AND THE WORKPLACE

A QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH

BRUCE W. SPAULDING, VCHAN-BUSINESS & FISCAL SERVICES
J. LEROY BALZER, PHD, ASST VCHAN-ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & SAFETY

* Is there danger from fumes and strange smells in our ventilation systems?
* "Sick Building Syndrome" - Is my building making me ill?
* What are future plans for handling "Space Crunch"?
* Are video display terminals toxic in any way?
* If I'm exposed to hazardous materials, what's the first thing I must do?

WHAT ARE YOUR QUESTIONS - CONCERNS - FEARS?

THIS HOUR IS DEVOTED TO ADDRESSING YOUR QUESTIONS. THERE WILL BE NO PRESENTATION.
JUST AN OPEN AND FRANK DISCUSSION. FIND OUT THE ANSWERS . . . PLEASE COME TO:

HSW 302 - THURSDAY, MAY 18th - noon to one

For more information, call ext. 67033 (Anne Poirier)
Spaulding, Balzer discuss toxins in the workplace
By Kevin Knopf

“We’re committed, if there is an environment that is in any way unhealthy, to making alternate work space available.” This comment by Bruce Spaulding, vice chancellor for university advancement and planning, was in response to repeated employee concerns about air quality at a free-wheeling “open forum” on environmental health issues held May 18.

But he cautioned that when toxic substances in the air are measured following employee complaints, the levels detected are almost always well within safe limits. This makes relocation unnecessary in most cases, although the source of the fumes should aggressively be attacked, Spaulding explained.

Spaulding appeared with J. Leroy Balzer, assistant vice chancellor for occupational safety and health, before a capacity noon-time crowd in HSW 302. The event was sponsored by the Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee on Toxins in the Workplace.

Many workers expressed concerns about inadequate ventilation, particularly in offices in the Millberry Union complex, which houses the parking garage. Several questioners reported ongoing problems with car and truck exhaust being sucked into their offices over long periods, despite repeated efforts by UCSF officials to solve the problems.

Other employees expressed fears about the possible health hazards associated with working at both a medical and research institution that routinely uses a wide range of chemicals in lab and clinical work.

Balzer and Spaulding assured the workers that the levels of toxic chemicals, which are routinely measured, are too low to be causing an occupational hazard.

Many worker complaints are apparently related to the “sick building syndrome.” Many modern buildings are constructed with windows. Inadequate ventilation systems often allow the buildup of toxic gases or fumes, such as ozone and ammonia, routinely given off by office machines, or chemicals such as formaldehyde, used in the manufacture of furniture and carpeting.

Outdoor pollutants, such as carbon monoxide, are sometimes sucked into such buildings through poorly designed heating and cooling ductwork. Some experts believe that the combination of pollutants cause a synergistic effect, although individual pollutants are usually present in very low concentrations.

Classic sick-building symptoms—fatigue, headaches and respiratory complaints—are widespread among workers in newly remodeled areas of MU.

Balzer and Spaulding reiterated UCSF’s dilemma on space: Because the campus growth is limited, an often-used approach solution to space demands has been to remodel for higher density use. But ventilation systems installed in the remodeled offices have not always been able to handle the job.

“We need a comprehensive program for all our older buildings, to improve the ventilation systems,” Spaulding said, noting that prior ventilation decisions “were not ideal” and “would not be repeated” in future projects. But compensating for past errors could cost tens of millions of dollars, he added.

Currently, occupational health officials are surveying the ventilation needs of all campus buildings. Spaulding hopes that bond measures in future years could provide enough funds to solve ventilation problems. In the mean time, the worst problems will be tackled first, he said.

“The key thing is that there are people available to come out to your office and see if we can solve the immediate problem,” Balzer said.

Spaulding and Balzer also made these responses to questions specific to a particular work environment:
- Plans to improve the air supply for C level in Millberry Union have been made and funding has been set aside.
- Air quality on C level of the Ambulatory Care Center is being examined for a possible overhaul of the ventilation system. “My judgement is that the C-level environment is unacceptable,” Spaulding said. Improvements may be linked to ventilation for the new Magnetic Resonance Imaging Center under construction on that floor.
- Construction activity in Millberry is being monitored for possible dust generation, especially near air intake areas.
- The microwave ovens used in the hospitals have been checked for radiation leakage yearly and all but one have been found to be safe. The unsafe unit was removed.
- The radiation risk from video display terminals (VDTs) is not well documented. But problems are clearly linked to poorly designed chairs, eye strain, and a lack of exercise associated with working at VDTs.
- New policy recommendations about these factors are in the works.
- The procedure for documenting health problems due to poor air quality or other possible work-related exposures can come from the employee’s doctor’s reports or through employee health. There is a physician on call for employee treatment, and if necessary, for documenting worker concerns, Balzer said.

The lively meeting was so well attended that Steve Reynolds, a member of the sponsoring committee, suggested that future meetings maintain the open forum format. If workers have a particular concern about their work environment they should call Environmental Health and Safety at 476-1300.
## Staff Advisory Committee
### 1988-89 Costs

### Publicity
- Fliers to UCSF Staff - AIS, Reprographics, Addressing Svc.  
  "Toxins and the Workplace" Forum - May 18, 1989  
  $977.52
- Fliers to UCSF Staff - AIS, Reprographics, Addressing Svc.  
  "Toy and Book Drive" - May 15-June 9, 1989  
  $977.52

### Supplies
- EMR Videotaping  
  "Animal Research, Why?" Forum - May 26, 1988  
  $283.01*
- Cards for Networking - Quick Copy - June 1989  
  Information & Advocacy Committee  
  $16.78
- Poster Boards - Millberry Union Bookstore  
  "Toy and Book Drive" - May 15-June 9, 1989  
  $16.87
- Five 5x7 Prints for Neighborhood Papers  
  "Toy and Book Drive" - May 15-June 9, 1989  
  $28.76

### Catering/Rental for General Meetings
- Moffitt Catering - July 1988  
  $45.00
- Moffitt Catering - September 1988  
  $50.00
- Millberry Union Room Rental for Orientation Meeting  
  with Thena Trygstad - October 1988  
  $162.83
- Moffitt Catering - October 1988  
  $50.00
- Moffitt Catering - November 1988  
  $150.50
- Moffitt Catering - December 1988  
  $40.00
- Moffitt Catering - January 1989  
  $45.00
- Moffitt Catering - February 1989  
  $45.00
- Moffitt Catering - March 1989  
  $50.00
- Moffitt Catering - April 1989  
  $50.00

**TOTAL**  
$2,988.79

* Activity from 1987-88 year charged to July 1988 ledger
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO
Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee
125TH ANNIVERSARY KICK-OFF CELEBRATION OCTOBER 14, 1989
Sign-up to Distribute Publicity

SAC gets involved in the 125th Celebrations!

Janet Norton, Director of Institutional Relations, News & Public Information Services, has given SAC the opportunity and responsibility of distributing the October 14th 125th Anniversary Kick-Off Celebration advertising posters, leaflets and t-shirts to our neighborhood merchants. The two targeted areas are the Parnassus Campus neighborhood and Laurel Heights.

1. Please sign up to distribute publicity. Note your location here:

   Sign up for the same location with a friend from SAC, or get to know someone new on the committee by incorporating a luncheon date with the distribution activity!

2. Pick up your posters, leaflets and t-shirts on Monday, September 18 or Tuesday, September 19 from Jean Ball at the Visitor Information Center in the Medical Science Lobby.

3. From Wednesday, September 20 through Saturday, September 23, distribute 1 poster, leaflets, and 1 free t-shirt to each store in your designated area.

4. Be the first to model the t-shirt with the UCSF 125th logo! Or wear your work clothes with official UCSF name pin for identification.

5. Take a new friend from SAC, a colleague from your department, or your children with you and make this a special occasion. Volunteers are always welcome in SAC projects.

6. Identify yourself to each merchant as being a member of SAC and UCSF. Contribute additional information about the October 14th festivities and UCSF. Be professional, courteous, and cheerful, and encourage merchant attendance at our community activities. This is our chance to project a very positive, community-oriented image of UCSF. Thank all merchants for their time in listening to you, even if they do not wish to help advertise the event.

7. Take your extra posters and leaflets home and distribute to your favorite merchant in your neighborhood, and to your neighborhood church, school and public library.

8. And don’t forget to start talking about the 125th and especially the October 14th activities in your department.

9. Return unused posters, leaflets and t-shirts to the Visitor Information Center in the Medical Science Lobby.

10. Questions or ideas? Contact Anne Poirier at 6-7033 (with answering machine) or Kathy Balestreri at 6-2316.
### Outbound

#### UCSF to LHts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Departs:</th>
<th>TSR</th>
<th>PDCC</th>
<th>LHts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning break for drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon break for drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All passengers requesting drop-off at the Turk Street Residence (TSR) must present student/resident identification.

* O: Stops only when requested from UCSF.

### Inbound

#### LHts to UCSF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Departs:</th>
<th>TSR</th>
<th>UCSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning break for drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon break for drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All passengers requesting pick-up at the Turk Street Residence (TSR) must present student/resident identification.

* Times shown for TSR departures are approximate.

### Stops

**University of California, San Francisco (UCSF).**

The UCSF Shuttle Stop is located in front of the Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute (LPP1), at 401 Parnassus Avenue. Inbound riders from Laurel Heights may request the driver to stop at the intersection of 4th and Parnassus Avenues (School of Dentistry, Marin commuter bus stop).

**Turk Street Student Residence (TSR).**

The shuttle serves the MUNI bus stop on the south side of Turk Street, near Arguello Boulevard. All riders requesting service to/from TSR must present student/resident identification.

**UCSF Psoriasis Day Care Center (PDCC).**

The shuttle stops at the corner of California and Spruce Streets in the outbound direction only. Passengers returning to UCSF may walk to Laurel Heights and board the inbound shuttle at that location.

**UCSF Laurel Heights (LHts).**

The shuttle stop lies just outside the main lobby of the Laurel Heights building at 3333 California Street.

*Shuttle buses are not permitted to stop at any other location(s).*
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

HIGHLIGHTS

July 9, 1987
Unfavorable California Court of Appeals ruling on UC at Laurel Heights

September 25, 1987
Chancellor Julius R. Krevans calls on campus community to join efforts countering the University's prevailing negative image resulting from this conflict; Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) formed with 25 members

January, 1988
SAC participates in a letter-writing campaign to San Francisco Supervisor Wendy Nelder (she was considering a proposal to the Board of Supervisors to file an amicus brief for the Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association lawsuit against UCSF). Supervisor Nelder received between 50 to 60 letters, an action that presumably prompted her to drop the plan altogether.

April 1, 1988
SAC-sponsored noontime forum entitled UCSF: Our Future, featuring Chancellor Julius R. Krevans, Dr. Henry J. Ralston, Ill, Academic Senate Chair, and Joy Becker for the Staff Advisory Committee; over 400 people attended to hear an update on the Laurel Heights issue.

April 20, 1988
SAC-sponsored educational program on Radioactivity: Its Use in Hospitals, In Research, and the Hazards of Its Use and Disposal, with J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety; about 40 attend.

May 11, 1988
SAC helps mobilize 60 UCSF faculty, staff and students to attend the San Francisco Sierra Club Executive Committee meeting. After lengthy testimony and discussion, a draft and resolution at the initiative of the Laurel Heights Improvement Association was substantially amended to something much less punitive, more related to the facts about pollution and safety, and less misrepresentative of UCSF's position in the city.

May 26, 1988
SAC-sponsored educational program, Animal Research: Why? A Forum to Address Campus Questions Concerning the Use of Animals in Research, featuring a panel of six speakers; 60 people attend.

August 3, 1988
SAC members participate in 125th Anniversary Committee planning process for the next 14 months.

September 24-25, 1988
SAC organizes UCSF participants in a community project to create a childcare center for the Plaza East Housing Development in the Western Addition, San Francisco; skilled labor including three electricians, three plumbers, and a carpenter from the Physical Plant Department, along with 40 other volunteers helped to clean, scrape, and paint the new Center.
October 1, 1988
Forty staff members appointed to the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee; three working committees formed in the areas of Community Outreach, Information and Advocacy, and Staff Education. Highlights of these three working committees are listed below.

October 17 and 24, 1988
SAC co-sponsors S.F. Board of Supervisors Candidates Forum with other faculty, staff and student organizations.

December 12-16, 1988
SAC organizes campus community participation in the San Francisco Corporate Challenge Food Drive; over 5000 lbs. of food were collected, making UCSF one of the top four largest contributors in the drive.

December 12, 1988 and January 23, 1989
SAC encourages UCSF faculty and staff residing in the Noe Valley area attend community meetings to discuss cancer cluster; allegations that toxic air emissions from UC's research facility were the possible cause of cancer are discussed and countered.

May 18, 1989
SAC-sponsored educational forum: *Toxins in the Workplace--A Question and Answer Session* with Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor, Business and Fiscal Services, and J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety. Over 130 people attended this standing-room only forum to discuss campus members' concerns like, "Is my building making me ill?"

May 15-26, 1989
SAC-sponsored UCSF Toy Drive; approximately 15 barrels full of toys and books for the children of San Francisco were collected and are now being distributed to needy day care centers and nursery schools in the city.

August-September, 1989
Anticipated SAC assistance in mobilizing for the campus and community informational meetings on the Environmental Impact Report process for Laurel Heights and Mt. Zion.

October 14, 1989
SAC to lead tours during the kick-off event for the UCSF 125th Anniversary Celebration.
Officials of the University of California at San Francisco said yesterday they will curb toxic releases from hospital sterilizers at the medical center even though they believe the gases pose no major health risk.

The decision to install pollution control devices, which may cost as much as $600,000, was prompted by the findings of a two-year examination of toxic and radioactive emissions from the school’s Parmesan Avenue campus.

The $1.6 million study, believed to be the most exhaustive environmental checkup undergone by any medical center in the country, was started by the university two years ago as a way of soothing community fears about pollution from the school’s research laboratories.

UCSF administrators said the report’s findings, submitted yesterday to the San Francisco Department of Public Health, should reassure people that it is safe to live next door.

“I think it does effectively lay to rest a tremendous amount of concern,” said Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding, who oversees environmental health and safety at the campus.

‘Worst Case’ Scenario

The study found that the "worst case" scenario — a person standing at the point of maximum exposure for 70 years — poses a cancer risk of 14 in 1 million, the equivalent of one additional cancer case in San Francisco every 100 years. Installing pollution controls on the sterilizers, the report said, would bring the risk down to 4.7 in 1 million.

Members of an advisory group that serves as liaison between the university and surrounding neighborhoods said they will withhold judgment on the highly technical report until hearing the assessment of an independent consultant.

“It sounds like there’s no real problem in terms of danger to the community,” said Katie Traynor, who represents the Haight-Ashbury Improvement Association on the liaison group. “But I don’t know. I would be very curious to have the second party’s report, too.”

UCSF agreed to bring in a second consultant after the advisory group questioned the credibility of the Radian Corp., the firm that performed the environmental analysis. Although the university has committed $10,000 to hire the second consultant, a firm has not yet been selected.

The university undertook the environmental review in an attempt to shore up relations with neighbors worried about chemical exhausts and about state findings that UCSF researchers had repeatedly violated rules on handling of radioactive materials.

Those concerns had also brought about a rumorous dispute with residents of Laurel Heights, where the university plans to relocate some of its laboratories. Under court order, the university is preparing a new environmental study on the site.

Water, Air and Soil Tested

The Radian findings are based on hundreds of air, water and soil samples collected on and around the campus, computer modeling that projects the probable path of pollutants leaving the campus, and a theoretical analysis that tries to predict affects on the exposed population.

According to the university, the study found that radiation levels are 33 times lower than the government standard, chemical releases to the sewer system are one-tenth the allowable level, and all the air emissions combined posed only slightly more risk than a neighborhood dryer.

Most of that risk comes from ethylene oxide, a potent carcicogen commonly used in hospitals and laboratories to sterilize surgical implements and research materials.

Putting pollution "scrubbers" on the school’s three large sterilizers — two at the hospital and one at the dental clinic — will cut ethylene oxide emissions by 90 percent, said Leroy Baier, assistant vice chancellor for environmental health and safety. Installation of the scrubbers will begin this fall, he said.

Cancer Risks Assessed

Radian’s analysis found a theoretical cancer risk at various points in the surrounding neighborhood that ranged from a low of 1.3 in 1 million, at Douglas Elementary School in Eureka Valley, to a high of 14.3 in 1 million, at the south end of Edgewood Avenue, just east of the campus.

By comparison, the Environmental Protection Agency typically aims for a risk no higher than one in a million when setting limits on pesticide residues in food, but just this week the agency announced new controls on benzene emissions that allow risks as high as one in 10,000.

A projected risk of one in a million means that over a 70-year period one additional case of cancer would be expected for every 1 million people experiencing the maximum expected exposure.

Vice Chancellor Spaulding said such calculations tend to exaggerate risk and he believes the actual risk posed by the university's emissions is lower than the numbers suggest.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 3, 1989

TO: SAC Subcommittee on Staff Education

FROM: Anne Poirier, 6-7033, LPPI Box F-0984, email annep/apllpd

SUBJECT: NEXT MEETING MONDAY, JANUARY 9 12-1pm in S-940

The next meeting of the SAC subcommittee on Staff Education will be Monday, January 9 from 12-1pm in Room S-940. Agenda will be a continued discussion of the Toxins Seminar, as well as planning for future seminars.

Enclosed please find minutes for December 15 and 20.

cc: Trinity Ordona, Chair, SAC
    Valli McDougle, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
    Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach
    Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations
    Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services
    Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
Toxic Sem., Jan. 1989

Labor Occup. Health Prog. (Berkeley)

CAL OSHA

Citizens for Better Environment (Paul Neill)

EH & S (Environmental Health & Safety) (Dogman Fung)
Tapes of the seminars - Radioactivity

1. AIDS research
2. Mt. Zion - what's happening?  
3. Stress
4. Pamphlet - Animal Res. [Steve]

Meeting: Thurs. Nov. 10

AIDS week 1-8 Dec (Jane Norton)

Sneaker/panel presentation 2/day
Exhibit of AIDS patients Med Sci Library
AIDS guilt in different rooms

Thurs 1 HSW 301 SCIENCE OF AIDS for the non-scientists 8-2

Fri 2 OCCUP CONCERNS

Mon 5 Panel of Multi-COH APP to AIDS

Tue 6 Politics of AIDS - Silverman

Wed 7 PANEL LIVING W/ AIDS 6-70 PM (care for caregivers)

Thr 8 UC Benefits & Services (ASS'T related to AIDS) at 864

Fri 9 Presentation of AIDS guilt

Thurs 8 Video - the Healing Hand
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 10, 1989

TO: SAC Subcommittee on Staff Education

FROM: Anne Poirier, 6-7033, LPPI Box F-0984, email annep/apllpd

SUBJECT: NEXT MEETING MONDAY, JANUARY 23 12-1:15 PM Room LPPI-116

Enclosed are minutes from our last meeting.

The next meeting will be Monday, January 23 from 12-1:15 pm in Langley Porter Room 116. Trinity Ordona will also attend.

Agenda:

1. Cancellation of Toxins Seminar
2. Direction of Subcommittee on Staff Education
3. Viewing Radioactivity Video of 4-20-88

cc: Trinity Ordona, Chair, SAC
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
Kathy Balestreri, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach
Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations
Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services
Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee  
Staff Education Subcommittee  
January 9, 1989  12-1 PM  S-940

Present:  Anne Poirier & Suzanne Gottschalk (Co-Chairs), Ethel Adams, Isobel Romo  
Absent:  Joy Becker, Karen Eldred, Michele Graf, Susan Heath, Loretta Maddux, Duffy Price, Eunice Redondo, Steve Reynolds, Barbara Wilson

TOPIC:  SAC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

DISCUSSION:

1. Anne Poirier briefly summarized the agenda discussed at the SAC Executive Committee meeting January 6, 1988, including the success of the Corporate Food Drive at UCSF, plans to identify and investigate community outreach projects for 1988-89, and review of this committee's activities and future program ideas.

ACTION:

1. This information will be covered at the SAC General Membership meeting Friday, January 13th.

TOPIC:  TOXINS SEMINAR

DISCUSSION:

1. Upon advice from Trinity Ordona, Anne Poirier reported that the Toxins seminar has been postponed until the committee can organize a solid program. It was also recommended that the program be focused on one topic by one speaker, such as Allergies in the Workplace by Dr. Don Jewitt or Dr. Joseph Ladou, allowing plenty of time for audience participation.

ACTION:

1. Anne Poirier will contact Drs. Jewitt and Ladou to discuss possible seminar presentations and report back to the committee.
2. Anne Poirier and Suzanne Gottschalk will try to arrange to view last year's video tapes with Trinity Ordona, or with the committee as a whole, to analyze strengths and weaknesses of the seminar format.

TOPIC:  FUTURE SEMINARS

DISCUSSION:

1. The Committee must investigate new ideas for future seminars.

ACTION:

1. Committee members will ask colleagues about ideas for future seminar topics.

NEXT MEETING:  TBA

cc:  Trinity Ordona, Chair, SAC  
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy  
Kathy Balestreri, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy  
Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach  
Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations  
Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services  
Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
American Association for the Advancement of Science
Annual Meeting

Scientific, Legal and Ethical Issues

Not In My Backyard: Where Can Biomedical Research Be Done?

Sheldon Krimsky
Professor of Urban & Environmental Policy, Tufts University

Allan Mazur
Professor of Sociology, Syracuse University

Larry Horton
Associate Vice President for Public Affairs, Stanford University

Jere E. Goyan
Dean, School of Pharmacy, UCSF

George M. Carr
President, Laurel Heights Improvement Association

TUESDAY, January 17
Continental II Room       SF Hilton Hotel       2:30 - 5:30 p.m.
Mason & O'Farrell Sts.
TO: Members, Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

FR: Trinity A. Ordoña, Chair

RE: SAC General Membership Meeting
    Friday, February 10, Room S-118, 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.

I am pleased to announce that the guest speaker at our next general membership meeting will be J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety. Roy will be there to discuss our questions and concerns about toxics and UCSF. What does UCSF send up in its stacks? How toxic is UCSF? What about the ventilation fumes? These questions and others arose from discussions within the Staff Education Committee as it tried to plan a seminar on toxics. It was felt that we should start with answering our own questions and educating ourselves on the basics of toxics before a campus seminar is offered. Bring your questions and concerns to the Friday general meeting.

REMINDER: SAC General Meetings -- March, 10, April 14, May 12, June 9

AGENDA:

1. Review and correction of minutes
2. Chair's report
3. Sub-committee reports: Information & Advocacy, Community Outreach, Staff Education
4. Liaison reports
5. Guest speaker: Dr. Balzer

TAO
cc: J.L. Balzer, Paula Schultz, Janet Norton, Barbara Atkinson, Fred McEnroe
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 2, 1989

TO: SAC Subcommittee on Staff Education

FROM: Anne Poirier, 6-7033, LPPI Box F-0984, email annep/apllpd

Enclosed are minutes from our last meeting on January 23, 1989.

The next general meeting of the Staff Advisory Committee will be Friday, February 10 from 12 - 1 PM in Room S-118. It's very important that we all try to attend as Roy Balzer will be making a presentation on toxins. This is our opportunity to become familiar with this issue by asking questions.

cc: Trinity Ordone, Chair, SAC
    Valli McDougle, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
    Kathy Balestreri, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy
    Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach
    Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations
    Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services
    Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee  
Staff Education Subcommittee  
January 23, 1989 12-1:30 PM LPPI-116

Present: Anne Poirier & Suzanne Gottschalk (Co-Chairs), Ethel Adams, Michele Graf, Loretta Maddux, Barbara Wilson  
Guest: Trinity Ordona  
Absent: Joy Becker, Karen Eldred, Susan Heath, Duffy Price, Eunice Redondo, Steve Reynolds

TOPIC: TOXINS SEMINAR

DISCUSSION:
1. Suzanne Gottschalk reviewed last week's ABOG sponsored lecture by Dr. Joseph Ladou on occupational health risks, noting the material did not seem to cover in detail the topics we wish to raise, and also noting the poor attendance.
2. Anne Poirier stated she would attend today's seminar by Dr. Paul Blanc on "Poisonings on the Job" to determine if SAC's toxins seminar would be redundant.
3. The committee discussed ideas for the toxins seminar, including focus of topics and speakers, and whether this issue was appropriate and timely for SAC to support. Trinity Ordona proposed testing this topic out at the next general SAC meeting, inviting Roy Balzer (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety), Bruce Spaulding (Vice Chancellor, Business and Fiscal Services) and Gary Nelson (Director, Capital Project Management) to discuss: a) what UCSF is producing in terms of air, water and soil toxins; scale of toxins in comparison with other sources; Proposition 65 disclosure; and b) what toxins are within UCSF, encompassing "sick building syndrome", ventilation, construction, asbestos concerns.

ACTION:
1. Trinity Ordona will approach Administration (Paul Schultz) for approval of an introduction to toxins presentation to SAC. If approved, Trinity will contact Bruce Spaulding and Roy Balzer.
2. Committee members will consider questions to ask speakers.

TOPIC: DIRECTION OF SUBCOMMITTEE AND VIEWING VIDEOTAPE

DISCUSSION:
1. The committee discussed its view of the mission of this subcommittee, including whether we should create issues for staff education or solely respond to issues which arise in the UCSF and/or outside community.
2. In preparation for presenting a seminar, the committee viewed part of the SAC sponsored 4-20-88 Radioactivity Seminar, and agreed the major weakness was that it appeared to be heavily oriented towards EH&S as opposed to open to debate and, as such, perhaps a less effective educational tool.

ACTION:
1. Committee members will continue to view these videotapes as time permits in future meetings.

NEXT MEETING: TBA

cc: Trinity Ordona, Chair, SAC  
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy  
Kathy Balestieri, Co-Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Information and Advocacy  
Byron Sigal, Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Community Outreach  
Barbara Atkinson, Liaison for Community and Governmental Relations  
Janet Norton, Liaison for News Services  
Paula Schultz, Liaison for Vice Chancellor Trygstad
MEETING
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
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AGENDA

I. Minutes of meeting of December 7, 1988
II. Announcements of the Chancellor
   Chancellor Krevans will attend the meeting
III. Announcements of the Chair and Others
   Vice Chancellor Rolinson will address the Assembly on University
   and campus long range planning
   Associate Dean W. Hamilton of the S/Medicine, will discuss the
   status of the Mt. Zion/UCSF program affiliation
IV. Special Orders
   Consent Calendar: *Annual Report, Committee on Academic Personnel
   Lists of candidates for degrees and certificates as of June 12,
   July 24 and September 4, 1988
V. Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties
VI. New Business
   Consent Calendar* — all items on the Consent Calendar must be approved
   by a single unanimous vote. At the request of any Senate member, an item
   removed from the Consent Calendar must be considered under its regular order
   of business.

The presentations of Vice Chancellor Rolinson and Associate Dean Hamilton
were postponed from the December 7 meeting due to the lengthy discussion of
the Supreme Court decision on Laurel Heights. Academic planning is a
process which involves both faculty and administration. These presentations
should provide an interesting overview. WE AGAIN URGE ALL SENATE MEMBERS
AND OTHER INTERESTED FACULTY TO ATTEND THIS MEETING.

G. L. Kenyon, Chair
San Francisco Division
Academic Senate
San Francisco Division

December 7, 1988

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY

The meeting of the Representative Assembly of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chair G. Kenyon at 4:10 p.m. on Wednesday, December 7, 1988.

I. The minutes of the meeting of October 18, 1988 were approved as distributed.

II. Announcements of the Chancellor - none

III. Announcements of the Chair and Others

Professor Kenyon explained that the meeting would be devoted to discussion of the ramifications of the Supreme Court decision on the use of Laurel Heights and he made two announcements apropos to that discussion: 1) on Wednesday, December 21, 10 A.M. in Toland Hall the Academic Business Officers Group and the Academic Senate would co-sponsor a discussion by Ethan Schulman, the University lawyer presenting the Laurel Heights case; 2) copies of the Supreme Court decision were available from the News Services office in room S-20.

Professor Kenyon introduced Senior Academic Vice Chancellor Ramsay, who briefly summarized the effects of the court decision. In one important respect the ruling was very favorable to the campus in that it found acceptable the campus discussion of mitigation of any adverse environmental effects caused by the move of the School of Pharmacy programs to Laurel Heights. About 40 of the 78 pages of the decision dealt with this issue of mitigation of chemical and/or radioactive emissions; a ruling that these were not adequate would have had extreme consequences on every biomedical research institution in the state. In addition, the stay placed on radioactive chemicals at Laurel Heights has been lifted, and the campus can apply for a license for use with the programs which are already located there.

Two parts of the Laurel Heights EIR (Environmental Impact Report) were found wanting: (1) the court found that UCSF should have discussed the possible use of the other half of the building made available when CALTRANS moves; (2) the court found that the EIR did not adequately discuss possible alternative uses of the facility or alternative sites. Vice Chancellor Ramsay felt that the Supreme Court's decision had set out a definite "road map" which the campus could follow in drafting a new EIR. The present hope is that a new EIR can be completed in the spring.

Vice Chancellor Ramsay introduced Mr. Bill Falik, of the Howard Rice law firm which is advising the campus on the preparation of the new EIR.

Mr. Falik introduced his presentation with a summary of the chronology of events surrounding the purchase and proposed use of Laurel Heights, from the initial negotiation in 1984 to lease space in the building to the University's decision in 1985 to purchase the entire building. He described the extensive planning process for use of the facility which involved the administration, campus and Senate committees; the decision to lease half the
facility to CALTRANS; the decision to move into the other portion the academic and basic research programs of the School of Pharmacy; and the certification by the Regents of the EIR in July 1986.

Mr. Falik then summarized the sequence of litigation which followed the certification of the EIR. Two lawsuits were instituted by neighborhood groups in August of 1986. One, claiming intentional misrepresentation by the University with regard to the proposed use of Laurel Heights as being only for "academic and administrative" units, remains in the courts; the other cited the inadequacy, under CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act), of the EIR on three counts. The Superior Court's finding in favor of the university was appealed to the Court of Appeals, which ruled that the EIR was indeed inadequate. This ruling was appealed by the University to the state Supreme Court, whose decision in December 1988 found that the EIR was invalid in two parts but adequate in the third.

Mr. Falik commented at length on the three areas which were at the heart of the lawsuit on the insufficiency of the EIR:

1) **Inadequate discussion of alternative future uses of Laurel Heights** — agreeing with the Court of Appeals decision, the Court ruled that all "reasonably foreseeable uses" and their environmental impacts should have been studied, although it gave no guidance as to how specific the university should be. Mr. Falik believed that to deal with that uncertainty, the new EIR would have to contain a detailed analysis of a wide range of alternatives.

2) **Inadequate discussion of alternative sites** —
the Supreme Court agreed with the contention that the EIR's treatment of alternative sites was deficient, pointing out that only two sentences each were allocated to alternative Parnassus sites and alternative off-campus sites. An appropriate EIR under CEQA must contain a reasonable range of alternatives for a project and the reasons for their rejection.

3) **Insufficient evidence that any adverse environmental effects would be mitigated** —
contrary to the contention of the Laurel Heights Association, which was upheld by the Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court found that the Regents had provided substantial evidence to support their determination that the impacts of the project on air quality and human health would be sufficiently mitigated. Subsequent to this finding, the Court permitted the university to continue to use Laurel Heights for the programs presently there, and lifted the stay which had prevented UCSF from applying for a license to use radioactive materials in that facility.
Mr. Falik quoted a portion of the Court's decision on the point of mitigation:

Requiring the University to cease existing laboratory operations at the Laurel Heights facility and to move them to other sites would cause unnecessary costs that would ultimately be borne by the taxpayers. More important, such an order would seriously disrupt ongoing scientific research and perhaps cause the University to lose important faculty members and research funds. UCSF research is designed to improve the state of medical knowledge and thus improve, and even save lives. We are especially reluctant to interfere unnecessarily with such a salutary enterprise.

It was Mr. Falik's opinion that by carefully following CEQA and providing a full examination of alternatives, UCSF's new EIR would be found adequate. The firm of Environmental Science Associates has been retained to document the environmental impacts of whatever alternative uses can be identified. This does not mean that the campus must utilize those alternatives in the ultimate project, but it must consider them and determine the environmental impacts. The public will be involved in many steps of the process, as it should be. Mr. Falik underscored a comment of Vice Chancellor Ramsay: no decision has been made as to how Laurel Heights ultimately will be used. The faculty or administration may identify their preferred alternative use, but the ultimate decision, of course, will be made by the Regents, informed by a full and adequate EIR. This will not be a short or simple process, but Mr. Falik hoped that the EIR could be completed in the spring and certified in the summer or the early fall.

In closing, Mr. Falik commented that it is absolutely critical that the neighborhood become aware that the campus is of great benefit to it specifically and to the general community overwhelmingly. He thought that the Supreme Court had set the tone in that respect and that this had been very helpful.

Mr. Falik invited questions.

What is the possibility of the new EIR being taken to court?

Mr. Falik thought that it would be challenged and if the Superior Court ruled in favor of the University, that decision perhaps will be appealed. He hoped this would not occur but in the event an appeal was instituted, he anticipated that there would be no stay on the continuance of the programs already at Laurel Heights, given the Supreme Court decision. This would mean that planning could continue while the Supreme Court considered the appeal.

At what point is it legal to make serious architectural plans?

There is no easy answer to this. The Supreme Court decision did not
clarify this point, beyond saying that the university must consider future uses of the building. It is certainly appropriate to think about alternatives from an architectural standpoint, particularly when planning alternatives for an expensive building with large floors of empty space. When a faculty or administration meets and considers feasible alternatives, an architect is hired to draw plans. There certainly cannot be any construction until the EIR is certified, but considerable work can be done in the period leading up to certification. Whether to proceed to working drawings is partly an economic decision, considering the initial cost and interest costs of the building, and partly a balancing of risks. Working drawings could save six to nine months of time; on the other hand, the Regents might determine to use the facility for a reason other than that for which the drawings were made, or the drawings could be interpreted as a commitment to a certain course of action, in violation of CEQA. There will have to be an open and candid balancing of these economic and political risks.

Are the "alternate sites" referred to in the Supreme Court decision those already owned in the city by the university or does it mean any possible site anywhere?

Although they will certainly have to be considered, the decision does not mean just those sites already owned by the University. Again, there is no clear guidance. The decision says "available sites", which means possible consideration of such areas as South San Francisco, for example, from the standpoint of the impacts and difficulties that might be imposed on faculty or research. It has to be as reasonable an array as possible...the Hunters Point facility might be expanded, or Oyster Point. There may be other facilities or other areas to be studied in detail in the EIR. This could be very helpful, there might be another site or area that would fit. That is what the process is about.

Under the best of circumstances, what would be the time frame for beginning of construction at Laurel Heights?

Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding answered that it was hoped that the campus could begin construction in 1990, with an estimated construction period of approximately eighteen months.

Since every project has impacts, what level of mitigation do the CEQA guidelines consider adequate? What exactly must an institution do to receive permission to pursue its goal?

A full and open analysis of the impacts of the project to be pursued; a reasoned determination that this project is reasonable environmentally when balanced against the alternatives. If there are environmental problems, assuring that mitigation measures are sufficient, which means mitigated to the extent feasible for eliminating the environmental impacts. One cannot eliminate all
impacts, but it is certainly reasonable to suppose that if those impacts are mitigated to the point of environmental insignificance, it should be reasonable for a project to proceed. The EIR is an environmental informational document, it is not a decision-making document. The decision is that of the Regents.

Would it be relevant to compare projected activities at Laurel Heights with its use by the Firemans Fund?

It would be a relative baseline only. The Supreme Court decision mentions that a no-project alternative must be considered. This would be more like the Firemans Fund office use.

What are the limits to expansion of research programs currently at Laurel Heights?

You may maintain what is there now, but no new facilities may go in until there is a certified EIR.

What is the war chest referred to earlier?

In environmental litigation, it is usual for an environmental group to be awarded attorneys' fees by superior court if they win in a suit brought under CEQA. The Supreme Court in its decision suggests to the Superior Court, which will determine the amount of fees, that fees not be awarded for the mitigation analysis. The Association will receive attorneys fees on the other two points of contention, so they will have funds to finance additional litigation.

If the toxic and radioactive issues have been dealt with, what are the environmental impacts that will have to be considered in the new EIR?

The new EIR will have to consider the entire 354,000 square foot facility and its potential uses and analyze the impacts. Impacts such as traffic, parking, construction noise will have to be studied. If one of the alternatives is using much of the building for biomedical research, there may be more impacts to be cited with regard to the scientific/biotechnical/radiological use, storage and disposal of toxics. These would have to be studied in the same vein as the previous EIR, but perhaps with a little more detail.

If, after full analysis of alternative sites, it was found that another site was equally feasible for whatever use is ultimately decided on, could the determination still be made that Laurel Heights had obvious advantages through proximity and promotion of collegiality, etc.?

The objective of proximity, collegiality, interrelationship of programs is a fundamental objective that is honored under CEQA and can be used to make the determination that facility A makes more sense than
facility B. A court will not second-guess a decision as long as the reasoning is logical and well documented.

Because of the lateness of the hour the Chair announced that the presentations of Vice Chancellor Rolinson (long range development planning) and Associate Dean Hamilton (status of the Mt. Zion/UCSF program) would be postponed to the February 7, 1989 meeting.

IV. Special Orders

Consent Calendar: by unanimous vote the annual report of the Committee on Equal Opportunity was received and placed on file.

V. New Business — none

Meeting adjourned 5:10 p.m.

R. A. Mitchell, Secretary
San Francisco Division
February 3, 1989

Julius R. Krevans, M.D.
Chancellor
University of California - San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94143-0402

Dear Julie:

While you have probably read more than you care to about UCSF's Supreme Court experience, enclosed is a copy of a publication which Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro regularly sends to some of its clients. Apparently the firm considers the Court's holding of such significance that it has developed a special bulletin for a discussion of its legal implications for the development community.

Sincerely,

Frances M. Davis
Vice President and General Counsel

Enclosure
On December 1, 1988, the California Supreme Court issued its first decision under the California Environmental Quality Act since the "reconstitution" of the Court following the 1986 elections. In Laurel Heights Neighborhood Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, the Court ruled in a unanimous 7-0 decision that the Regents had failed to comply with CEQA in certifying an environmental impact report for the relocation of biomedical research facilities within the City of San Francisco.

The Court found the EIR failed to discuss "anticipated future uses" at the new site and inadequately considered alternative sites for the project, but upheld the Regents' finding that all significant environmental effects of the present activities had been mitigated. While requiring the Regents to certify a new or revised EIR, the Court declined to enjoin the ongoing research at the new location. The Court also upheld an award of attorney's fees to the neighborhood association which brought the case.

The Laurel Heights decision is significant to the development community for many reasons. While some observers have expected the new Court to cut back on expansive interpretation of CEQA, it declined to do so. Instead, the Court's decision is in line with existing authority applying CEQA in a broad fashion and gives strong support to the basic CEQA goals of environmental protection and public participation. Although the Court also emphasized the limited role that the judiciary should play in reviewing CEQA matters, there is little in the opinion that indicates the Justices will approach CEQA issues in a more limited manner than their predecessors.

The opinion is important for several areas of CEQA practice, including the extent to which an EIR must include:

- An analysis of "anticipated future uses" of a site related to a presently proposed project.
- An analysis of alternative sites for a project.
- A discussion of the types and amounts of potential toxic emissions from a project.
- The preparation of "additional studies" as suggested by project opponents.
- An analysis of the "environmental record" of a project sponsor.

In addition, the Court addressed for the first time the issue of potential relief for CEQA violations under section 21168.9, a remedial provision added to the statute in 1984 which has not received significant attention in appellate decisions. In applying section 21168.9, the Court looked to "traditional equitable principles" outlined in federal cases in allowing UCSF to continue its research activities at the new site despite the inadequacy of the EIR. Significantly, the Court...
confirmed the principle that the courts have substantial discretion in fashioning relief and need not “automatically” enjoin every project for a CEQA violation. However, the circumstances of Laurel Heights are unique and it must be questioned whether a routine development project would be accorded the same equitable treatment.

In view of the importance of the decision, we have devoted this special issue of the PM&S Environmental Bulletin to the issues raised by Laurel Heights. The PM&S Environmental Group has also prepared an extensive memorandum analyzing the decision in detail which is available to our clients and associates upon request.

Background

Facing serious space constraints at the UCSF Parnassus Campus, in 1985 the Regents purchased the 354,000 sq. ft. (former) Fireman’s Fund Insurance building in the Laurel Heights neighborhood, located two miles northeast of the campus. Subsequently, the Regents decided to relocate certain biomedical research facilities in the School of Pharmacy to occupy some 100,000 sq. ft. of the Laurel Heights building. The draft EIR prepared to analyze the potential environmental effects of the relocation project disclosed potential impacts on air quality from venting of laboratory emissions, effects on human health from exposure to hazardous chemicals and other effects including noise, traffic congestion and parking. After public review and comment, the Regents certified a final EIR, adopted the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and found that the significant environmental effects of the project had been substantially mitigated. The Laurel Heights Neighborhood Improvement Association challenged this approval, claiming that the EIR was legally insufficient and such research activities were inappropriate in their area. The trial court upheld the Regents’ action, but the Court of Appeal reversed, finding the EIR inadequate in several respects and enjoining all research activities at the Laurel Heights building. The Supreme Court then granted the Regents’ petition for review.

General CEQA Policies

Before addressing the EIR itself, the Court reaffirmed its prior decisions interpreting CEQA broadly. The Court emphasized the importance of an adequate EIR under CEQA and the significant role that informed public participation plays in the CEQA process. While a recitation of “CEQA litany” is commonplace in these cases, the Court’s discussion in Laurel Heights emphasizing environmental protection goals is particularly significant since few CEQA cases reach the High Court. The Court also recited the principles of limited judicial review which govern CEQA cases, although it later conducted a searching inquiry of the adequacy of the Laurel Heights EIR and the evidence of mitigation in the administrative record. Overall, the analysis is in keeping with existing authority and offers little indication that the Court will pursue a more narrow construction of CEQA in future cases.

First Issue: Anticipated Future Uses

The Court’s initial ruling was that the EIR should have discussed the impacts of UCSF’s “anticipated future uses” of additional space in the Laurel Heights building, as well as the present project. The relocated facilities occupied approximately 100,000 sq. ft. of the building, leaving an additional 254,000 sq. ft. that would become available to UCSF in 1990 or later. The Court found clear evidence in the record that the University intended ultimately to use the entire building and rejected arguments that the EIR need not discuss that future use because precise plans had not yet been approved.

The Court recognized that analysis of “anticipated future uses” requires the balancing of two competing CEQA policies: the need for preparation of an EIR as early as possible in the planning and approval process, versus the need to avoid pure speculation if issues are addressed prematurely without sufficiently concrete plans. In reconciling this conflict, the Court found that CEQA requires an EIR to discuss future action related to a project whenever sufficient reliable data is available “to permit preparation of a meaningful and accurate report.” The Court thus held that an EIR must include analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion or other action related to a project if (i) it is a “reasonably foreseeable consequence” of the initial project and (ii) the future action will likely change the scope or nature of the initial project. In the Court’s view, UCSF’s plans to occupy an additional 250,000 sq. ft. clearly satisfied this test.
While the issue of "anticipated future uses" may have little implication in the case of a simple or self-contained project, we believe the Court's holding could present substantial problems for complex projects which are long-term or phased in nature. The decision appears likely to require repeated review of related future action; indeed, the Court recognized that discussion of "future uses" of necessity will be more general and suggests that a "program" or "tiered" EIR would have been appropriate in the Laurel Heights situation.

The Court's opinion is not surprising given the circumstances of the case and the long-standing CEQA policy against "piecemeal review" by chopping larger projects into little ones. The claim by project opponents that an EIR fails to address a "larger project" than the one proposed has become commonplace where complicated or phased development is involved. Nonetheless, the Court's opinion will lend backing to such claims and, in some circumstances, project sponsors must take this issue into account in the EIR process.

**Second Issue: Analysis of Alternatives**

In its second ruling, the Court found the EIR's discussion of alternatives to the project was inadequate. While the EIR purported to discuss alternative sites, including sites both on and off the Parnassus Campus, the Court found this discussion was conclusory and inadequate to serve CEQA goals. A "meaningful discussion" of alternatives, which provides the informational underpinning for the "analytic route" the agency travels in rejecting these alternatives, was deemed necessary to ensure that the agency considers environmental consequences and informs the public of how the agency has dealt with environmental concerns. The one and one-half page discussion in the Laurel Heights EIR was deemed "cursory at best" and it failed to provide sufficient information to serve these purposes.

The Court rejected a number of arguments by the Regents defending the EIR's treatment of alternatives. First, the Court vigorously disputed the Regents' contention that alternatives need not have been discussed in the EIR at all, since mitigation measures were later adopted upon project approval which reduced all environmental effects to insignificance. The Court found clear and convincing authority under CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines that both alternatives and mitigation measures must be considered in a draft EIR, regardless of the action an agency ultimately takes in approving the project. The Court rejected the Regents' attempted interpretation of the word "or" in CEQA section 21102 to allow study of either alternatives or mitigation, as inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of environmental protection. The Court also found that the Laurel Hills case relied on by the Regents was inapposite since the EIR there had considered eight separate alternatives.

The Court also rejected the Regents' argument that alternative sites both on and off campus had already been found infeasible during UCSF's prior internal planning processes. The Court emphasized that CEQA requires a meaningful analysis of alternatives in the EIR itself, so that the public will be informed of the agency's reasons for finding alternatives infeasible.

Finally, the Court denied the Regents' contention that the Association itself had failed to show that there were feasible alternative sites. The Court held that it is the project proponent's responsibility to provide an adequate discussion of alternatives whether or not members of the public can show that such alternatives exist. The Court distinguished the cases relied on by the Regents as situations where an adequate range of alternatives had been considered in the EIR but the project opponents claimed additional alternatives were needed. The Court found the project proponent's duty under CEQA to discuss a range of alternatives in the EIR "entirely realistic", given the sponsor's greater knowledge of the project and of the feasibility of alternatives.

For guidance, the Court explained that both the range of alternatives to be considered, and the level of analysis, are subject to a "rule of reason." The information provided in the EIR must be sufficient to permit the agency to make a reasonable choice of alternatives with respect to environmental impacts and to inform the public of the reasons for that choice.

The issue of project alternatives has received significant attention at late (e.g., Citizens of Goleta Valley, where the court held that the record must contain comparative cost analyses to sustain a
finding that alternatives are economically infeasible). The Supreme Court's endorsement of the leading cases and its rejection of the Regents' arguments may provide impetus to the lower courts to apply the requirements regarding project alternatives more stringently. We believe that challenges to EIRs on this ground are likely to increase and that project sponsors need to consider carefully the already difficult task of fashioning a "reasonable range" of project alternatives for study in an EIR. The Court's "rule of reason" does not provide much guidance in this effort and careful analysis of the factual circumstances of each project will be necessary.

Third Issue: Evidence of Sufficient Mitigation

According to the opinion, the Laurel Heights EIR discussed a number of measures to mitigate the impacts of the relocation project and the Regents adopted each of these measures upon project approval. The Association challenged the adequacy of the EIR's treatment of the mitigation measures and the Regents' finding of sufficient mitigation based on the EIR. Reversing the Court of Appeal on this issue, the Supreme Court found that the record as a whole contained "substantial evidence" to uphold the Regents' finding.

In making this ruling, the Court emphasized that the role of a reviewing court is only to determine whether substantial evidence supports the finding and whether the EIR is sufficient as an informational document. The Justices cautioned that a court should not undertake independently to weigh competing technical data and arguments to determine which are correct or more reasonable, and they criticized the court below for doing so. But the Court also emphasized that, in making this determination, a reviewing court must "scrutinize the record" with particular attention to detail, while not losing sight of the rule that the evidence must be weighed as a whole. Even though some of the evidence relied on by the Regents may have been "inconclusive", and additional evidence suggested by the Association but not included in the EIR might have been "helpful", the question remained whether the evidence was substantial considering the record as a whole.

However, while disclaiming an "independent" review, it is clear that the Court critically examined each of the areas of evidence in contention between the parties. The Court noted that some of the "evidence" relied on by the Regents really tended to show an absence of significant effects, rather than mitigation, but treated the matter as a "mitigation" issue because the parties had done so. The Court found that the information relied on by the Regents to mitigate air quality and public safety impacts—prior studies at the Parnassus Campus, the absence of evidence of health hazards in the scientific literature, the absence of regulation of emissions from research and a commitment for future monitoring—were sufficient given the record as a whole. The Court rejected each of the Association's contentions regarding air quality and safety impacts, as well as other issues such as traffic, parking, noise and handling of radioactive materials.

While it would be inappropriate in the limited space available here to recount the Court's treatment of all evidentiary matters, a number of the issues may provide insight for particular problem areas.

1. Toxic Emissions.

The principal evidentiary issue concerned the possible venting outside the building of hazardous materials handled in the laboratories. The Association claimed the EIR should identify the specific type and amount of substances that might be released. The Court rejected this claim, finding that the changing nature of UCSF's research made it difficult and unreasonable to make precise future predictions. But the Court also noted that "we are not faced with a manufacturing facility" that could be expected "to know or estimate what materials it intends to use in its operations."

The Court also rejected the Association's suggestion that public risk from emissions outside the building was significant just because the research activities involved materials which could be toxic in laboratory exposure. Finding no evidence to that effect, the Court questioned "the Association's apparent assumption that a chemical that may be toxic in the closed confines of a laboratory will result in a toxic emission into the outside air."

2. Additional Studies.

In almost every major project, the opponents claim that "additional studies" are needed. The Association claimed there was inadequate study
in the EIR of dispersion effects and the Court of Appeal agreed. But the High Court found the Laurel Heights EIR sufficient in this area, stating:

“We disagree that such information was necessary. * * * A project opponent or reviewing court can always imagine some additional study or analysis that might provide helpful information. It is not for them to design the EIR.”

3. Environmental Record.

In challenging the Regents' mitigation finding, the Association pointed to UCSF's record of citations for mishandling of radioactive wastes. The Court agreed that a "project proponent's prior environmental record is properly a subject of close consideration" in determining the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. While the Court was satisfied with the Regents' response here, we believe the "environmental record" question will now become an issue in many EIRs. The courts were advised to consider several relevant factors such as:

"* * * the length, number, and severity of prior environmental errors and the harm caused; whether the errors were intentional, negligent, or unavoidable; whether the proponent's environmental record had improved or declined; whether he has attempted in good faith to correct prior problems; and whether the proposed activity will be regulated and monitored by a public entity."

Fourth Issue: Remedies for CEQA Violations

Having found the Laurel Heights EIR inadequate in some respects, the Court considered whether to enjoin the research activities already underway in the facility. The Court was thus required to construe the remedial provisions of CEQA section 21168.9 for the first time. That section provides that if a court finds a violation of CEQA, it must enter an order including one or more of three specified provisions, one of which is a mandate "suspension of all activity" by the public agency and/or the project sponsor. The Court concluded that section 21168.9 provided clear authority to enjoin all activity at Laurel Heights, and framed the question as "whether we should do so."

In answering this question, the Court adopted the approach of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions concerning remedies in Federal environmental cases. Under this approach, the primary objective is protection of the environment. Since the Court upheld the Regents' finding that all environmental effects of the present research activities at Laurel Heights had been substantially mitigated, it found that no damage was threatened by allowing the research to continue. By ordering the Regents to prepare a new EIR addressing anticipated future uses and alternative sites, and forbidding the Regents from relying on the present activities as justification to continue the project, the Court reasoned that CEQA procedures would be satisfied as well. Since significant harm was threatened to the Regents and the public in general if important biomedical research were halted, the Court found that the equitable balance favored allowing UCSF's research activities to continue.

The Court's analysis is favorable to the development community in confirming that CEQA does not "automatically" require the issuance of an injunction if a violation is found. For example, it is not uncommon for developers to prevail against CEQA challenges at the trial court level, only to have that ruling reversed by a Court of Appeal after development activities are underway or completed. The Court's analysis provides encouragement that enjoining all such activities may not be necessary.

It should be noted, however, that Laurel Heights presents unique circumstances for a court to refuse to stay project activities. The Court itself noted that this was not the usual CEQA case "in which the concerns are over the potential environmental effects of a new project," but the relocation of research activities already being conducted elsewhere in San Francisco. The nature of the public project sponsor and the research activities in question certainly weighed heavily in the equitable balance, particularly where the Court seemed convinced that the present activities at Laurel Heights presented no threat of environmental harm. This favorable equitable treatment may not be accorded in a situation where a project EIR identifies significant environmental effects and the project has not been commenced. Still, it is significant that the Court recognizes that not every CEQA violation
leads to the strictest possible remedy and that a project can continue in some situations.

Conclusion

Given the unanimity of the Laurel Heights decision, and the fact that so few CEQA cases reach the Supreme Court, the main significance of Laurel Heights lies in its reaffirmation of the CEQA goals of environmental protection and meaningful public participation. Even though the Court felt no environmental harm was presented by the existing research activities, it nonetheless required the Regents to conduct another EIR process. And while the Court applied common sense principles in not enjoining the project, this favorable outcome is limited by the unique circumstances of the case. While the decision has pluses and minuses, overall, we foresee that Laurel Heights will be viewed by project opponents and the lower courts as a message to continue vigorous CEQA enforcement.

* In this case, the Court was dealing with a "public" project, approved and implemented by the Regents and their subordinate organizations. In that situation, a project proponent may also be the EIR preparer. The Court's discussion of a "project proponent's" responsibility with respect to alternatives thus extends to EIR consultants who typically prepare the EIR in the context of private development projects.

Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, as part of its real estate, environmental and litigation work, has developed a substantial practice representing diverse clients in a range of projects involving CEQA, Coastal Act, subdivision, planning and permitting, and related land use development issues. The practice is statewide, involving projects throughout California and the Firm's offices in San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, San Diego and Walnut Creek. The practice involves an extensive CEQA and land use library and substantial legal assistant expertise. A partial listing of attorneys in the Firm handling these matters is set forth on the back of this Special Bulletin.
March 28, 1989

TO: Members, Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

FR: Trinity Ordoña, Chair

RE: Upcoming General Meeting

Friday, April 14, 12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m., S-118
(Please note the meeting has been extended until 1:30 p.m.)

Dear Colleagues,

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of the last general meeting of March 10. Please review and bring any corrections to the next meeting, which is Friday, April 14, Chancellor's Conference Room (S-118), 12:00 noon to 1:30 p.m. Please note the meeting has been extended until 1:30 p.m. to have adequate time for discussion. If you are unable to attend, please call me (x68180) or the Vice-Chair, Steve Reynolds (x62556).

The agenda will focus on the upcoming Radiation Safety License Hearing for Laurel Heights (April 21) and possible strategies for UCSF's approach to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) processes for Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights. EIR preparations are underway and will probably culminate, including open public hearings, sometime within the next twelve months. Barbara Atkinson, Community & Governmental Relations, will present a draft report on the EIR process, possible ways interested staff could be involved, and differences with past approaches. In addition, Atty. Anna Shimko (Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Robertson & Falk -- the firm engaged to handle the EIR for UCSF) will present our legal strategy.

AGENDA:
1. Review and correction of minutes
2. Chair's report
3. Sub-committee reports:
   - Community Outreach
   - Staff Education
   - Information & Advocacy
4. Liaisons report
5. Presentations: Barbara Atkinson and Atty. Anna Shimko

cc: Bruce Spaulding, Anna Shimko, Barbara Atkinson, Paula Carien Schultz, and Janet Norton

TAO: encl.
March 30, 1980

TO: Valli McDougle, Kathy Balestreri, Byron Sigal, Elenor Shimosaka, Anne Poirier and Suzanne Gottschalk

FR: Trinity Ordoña and Steve Reynolds

RE: Change in Executive Committee Meeting

This is just a short note to remind you, following Steve's phone call last week, that the next Executive Committee meeting has been changed to Monday, April 10, 3:30 - 5:00 p.m. S-222. The agenda will be:

1) SAC Budget, 1988-89 and 1989-90

2) Staff Appreciation Week/Campus Holiday Party and 125th Celebration Plans

3) Status Report on Toy/Book Drive, Renovation Projects; Toxics Seminar and EIR Process/Staff participation

4) General Membership Meetings schedule for summer

The regular schedule for Executive Committee and General Membership meetings will resume for May and June.

Executive Committee: Friday, May 5 and June 2, 3:30 - 5:00 p.m, S-222

General Membership: Friday, May 12 and June 9, 12:00 - 1:00 p.m., S-118

/tao
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

Friday, March 10, 1989
12:00 Noon - 1:00 p.m.
S - 118

Members In Attendance: Steve Reynolds - Vice Chair, Tim Baldwin, Kathy Balestreri, Agnes Canfield, Bart Cohen, Karen Eldred, Rita Emelia, Linda Erkelens, Carolyn Koster, Loretta Maddux, Valli McDougle, Karen Newhouse, John O'Connor, Anne Poirier, Eunice Redondo, David Santos, Elenor Shimosaka, Byron Sigal, Barbara Ann Wilson; May Huang (guest); Fred McEnroe - Staff

Liaisons: Barbara Atkinson, Public Service Programs; Janet Norton, News Services; Paula Carien Schultz, Vice Chancellor--Personnel and Student Services Office

Members Absent: Ethel Adams, Joy Becker, Yi Ann Chou, Suzanne Gottschalk, Michele Graf, Miles Hamada, Martha Hooven, Helga Justman, Steve Leonoudakis, Al Minvielle, Deborah Pauley, Dorothy Price, Eugene Salazar, Chris Slaboszewicz, Susan Stevens, Margaret Warren, Christine Yee

Guests: Leroy Balzer, Michela Reichman, Bruce Spaulding

The meeting was brought to order by Steve Reynolds at 12:00 noon. Steve distributed a sheet of questions related to toxins and a news handout. He called for any corrections or additions to the minutes. The following correction to the February 10 minutes was requested:

Under Committee Reports, the second paragraph should read: "Valli McDougle and Kathy Balestreri will scan Synapse and enlist committee members in responding to any misinformation."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

Committee Reports

Kathy Balestreri from the Information and Advocacy Committee again requested any information on campus publications or newsletters that SAC members may know about and encouraged SAC members to send in their survey cards if they haven't already done so. She said that the proposal for the rumor Hot Line has been referred to Michela Reichman for consideration in next year's budget. Also, she and Valli have arranged for a speaker at the next SAC meeting to present the EIR process for Laurel Heights and the Mount Zion proposal, if it is approved by the Regents.

Byron Sigal of the Community Outreach Committee stated that the committee has decided to focus on three specific projects targeted to UCSF neighborhoods: 1) helping to renovate the dining area of the Hamilton Methodist Church on Waller Street, where many homeless people are fed, 2) helping with building renovation and the donation of furniture to the Booker T. Washington Center on Presidio near Laurel Heights, which is a community center serving the Western Addition and 3) a toy and book drive. Elenor Shimosaka said that they have been in contact with several child care centers in need of toys and senior centers in
need of books. Steve said that in the future the committee would be working with Carol Fox of News Services to underscore the newsworthiness of these volunteer activities by UCSF employees.

Liaison Reports:

Paula Carrien Schultz said that the SAC budget has been approved and that an account and fund is in the process of being established.

Barbara Atkinson reminded the committee that on April 21 an all day public hearing will be held on the amendment to UCSF's radiation license. She also passed around two advance copies of a pamphlet entitled "In the Community," which is an introduction to UCSF's community outreach programs. She said that they would be available to the committee when published in final form.

Guest Speakers

Anne Poirier introduced Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and Assistant Vice Chancellor Leroy Balzer who had come to respond to questions on the topics of toxins and other potential environmental health hazards at UCSF.

Anne opened the questions by asking about the article in the 3/2/89 edition of Synapse about the exhaust fumes in the C Level offices. As an overview of the problem, Bruce said that a serious hindrance in the maintenance of ventilation, heating and cooling systems is that they have a very low priority on the list of systemwide capital expenditures, particularly given San Francisco's moderate climate. This situation is also aggravated by statewide budget concerns. He pointed out that UCSF is not unique in this regard but that on many campuses across the United States there is a serious problem with the decay of the physical environment. Another aspect of life we are all familiar with at UCSF is that the population much greater that the space has been designed to accommodate. For instance, if the Medical Sciences Building were just now being constructed to contain the population of employees it currently houses, the lobby would have nine, rather than four, elevators. Of course, it is possible to change old buildings, as we have been doing at UCSF for some time, but it can be extremely expensive and extremely complex. He wrapped his introduction up by saying that there really are no simple solutions to the problems we face.

The following questions were addressed (please see attached list):

#5. Are there toxins produced by general office supplies, etc.? In new offices there is a process of degassing, in which new carpets and new furniture fabrics give off gasses used in their production. The process may take several weeks before all the gasses have dissipated. In the meantime, some individuals may be made uncomfortable or even ill during the process. People have different reactions to chemicals in their environment. Marking pens, white-out solvent, even the chemicals used in making various types of paper may produce a variety of physical reactions in people.

#1. Define "toxin." "Toxicity" is the degree to which the body reacts to chemicals in the environment. All people are unique in some respects in the ways their bodies metabolize chemicals taken in by the body. Some chemicals produce no effect at all, some are in varying degrees noxious, that is, they
produce unpleasant physical effects, and some chemicals are health hazards, they produce actual physical damage.

#15 & #18. Hazardous materials education and response to toxic spills. Principal investigators have primary responsibility for education about hazardous materials. In addition, departmental safety committees have been increasing in number and responsibility, and by the end of the year there should be one for each department. For EH & S safety education is an ongoing process. EH & S can look into safety issues during the process to obtain grants or during an audit of an investigator. All safety issues are reported to the departmental safety committees.

#11. How does EH & S service complaints? There are two responses, emergency and standard. Twenty four hours a day, any call to the UCPD will result in an immediate response by an EH & S staff member who is on call for emergencies. Between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. a call to x1300 will result in a response by a member of the appropriate EH & S department (chemical, radiation, etc.) who will examine the situation, see that it is taken care of and will then issue an incident report, a copy of which will go to the people affected.

In closing, Roy Balzer said that he would look forward to working with members of the Staff Education Sub-Committee on a toxins seminar for staff employees.

Steve Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Attachments:
Questions for Toxins Presentation
Revised SAC Membership List

cc: Roy Balzer
Bruce Spaulding
DATE: February 24, 1989

TO: Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding
    Assistant Vice Chancellor Leroy Balzer

FROM: Anne Poirier and Suzanne Gottschalk
       Co-Chairs, Staff Education Sub-Committee
       Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

RE: Toxins Presentation on March 10, 1989

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee is looking forward to sponsoring a general campus seminar on toxins to educate staff members on current issues and information. As a first step, we found Roy Balzer's presentation on February 10 very interesting and the question format effective. To guide you in the next committee meeting on March 10 at 12 noon in S-118, we offer the following list of questions. Thank you very much for your assistance.

1. Define "toxin." What is the difference between "toxin" and "irritant"?

2. Compare, if possible, toxic emissions from UCSF to a similar 5 block area of nearby Irving Street businesses. Are UCSF's toxic emissions comparable to those from other hospitals in the Bay Area? If not, why? How are toxic wastes disposed?

3. Does the ventilation system circulate toxins? Why can office workers occasionally smell chemical fumes and car exhaust from the ventilation system?

4. With the space crunch on campus, officers are being partitioned into smaller and smaller areas. Employees complain of lack of temperature control and air flow. Is this a serious, or just an uncomfortable, problem?

5. Are there toxins produced by general office supplies and equipment, such as from felt tip markers, xerox machines, VDT's, ceiling tiles, rugs?

6. Are headaches, dizziness and nausea possible allergic reactions to the work site? Have you noticed trends in certain buildings?

7. Are construction sites toxic to UCSF workers and neighbors?

8. Define "Sick Building Syndrome." Is this a concern at UCSF? Does UCSF have an asbestos problem?

9. Does UCSF have measurable radon levels?

10. Are lead pipes a safety issue at UCSF?

11. Employees in HSE have been told not to drink the tap water due to algae contamination. Is this true?

12. What are the metal boxes labelled hazardous with rubber hoses draining into the street on Parnassus Avenue?
13. Do you have results from the wind studies of UCSF emissions allegedly causing cancer clusters in Noe Valley?

14. How does EH&S service complaints?

15. How much education are lab employees given in the safe use of hazardous materials? Does this education begin before employment starts?

16. What is the procedure for handling toxic gases?

17. Is there a chemical safety policy manual?

18. When a toxic spill occurs, have employees been trained how to handle it and to whom to report?

19. Lab workers wander outside their labs still wearing lab coats and rubber gloves. Is this following campus safety regulations?

20. What can staff members do to educate themselves and community members on these issues?

21. Do you think this is the appropriate group and the appropriate time to sponsor a toxins seminar for UCSF staff members?
# CHANCELLOR’S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
1988 - 89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Ordona</td>
<td>x8180</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-834</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Baldwin</td>
<td>x0579</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Balestreri</td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103</td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Becker</td>
<td>x2204</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Canfield</td>
<td>x3876</td>
<td>Box 0604</td>
<td>N-331B</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Ann Chou</td>
<td>x2298</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED 425</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>x0544</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Emelia</td>
<td>221-4810/x3749</td>
<td>VA 116A</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED 145</td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x1373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>x4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>x1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>x1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td>Fac Alum, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>S-612</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>x1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>x6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McDougle</td>
<td>x2342</td>
<td>Box 0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Minvielle</td>
<td>x8683</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-238</td>
<td>Millberry Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>x8974</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
<td>Lab Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Connor</td>
<td>x9014</td>
<td>Box 0640</td>
<td>C-734</td>
<td>Growth &amp; Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pauley</td>
<td>x8808</td>
<td>Box 0910</td>
<td>HSE Annex</td>
<td>Material Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Poirier</td>
<td>x7033</td>
<td>LPI-F-0984</td>
<td>LP-348</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>x4592</td>
<td>Box 0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
<td>SFGH, 3C29</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>GI Division, SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Roma</td>
<td>x8112</td>
<td>Box 0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Salazar</td>
<td>x4373</td>
<td>Box 0934</td>
<td>145 Irv 1W</td>
<td>Assoc Dean, Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Santos</td>
<td>x2681</td>
<td>Box 0430</td>
<td>S-630</td>
<td>Dean's Office, S/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Shimosaka</td>
<td>x2800</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHS-150</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Sigal</td>
<td>x1616</td>
<td>Box 0968</td>
<td>610 Parnassus</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>x8095</td>
<td>Box 0288</td>
<td>MU 2nd fl E</td>
<td>VC-Bus &amp; Fis Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>x7625</td>
<td>LPI-ACA-0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
<td>Psych/ Acad Affrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Thomas</td>
<td>x1183</td>
<td>Box 0202</td>
<td>M-05</td>
<td>Env Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>x1571</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>x1226</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-926</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yee</td>
<td>x5683</td>
<td>Box 0238</td>
<td>MU 3rd fl W</td>
<td>Police Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred McEnroe</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Atkinson</td>
<td>x3206</td>
<td>Box 0930</td>
<td>1308-3rd Ave</td>
<td>Com &amp; Gov’t Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Norton</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0250</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Carien Schultz</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 30, 1989
April 6, 1989

TO: School of Medicine Leadership Retreat Participants, Department/ORU Managers, and Others

FR: Valli T. McDougle /vmc/
Executive Assistant to the Dean

RE: Materials from the 1989 Leadership Retreat
"The Community and Its UCSF: 'Oh wad some power the fiftie gie us to see oursels as others see us.'"

Although this may appear to be a wealth of material, because the topic was timely and critical to the school and the campus, we have done a minimal amount of editorializing. Please feel free to comment on the presentations and the recommendations.

This packet includes the following materials:

1) Executive Summary

2) Transcripts of Retreat presentations:
   A) Joel Ventresca
   B) Dan Rosenheim
   C) Lloyd H. Smith; Bruce Alberts - Attachment
   D) Rudi Schmid

3) Small Group Reports - #1 through #6

4) Evaluation of 1989 Retreat (to be completed and returned to Valli McDougle by 4/15/89)

5) Group photograph (Retreat attendees only)

vmc
Enclosures
LEADERSHIP RETREAT - 1989
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The fifth annual UCSF School of Medicine Faculty Leadership retreat took place on January 13 - 15, 1989, at the Asilomar Conference Center. Department chairs, directors of organized research units, representatives from the Chancellor's Office, members of the Council of the Faculty, students, residents, associate deans and the dean gathered to ponder the state of the university vis-à-vis its place in and relationship with the various communities that comprise San Francisco. The goal of this retreat was to give many of the primary School of Medicine decision-makers an uncensored look at how the university overall is perceived by the community, and an opportunity to discuss this information in a focused way.

There were two guests who were especially chosen for the unique perspective they could give on how UCSF is perceived by the community. Joel Ventresca is the current president of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood Associations. He is highly critical of the university and has, in fact, been a long time opponent of UCSF growth as well as of many campus activities. Daniel Rosenheim, city editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, as a journalist is in the unusual position of being the recipient of opinion and information from all segments of the community.

Discussion groups were formed to address issues and questions relating to the overall theme of the retreat (see attached). The questions revolved around three major themes: 1) The image of UCSF in the community. 2) The political environment in which the work of the university must be carried out. 3) The role of the faculty in service to the larger community, apart from the already defined missions of patient care, research, and teaching.

The ideas and/or recommendations that arose from these meetings are outlined below.

Improving our public image

1. Guard against appearing to patronize the community; the essence of good citizenship is not necessarily what you contribute so much as it is joining in the process.

2. Relate to patients. UCSF is not widely perceived as placing a high premium on patient care. We need to demonstrate more sensitivity to patients and their needs. Suggestions included valet parking when the parking lot is full; improving campus information centers including stationing a person at the top of the elevators to direct patients appropriately; developing a mechanism for preferred treatment in the ER and Admitting for patients from the neighborhood.

3. Emphasize that we are an integral and long valued member of the San Francisco community by stressing our longevity.

4. Engage a professional public relations firm. Among items that could be considered by such a firm would be changing our name to UC Health Center.

5. Publicize the things we do and have done that have direct positive impact on human well being.
Political Relationships

1. Develop an advisory committee to work with the Assistant Chancellor for Public Service Programs with the task of coordinating outreach efforts to local politicians.

2. Have faculty enthusiastically promote the university in all spheres in which they find themselves and use their influence to try to gain a more politically accurate perception of UCSF.

3. Be aware of the political element implicit in the school/campus relationship with our various constituencies, e.g., patients, organized labor, the business community.

4. Invite politicians to the campus to assist in developing an ongoing dialog.

Public Service

1. Consult with community representatives to identify areas of need and determine if UCSF could help to meet those needs.

2. Hold evening classes. Suggestions included English as a second language and science courses for the lay public; a series of lectures on the biology of AIDS or the topic of diet and nutrition. A related idea was a lecture series targeted at the scientifically knowledgeable lay person.

3. Reward local community service, as distinct from service on university committees or study sections, in the faculty promotion process.

4. Expand the Chancellor's Awards for Public Service and develop Dean's Awards for Public Service.

5. Develop an administrative mechanism to cultivate outreach and support of community programs, as well as to keep faculty and employees apprised of opportunities to participate in such programs.

6. Explore grant support for individuals who want to engage in community outreach projects.

7. Develop two childcare centers in partnership with interested neighborhood groups, one located near the Parnassus campus and one at SFGH. The current UCSF Child Care Center is inadequate to meet the needs of the campus and neighborhood communities.
WILLIAM K. HAMILTON: Associate Dean, UCSF School of Medicine

Introductory Remarks

At previous retreats, we have discussed what I guess could be categorized as a traditional academic subject. This year your committee met to discuss the agenda -- you know, of course, that in the University of California things must be done by committee. At the time we met the atmosphere was filled with words like "space ceiling" and "unexpandable space," "Laurel Heights" -- or as Holly Smith, a distinguished member of the committee, has referred to it, "Laurel Depths" -- "Marshal Hale and Mt. Zion." These were uppermost in our conversations at that time and we were involved with hospital occupancy and relationship with referring physicians, community physicians, both in San Francisco and in the immediately surrounding world.

Not all memories that are kindled by these words are pleasant; they're not things that make us think of beauty and comfort and so forth. All do have in common some focus on community relationship. And so the committee discussed the matter of community relationships as an appropriate subject to focus this particular meeting in 1989. Henry Bourne, a member of this committee also, related to us how he was shocked in a meeting that he attended -- I believe it was when the Sierra Club and others were discussing the Laurel Heights situation -- he was shocked into some reality by what he heard at that meeting as to how others perceived us. Whether right or wrong, the perception of others is extremely important and Henry was duly impressed by what he heard. He thought it might be good for all of us to hear this, to realize what this was about, with some hope that perhaps we could more clearly understand the community's perceptions of UCSF.

So we decided to aim this year's get-together towards local community relations. Initially it was thought that this topic wasn't academic enough. I looked up the word academic and found it defined as

"belonging to a school of Plato, or the Academy." The second description was that this is "of, pertaining to, or belonging to an academy or college or university." Third, "of, pertaining to literary, classical or liberal studies in distinction from technical or professional" -- I thought it was very interesting
in that sense that professional is not academic -- "conforming
to scholastic traditions or rules."

The committee thought that within that broad definition this subject was fit for our university community to address.

Because the original purpose of these retreats was that we get together to discuss some common problems that would bring us closer together, and to make more of a community. We hoped these meetings would result in the betterment of the school, and thus our lives in the community and society in general.

I think you as scientists and clinicians are vitally interested in probabilities and predictability, so let me present you with a scenario. Consider for a moment the way we present UCSF to ourselves and others. We are like the football crowds before a TV camera who wave their arms and shout, "We're number one!" We lead the country in medical schools and NIH funding. We lead almost any other university medical school in the membership in prestigious societies of various sorts. The best-doctor lists that have come out in several women's magazines have listed a lot of UCSF physicians. This is a national list, not a local list. We boast about our student applicant lists; we haven't suffered the decrease in applicants that many of the other medical schools in the United States have had. We know that's due to the excellence of the faculty. We're proud, and I think justly so, that our graduate programs attract the best and that our residency programs are considered among the leaders in the world. In institutional arrogance, as well, I think that we excel and we may, in fact, be number one.

Those who are assembled here relate to a national and an international scene. You're not recruited here because of what you might mean to the neighborhoods in San Francisco or to San Francisco, per se. Your interests and accomplishments are in research or clinical medicine and teaching. Most of you work, I expect, a minimum of 10 hours a day, six days a week. So I ask, "Is it not reasonably predictable -- in fact, highly probable -- that some conflict with the San Francisco community would occur?"

Arrogance shows to many people, and it's offensive to those to whom it appears. We are offended that the community doesn't recognize our obvious brilliance and our goodness. We don't have a football team, as some institutions do, to involve the interest of the community. We're offended by being mistaken as the University of San Francisco, by not being recognized as a part of the University of California. I suspect many of us don't realize that there is a real community problem until it hits us very hard in such things as a space cap or the Laurel Heights situation.

So for all of these reasons, the committee believed that we should address this problem directly, and perhaps bluntly. We've asked two speakers who represent the community, to talk with us. We have written to them and asked them to "tell it like it is, to tell us as you see it." First of all, let me just introduce to you tomorrow morning's speaker,
Dan Rosenheim, who is city editor for the San Francisco Chronicle, who with his bride is seated in the fourth row.

I have the pleasure this evening of introducing to you a man whom I have never met, but have visited with on the phone. I think he is particularly qualified to speak to us about the matters which I've been discussing for the last few seconds. This is Joel Ventresca. Joel's official title is President of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. We are, I believe, all proud of the fact that San Francisco is a community of neighborhoods, and Mr. Ventresca is particularly qualified for this. I have a list here of civic duties that he has performed and organizations with which he has served. I can tell you that he has a Bachelor's and a Master's degree from the University of San Francisco. With a long, distinguished record of community service and community interest, we've asked him to come and talk to us, to look at us as others see us. Joel, please come.

JOEL VENTRESCA: President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Good evening. As was stated earlier, I am the current president of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods in San Francisco. This is a multi-issue, city-wide coalition of neighborhood groups, which is made up of fifty groups, currently, including all the largest ones in San Francisco. Every neighborhood, almost every neighborhood is represented in this coalition. It's seventeen years old and we have taken a number of positions that relate to UCSF, which I researched our positions on and made copies, which I'll distribute at the end of my remarks.

Before I start, I just want to ask a few questions so I can get a sense of the audience that I am addressing. One question is "How many live in San Francisco?". (Four out of five raised their hands.) How many have lived in San Francisco for 10 or more years? (About half raised their hands.) And how many have lived in the Haight Ashbury-Inner Sunset part of the city? (About one-fourth responded.) So I might be covering some ground which some here are familiar with, but I think the ones who haven't heard about this story, this will be useful to go through.
A NEIGHBORHOOD VIEW OF UCSF
by Joel Ventresca, CSFN President

The following speech was delivered to the UCSF School of Medicine Leadership Retreat on January 13, 1989 at the Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove, California.

Introduction

UCSF (the University of California at San Francisco) is an important part of the San Francisco community and provides substantial economic, social, cultural, and intellectual benefits to the community at large. One out of every three families, in our region, has someone whose life is directly or indirectly affected by the university. UCSF is one of the largest employers in San Francisco. It is also the largest hospital, and the 13th largest educational institution in the Bay Area. UCSF is the only health sciences campus in the nine-campus University of California system.

Despite all these good attributes, there are serious problems and conflicts that exist. And that is why I am here this evening.

"There is a time," said Mario Savio, "when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part. You can't even passively take part and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to make it stop." Mario Savio, a leader in the Free Speech Movement, made this statement on December 2, 1964 before 5,000 at UC, Berkeley. He was talking about the University of California.

This type of passion and commitment has been instilled in neighborhood activists in San Francisco in their fight against UCSF's growth and expansion over the last 15 years.

In 1954, there were only five highrises in the central business district. In 1955, the Moffitt hospital highrise, on the UCSF campus, was completed. UCSF has since then produced the highest skyline and the greatest concentration of commercial highrises in the city outside of the downtown area.

The harsh and negative environmental impacts of
uncontrolled growth hit the surrounding residential neighborhood hard and created the growth control movement and its leaders. The Haight Ashbury and Inner Sunset area continues to have problems that downtown San Francisco has in terms of housing, transportation, and other environmental problems. The diversity and quality of life in the area is deteriorating because of this over-development.

The Impacts of Growth

Institutional expansion harms neighborhoods. Institutional expansion in the Haight Ashbury/Inner Sunset neighborhood has:

- increased demand for housing and on-street parking spaces.
- decreased the housing supply through demolitions and conversion of residential units to office space.
- congested our streets with parking, traffic, and transportation problems that continue to worsen.
- attracted commercial interests that are institutional-serving, not neighborhood-serving.
- expanded the desire of every nearby institution to expand again and again in an unending drive to be bigger and bigger no matter the cost to the surrounding residential neighborhood.
- created a transitory community where residents and small businesses last only a short time because the market competition determined by large institutions pushes people and small businesses out.
- produced the highest skyline and greatest concentration of highrises outside of the downtown area, and
- encouraged gentrification where young, professional, high-income, non-traditional households displace older, working-class, low-income families.

Demographic Changes Which Result From Growth

Too much institutional growth has resulted in less social and economic diversity. Between the 1970 and 1980 Censuses in the Haight Ashbury neighborhood, there was a:

- 33% decrease in older residents.
- 46% decrease in poor families.
- 38% decrease in families overall, and a
- 49% decrease in the black population.

According to a recent study, 600 households or 1,213 people are displaced involuntarily each year in the Haight primarily because of rising housing costs. In 1989, it is projected by a recent marketing report that the neighborhood will be primarily white (84%) with few
minorities (16%).

The neighborhood is becoming less and less diverse racially and economically. The neighborhood is becoming more homogeneous and less heterogeneous. The rich diversity that attracted many people to this neighborhood is disappearing. The driving force behind this loss of diversity is institutional expansion.

The Endless Push To Expand

UCSF has been almost under continual construction for a decade. Twenty large-scale development projects, or over 1.5 million gross square feet of new construction, are in progress in the Haight Ashbury area now. That's the equivalent of the Bank of America highrise in the financial district. Seventeen of these projects are associated with large institutions.

This has been an ongoing process. Overdevelopment by large institutions now and in the past in this neighborhood has created more and more uncontrolled institutional growth and expansion. The growth-inducing, cumulative effect of institutional expansion in the neighborhood has resulted in the significant deterioration of the quality of life.

The Battle To Control Growth At UCSF

The 1970's was a battle over growth. The 1980's has become a battle over health and safety issues coupled with the growth and expansion issue.

UCSF has increased its size in the city from 500,000 square feet in 1950 to 4.5 million square feet today. UCSF has facilities at 27 sites.

The 1970's

At the Parnassus campus, before 1975, facilities with floor space equal to six-50 story highrise Transamerica Pyramids were built. Consequently, 12,000 people struggled daily to gain access to this intensely congested site. This mammoth expansion brutalized the surrounding neighborhood by:

- confiscating 300 homes from the scarce supply of low to moderate income housing stock; between 1950 and 1979, 111 pieces of property were taken over by UCSF in the Parnassus area.
- violating municipal ordinances by using residential buildings as offices.
- constructing out of scale highrise buildings which tower 15 stories and blocked sunlight from nearby homes.
- obtaining public streets for construction projects.
- paving and building over acres of open space on Mount Sutro while cutting down hundreds of trees.
- denying the city tax revenues from properties and houses confiscated by the university.
- adding costs to the provision of municipal services, (police and fire) without contributing to the costs.
- destroying, through demolitions, 100 homes, and demolishing an entire block of houses.

Community residents had seen hundreds of families displaced from their homes by the university. UCSF acted in such a way as to guarantee distrust, hostility, anger, and open opposition. The uncontrolled growth at UCSF had forced out residents, drove up rents, created traffic congestion, erected a highrise wall in the midst of a residential neighborhood, and sparked greater housing demand with a lower vacancy rate. The university's expansion has always been at the expense of the surrounding community.

Key Events

Here are key events that occurred in the 1970's.

February 23, 1973. The Board of Supervisors voted to oppose the construction of the UCSF dental school.
March 15, 1973. The University of California Regents refused to listen to residents opposed to the UCSF dental school.
May 1973. The California Assembly voted to delete funds for the dental school and to place a ceiling on the overall growth of the UCSF campus.
1974. A ceiling of 3.55 million gross square feet was placed on UCSF campus construction at the Parnassus site by the State Legislature.
1975. The Mount Sutro Defense Committee, Inner Sunset Action Committee, Sierra Club, San Francisco Tomorrow, and the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council filed a lawsuit to stop the construction of the UCSF dental school charging that the University of California Regents approved the plan without a complete Environmental Impact Report.
November 1975. A preliminary injunction was placed into effect by a Superior Court judge blocking the expansion. The judge identified steps the UCSF medical center needed to take to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act.
May 21, 1976. The UC Board of Regents approved a set of growth control restrictions for the UCSF Parnassus campus.
August 1976. A lawsuit to block the release of $9 million in United States Health, Education, and Welfare Department funds for the UCSF dental school was filed.
1976. An injunction was sought to block the UCSF expansion plan.

The 1980's
The 1980's has resulted in two appellate court decisions that found that UCSF violated the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

A fraud case is about to come to trial.

UCSF Has A Credibility Problem

The relationship between the campus and the community is fraught with misunderstanding, miscommunication, and mistrust. Fear, distrust, frustration, and anger has existed for years.

Greed, ineptitude, arrogance, misconduct, mistakes, self-serving actions, overselling and hype, mismanagement, large egos, cover-ups, stonewalling, subterfuge, end-run tactics, law-breaking, double talk, bad faith, fraud, and deceit have all been part of the history.

There is little to no effort to portray information accurately if it may negatively impact UCSF. The downside of certain issues critical of UCSF are ignored. The public is treated as if their incapable of understanding what is going on. The mistakes the medical center has experienced are rooted in a failure to acknowledge weaknesses. Let's look at examples.

DOUBLE TALK ON THE PRESIDIO

In May and March of 1988, several letters were sent out by UCSF stating that "there is no UCSF proposal to occupy any part of the Presidio", yet newspaper accounts continue to raise that possibility and a discussion at a public meeting on the campus last February raised that possibility as well.

RADIAN'S SHELL GAME

Radian is not an objective independent consultant capable of a comprehensive environmental assessment of the Parnassus campus.

This firm under-estimated the risk of dioxin near Humboldt Bay.

Cate Jenkins, a Ph.D. chemist with the EPA, Francis Palmer, of the State Water Resources Control Board, Michael Lipsett, an M.D. who is Chief of the Hazard Evaluation Section in the California Department of Health Services, and Arnold Den, Senior Science Advisor with the EPA—all criticized the Radian study on the health risk assessment for dioxin done near Humboldt Bay.

Dioxin is known as one of the most deadly manmade chemicals. Three ounces of dioxin placed in New York city's drinking water supply could wipe out the city's entire population. It is one of the most powerful carcinogens known.

If Radian made mistakes in regards to dioxin, then this firm will have absolutely no credibility in terms of the community. A new
consultant should be selected with the mutual consent of both campus and community leaders.

STONEWALLING ON LETHAL GAS EXPERIMENTS

There are two researchers working on projects right now in the Health Science West building, at UCSF, that involve nerve gas and mustard gas which are funded by the Department of Defense, according to files recently released. At least 31 recent research projects at UCSF were funded by the Department of Defense. UCSF, however, continues to deny this type of research is conducted on its campus.

A HISTORY OF HEALTH AND SAFETY VIOLATIONS

Let's look at the last 12 years.

January 1977. A UCSF laboratory was the first to break the National Institutes of Health (NIH) safety rules set up for genetic engineering and covered it up for seven months. The lead scientist and department head told a subcommittee of the United States Senate that he deliberately decided to not disclose the violation to the NIH and the public.

1977. A science writer, in Smithsonian Magazine, described her three months in a UCSF laboratory and the disturbingly cavalier attitude toward NIH safety guidelines she observed there. Among post doctorates, she wrote, "it seemed almost chic not to know the NIH rules."

1978. The California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) inspected 50 laboratories and found seven violations of the OSHA health and safety standards.

April 1979. The state quarantined several areas of UCSF after Q fever spread to at least five employees-- one of whom died. His name was Hanley Fleming, a 74 year old elevator repairman. Blood tests showed that 25 persons had been ill with Q fever. Cal OSHA cited UCSF for "not sufficiently informing campus employees about the potential health hazard."

March 1983. State regulations regarding transportation of radioactive materials to a non-authorized location were violated when a doctor treated a patient in her residence.

1986. Radioactive hydrogen-3 was found in soil near the Parnassus campus in concentrations that were higher than background in some cases as much as 50%.

May 14, 1986. On this date, the Chief of the State Department of Health Services Radiologic Health Branch advised UCSF in writing that the results of its last inspection disclosed a "serious loss of control with respect to use of radioactive material on campus."

March 1987. The California Department of Health Services cited the campus for 33 violations of state regulations. The labs of several leading researchers were cited for repeat violations. UCSF paid a $25,000 fine. Among the incidents that drew citations were the disposal of radioactive substance in a dumpster, pouring radioactive liquids down a drain leading to the public sewer, and storing radioactive materials near flammable objects.
January 1988. Radioactive isotopes were mishandled by two research teams and some of it was possibly thrown out in the trash.

November 1988. Seventeen employees tested positive for the Q fever organism and employees were found to be violating Cal OSHA orders in a containment facility.

PARNASSUS GROWTH CONTROL RESTRICTIONS

The population and space growth control restrictions established on May 21, 1976 by the UC Board of Regents are being violated. The population and space projections in the current Long Range Development Plan (1982), the institution's master plan, are being exceeded. UCSF, however, refuses to admit these violations.

THE PANDOR'S BOX OF BIOTECHNOLOGY

Biomedical science and technology brings with it tough ethical dilemmas and the power to do great harm.

According to a new study by the National Wildlife Federation by Margaret Mellon, Ph.D., genetic engineering projects now on the drawing boards could increase the level of toxins in foods and increase the number of disease-causing organisms that are resistant to antibiotics. Engineered organisms can also be pests, displace existing plants and animals, disrupt the functioning of ecosystems, reduce biological diversity, alter the composition of species, threaten the extinction of various species, and change climate patterns.

This new technology should be developed cautiously. The public has a right to know about proposed genetic engineering projects and should be given a major role in decisions concerning these projects.

The environmental risks of genetic engineering needs to be rigorously examined, but UCSF continually downplays the risks.

In 1986, a Louis Harris poll for the Congressional Office of Technology found that 52% of the public thought it was likely that genetically engineered products will represent a serious danger to people or the environment. The poll also indicated the public strongly favors strict regulation.

The campus and community needs to work together to insure that this new technology is regulated so we can avoid any potential danger.

COVER-UPS

Cover-ups continue to come to light.

In the 1950's, UCSF helped collect shellfish toxin which was obtained by the CIA and used in clandestine operations--including its assassination attempts--abroad.
Charles Hine, a UCSF professor, in 1961 helped set standards for DBCP while his work was subsidized by Dow Chemical which made the pesticide. His inadequate tests led to relaxed standards that resulted in harm to many people.

LAW-BREAKING

UCSF is a consistent law breaker.

Seeking exemptions, violating laws, and ignoring regulations is not an effective way of making friends in the community. When UCSF disregards city policies, it shows a lack of respect for the city's residents, disrupts cooperative relations, and undermines the spirit of neighborliness and civic responsibility that exists in a community. UCSF should follow the City's zoning and land use policies.

OVERSELLING

Partial release of a poll was misleading.

The poll UCSF recently conducted showed or suggested that 53% of San Franciscans thought neighborhood resistance and opposition to UCSF institutional expansion had a positive value because it forced UCSF to do more than it normally would, to protect residents. This piece of information did not make its way into the newspaper accounts of the poll results.

Other Contributing Factors To UCSF's Credibility Problem

The University of California systemwide, current medicine practices, and scientific fraud all contribute to UCSF's credibility problem.

UC HAS A CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

Here are incidents that make citizens question UC activities.

UC's Lawrence laboratories at Berkeley and Livermore produced most of the 60,000 barrels of radioactive waste that was dumped 20 miles off San Francisco's coastline between 1946 and 1966. An EPA investigation revealed 25% of the barrels checked had broken open, a few years ago.

In 1950, a UC lab was involved in spraying over San Francisco an organism that is dangerous to elderly or debilitated people. Unknown to the public, the experiment was said to have caused at least one death.

UC, Hastings in the Tenderloin displaced 500 residents and has taken 300 low income housing units off the market.

UC's Livermore lab acknowledged in 1988 that the groundwater pollution, they caused, poses a potential public health risk, a
proposed incinerator may spew out toxic radioactive and hazardous wastes, and radioactive materials were released into the city sewage system for three days.

Growth control is becoming an important issue in several UC communities. Santa Cruz County and the cities of Berkeley and Santa Cruz last November passed ballot measures by over 70% of the vote which were directed at the UC campuses in those respective communities. Two were meant to limit UC campus growth and the other urged UC to follow local zoning and planning codes and pay a fee for public services the city was providing. If the same measures were placed on the San Francisco ballot, I firmly believe they would pass by large margins. These electoral responses were because of the poor relations the UC campuses had with their surrounding communities.

MEDICINE HAS A CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

Here are facts that make citizens question doctors, Medical Schools, and hospital practices.

In the 1960's American surgery rates were twice those of England—since then the surgery gap has widen.

American rates of frequency for coronary bypass is 28 times that of some countries in Europe. There are 6 times the number of coronary bypasses per capita in the United States when compared to England. Thirteen million women have undergone hysterectomies in the last 20 years in the U.S.—this is 19% of all females 15 years old or older. An American woman has 2 to 3 times the chance of having a hysterectomy as her counterpart in West Germany, France, or England. Twenty-four percent of births, in the U.S., are by Caesarean section and the rate is continuing to rise. 10,000 people a year, in the U.S., die because of anesthesia administration of which half are preventable.

One in ten patients would have lived had diagnosis been made correctly, according to a Northwestern University Medical School study.

In another study at a university hospital, 36% of patients had a treatment-caused disease. One-fourth of these cases were life-threatening or produced considerable disability. Two percent contributed to the death of the patient.

When psychiatrists from six countries tried to agree on which patients were dangerous, the overall agreement was under 50%, for three fourth of the cases reviewed.

Forty percent of hospital admissions may be unnecessary.

According to Joseph Califano, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, 25% of our health care costs or $150 billion are for things that are wasted and unnecessary. Dr. Robert Brook, a professor of medicine and public health at UCLA,
has shown that one-third of the procedures performed in some medical fields are unnecessary.

Treatment of choice in one country may be considered malpractice in another country. Doses of the same drug may vary drastically. Clinical signs receive different diagnoses. Doctors from different countries diagnose different causes of death even when shown identical information from death certificates. Within this country, different types of doctors treat the same illness differently. Physicians favor studies that suggest new types of treatments rather than studies that show current treatments are unnecessary. Misdiagnosis, unnecessary or incompetent surgery, errors in medication, and hospital infection rates are all problem areas. The medical profession has systematically allowed known incompetents to practice. People are dying in hospitals who could survive. Patients are being operated on who don't need to be. Unnecessary surgery is leading to unnecessary deaths. Hospitalization is often unnecessary and counterproductive.

Most people know of someone who has had a family member injured by medical services.

SCIENTISTS HAVE A CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

Fraud in scientific research has severely damaged the credibility of science and its practitioners. Here are some examples:

Robert Slutsky, a scientist with the University of California, San Diego, fabricated data and falsified his qualifications and 68 medical papers were judged to be questionably accurate.

Stephen Breuning, a scientist with the University of Pittsburgh, became the first scientist to have been prosecuted for falsification of scientific research recently. He pleaded guilty last September 19 to two counts of making false statements on grant applications.

Louis Keith, a Northwestern University professor, was indicted last March on charges of lying under oath and obstructing justice on behalf of the maker of the Dalkon Shield.

John Darsee, a researcher at Harvard Medical School, published articles that were based on contrived data.

The Health Care System In San Francisco

The health care delivery system in San Francisco has serious problems. San Francisco is overbuilt with hospital beds and medical facilities which drive up the cost of services. There are 19 hospitals in the City, 10 sit within a three mile area. About one-half the beds are empty. Children's has a 42% occupancy rate. French 37%. Marshall Hall 32%. Mount Zion 43%. Ralph K. Davies 33%. St. Francis 39%. St. Luke and St. Mary's 50%.

Medical costs are out of control. Nationally, health costs have
risen 50% in five years. $541 billion was spent for medical care in 1988. That is 11.5% of the gross national product, a bigger share than any other advanced country. Locally, we are pursuing a path that can only add to the inflation of health care costs.

Further institutional expansion of medical facilities in San Francisco will drive up the cost of medical services for consumers. Duplication of service, concentration of too many hospitals in one part of the city, the lack of cooperation between hospitals, and the large number of empty beds, is wasteful and increases cost unnecessarily.

Why should this system be rewarded with permission to continue to build in a saturated market? The growth at some point must stop.

Neighborhood Environmental Concerns

An alert, informed public is essential to prevent environmental problems.

Vigilance in the defense of the quality of life in our community is no vice. There are numerous examples where the lack of vigilance resulted in serious contamination.

Technology has drawbacks that can harm.

Near Niagara Falls, New York, 1,000 families were forced to move from their homes because of chemical contamination caused by the Occidental Chemical Corporation.

In Fernald, Ohio, a government plant for decades had radioactive emissions. The result has been a cancer cluster in the area.

In Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the nuclear reactor Three Mile Island released radioactive materials into the atmosphere. The clean-up of the accident will cost $1 billion, and the basement of the facility is expected to remain too radioactive for human beings to enter for three centuries.

In Hardeman County, Tennessee, residents found their water supply was contaminated with 12 chemicals including five known carcinogens from a chemical waste dump.

In Elizabeth, New Jersey, a dump site owned by Chemical Control exploded. 45,000 drums of illegally stored chemical waste burned for 10 hours, forcing the hospitalization of 66 people.

The nuclear-reactor accident at Chernobyl spewed radiation into the atmosphere for days and the effects on human health will continue to well into the next century. As a result of this disaster, 17,400 fatal cases of cancer throughout the Northern Hemisphere is expected according to the lastest evidence.

A Union Carbide pesticide plant had toxic gas escape and 2,500 nearby residents were killed on December 2, 1984.
These incidents are warnings to citizens to learn as much as possible about the potential hazards around them and act to remove them.

Research Facilities Can Cause Harm

In 1978, procedural lapses led to the escape of the smallpox virus from a university laboratory in England. Two people became sick, one died. Janet Parker, who worked in an anatomy laboratory near the smallpox laboratory at the University of Birmingham, died in September of that year from smallpox. She had infected her mother who recovered.

At Plum Island, New York in 1978, the foot and mouth virus escaped from a high security laboratory.

Academic chemistry labs have 10 to 100 times more accidents than industry, according to a recent survey by the Curry College in Milton, Mass.

These incidents indicate that citizen vigilance around research facilities is an imperative.

We are not anti-medicine, anti-technology, anti-progress, or anti-knowledge, but we are for responsible and accountable medicine, technology, and progress.

The search for knowledge should be conducted in such a way as to insure responsible and accountable conduct. Considerations of health and safety issues must also be addressed in the search for new knowledge.

The Neighborhood Movement: What We're About

The neighborhood movement gained strength by fighting for growth control, and growth control is the outcome of the battles over institutional expansion.

What is the background of this movement? What motivates neighborhood activists? What do we want?

After 15 years of neighborhood activism and participation in hundreds of neighborhood meetings throughout San Francisco, I can state unequivocally and without reservation that the neighborhood movement is overwhelmingly and primarily altruistic, protective of diversity, and grounded in a citywide perspective.

The neighborhood movement in San Francisco grew out of the civil rights, environmental, and anti-war movements. Equal rights, environmental protection, and questioning the government and other institutions are all a part of it.

Citizens have a right to be involved with the decisions that will affect their lives. Currently, citizens don't have enough of a
say. The residents who wish to have a greater role in public policy decisions are soldiers fighting in the neighborhood movement.

The neighborhood movement:
- fights to protect neighborhoods and the city as a whole from narrow, private, special interests that seek to exploit the city.
- struggles to preserve and improve the quality of life for the city's residents.
- represents the public interest.
- seeks to improve the lives of residents through non-paid volunteer efforts.
- works to protect the rich cultural diversity that made the city famous and unique.
- channels its energies into finding solutions to the tough urban problems we face as a great city, and
- seeks direct action, empowerment, and a brighter future for our children.

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN) embodies all of these positive attitudes and efforts. It's why we exist.

Neighborhood leaders and activists are volunteers who devote long, at times frustrating, hours working for and fighting for their families, neighbors, community, and city.

We often lose on important issues because City Hall continues to be overrunned with special interest lobbyists. We, however, will continue to work for a City Hall which will be responsive to the neighborhoods, and a City Hall which will be free of the narrow, self-serving, special interests that have dominated the city for too long.

The Battle Over San Francisco: A Citywide Perspective

Figuratively and literally for two decades, there has been a war going on in San Francisco between downtown/suburban special interests and neighborhood/resident public interests. The conflict has resulted in refugees, injuries, and fatalities through large scale development, demolition, displacement, and degradation of the urban environment. Those most vulnerable—low, moderate, and middle income households, families, minorities, displacees, the elderly, and homeless—have been hurt the most.

One side, the growth control advocates in the neighborhoods, seek to preserve the quality of life, our heritage, and cultural diversity. The other side, the pro-growth downtown forces, seek profit, subsidy, and less of the tax burden while harming the urban environment, corrupting the political process, ignoring our heritage, and pushing to decrease diversity.

The continuing battle is over the future direction of the city, who will be able to afford to live here, what kind of city our
children will inherit from us, and which side will control the political agenda and public policy.

Growth is the major issue.

Growth has created social, economic, fiscal, political, and environmental inequities.

The amount of downtown highrise office space has grown to 75 million square feet, while the size of the city's residential housing stock has remained virtually unchanged. The size of government has increased to serve the ever-expanding downtown area while the neighborhoods face cutbacks and neglect. Eight million tourists visit the city each year. Our weekday population swells from 750,000 to 1.2 million because of non-resident commuters and visitors.

Low, moderate, and middle income individuals and families are being priced out of their homes, neighborhoods, and the city itself by the highest housing costs in the nation which are driven by the escalating competition for housing generated by runaway growth.

In 1986, there were 27,000 evictions. According to one study, 8,000 residents are being displaced and pushed out of the city by the high cost of living and the high cost of housing each year.

Between 1978 and 1986, 55,000 net new jobs were created in the city, many of which went to non-residents. Forty percent of our workforce currently live outside the city.

The public sector has stimulated, regulated, and subsidized downtown growth at the expense of the neighborhoods.

City Hall has been a captive of downtown special interests and our neighborhoods have been neglected.

The urban problems we face today -- clogged congestion on our streets, high housing costs, lengthening commutes, overcrowding, displacement of people and small neighborhood serving businesses, frustration over the inability to park, shop, or find affordable housing in our neighborhoods, deterioration of the quality of life, homelessness, fiscal instability, neglect of the infrastructure, and rapid environmental changes -- are all the result of too much growth and a lack of growth management.

We are working to turn this around. For 20 years, there has been a downtown first policy at City Hall. We hope to change this to a neighborhood first policy as soon as possible.

Recommendations To UCSF

1. Absorb underutilized existing medical facilities instead of converting space that was not previously used as medical or research facilities.
2. Build on-campus housing for your students. Forty percent of the students and 20% of the faculty and staff live within a one mile radius of the UCSF campus which increases the demand for housing. Only 10% of the students live on campus.

3. Follow all local zoning, land use, planning, and health and safety regulations. Be a good neighbor.

4. Make payments-in-lieu of taxes for public services provided to the campus by the city.

5. Prepare a comprehensive annual report on the status of the institution which includes all efforts to mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding communities wherever UCSF has facilities and then provide a copy of this report to each neighborhood organization in the city.

6. Find an alternative site for the School of Pharmacy perhaps French Hospital would be appropriate.

7. Shift the focus of UCSF's public relations. Don't try to make certain that which is not. Disclose information quickly.

8. Full, free, easy, and continuous public disclosure of information should occur.

9. Place two community representatives on each committee that deals with health, safety, and human research and who can report back to neighborhood and environmental organizations.

10. Create systems to make public accountability and public participation in oversight possible. Accountability systems should be unequivocally and securely under public control. Doctors and scientists are less likely to go too far if they know they are accountable to effective oversight bodies.

11. Disclose outside financial interests for the facility and faculty.

12. Have an annual community meeting to review the 1976 growth control limitations, so the public knows the current status of compliance.

13. Deviation from the UCSF Long Range Development Plan should not occur.

14. Avoid pronouncements on the cancer cluster in Noe Valley until all the evidence is in. Efforts to downplay the current evidence is self-serving and counterproductive.

15. Select a new environmental assessment consultant which both campus and community leaders accept.

16. Encourage neighborhood organizations to send representatives
to Campus Planning Committee meetings. Broaden the scope of issues that are reviewed by the committee and allow motions or recommendations that are adopted democratically to be forwarded to the Chancellor for consideration and review.

17. Co-sponsor with the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods a conference on environmental issues confronting the city.

Conclusion

Cooperation between the campus and the community is possible but the university needs to turn over a new leaf.
QUESTIONS OF JOEL VENTRESCA

WILLIAM K. HAMILTON:

I'd like to see a little discussion of this. I think that we should bear in mind that it's not our position here to convert or otherwise alter Mr. Ventresca at all, but to get further explanations and further comments about the ideas that he's presented. So, Joel, if you would come and let people ask some questions.

PETER RALSTON:

I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Peter Ralston, and I saw you before tonight at the Sierra Club meeting. I don't pretend to speak for anybody here but myself. I'm a native San Franciscan who grew up in the very neighborhood in which you now live, and I know that neighborhood very well. I presently live in the southwest part of the city. I absolutely agree that there must be a good working dialogue between the University and the community. We are the community as much as we are the University. There are 10,000 of us who work at UC who live in San Francisco, so we are not foreigners. We are San Franciscans. I'm a member of my own neighborhood association. My parents have been a member of the Edgewood Avenue Neighborhood Association for some forty years.

What I'm concerned about is the sort of position which you present, that it is such a mixed bag, that I'm worried that it will impair dialogue. Many of the issues that you raised are real ones -- the character of the buildings on the site, the way they front directly on Parnassus rather than being set back, that sort of thing. I think few of us who, of course, came for the most part, to UCSF long after those buildings were built, would defend this. The one building actually which is the nicest building is the Dental School building as far as the way it follows the contour.

I also agree that there are many important issues which you rightfully raise as issues of concern to the community; however, amidst these are suggestions which I find impair that dialogue. To suggest, for instance, that the ethnic diversity of the neighborhood has changed because of UCSF, truly offends me. UCSF is a leader in recruiting staff and students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. We are one of the major institutions in the United States with diverse ethnic student bodies and staff. You probably know we are the largest employer of ethnic minorities in the city, and as you just mentioned many of
our people live right in the neighborhood, so I cannot agree that that's a justifiable position.

To suggest, talking to this group especially, but also to neighborhood groups as I know occurs, about issues concerning biotechnology and then at the same time talk about Chernobyl, chemical plants that pour waste into the ground, Three-Mile Island, I think is scare tactics. And that blocks dialogue. As you know, the Supreme Court of the State of California in its recent decision made the very important finding that what goes on in health science centers exemplified by UCSF is fundamentally safe. We're not perfect by any means, and nobody here would pretend that we're perfect, but to suggest that what we're doing is inherently dangerous to the community, in the same phraseology as when you are talking about Chernobyl, does not help develop a dialogue that is useful. It just scares people who aren't knowledgeable about what goes on. So that impairs the ability to talk.

To say that somehow we're intent upon gathering a Presidio -- I actually made the statement at the meeting which you referred to, in February, concerning the Presidio. My statement was that suggestions that we were about to clear-cut the Presidio were premature, because suggestions of that had cropped up in some meeting. And, of course, the one institution which might be remotely interested in the Presidio would be the hospital. You've just been talking about trying to use existing facilities. It's very unlikely we'd even be interested in the hospital because it does not meet seismic safety standards, and of course the whole rest of the Presidio is under the GGNRA, by Federal legislation. So that again, I think, is an example of a scare tactic which blocks dialogue.

To talk about biotechnology as potentially doing great harm -- it also has the potential for doing great good. And the people here are concerned with the quality of human life and doing great good for our community. And every aspect of the discussion was negative. I didn't expect you, by any means, to come and pat us on the back. We spend quite a bit of time patting ourselves on the back. But we are quite aware, as San Franciscans, of problems, and if you've identified problems, that's fine. To identify ways in which you think those problems should be approached is fine. And then we can sit down and discuss things.

However, what I do ask you to do is not use the sort of scare tactics which have been used. You recently referred to this thing about the cancer cluster in Noe Valley -- it's fine to ask us not to talk about it until the facts are in. You should also talk to some of your colleagues who go and talk about poisoning people in Noe Valley, when many of us here live in Noe Valley, and we know what the facts are. So it's a two-way street, and I think for you to be credible as a representative of the neighborhoods -- the representative of some aspects of some of the neighborhood associations, because I recognize, being a member of a neighborhood association, that it can be dominated by a small faction of people that have a particular ax to grind; some for the better, some for the worse, but that does occur -- you have to maintain your credibility. And I think,
taking some of the positions you did tonight harms your credibility in the same way you say our credibility is harmed, which again, impairs our dialogue. And so for a decent dialogue we have to have open and reasonable representation.

To suggest that we're doing Department of Defense work and saying that we're not, is not true. We say we do not do classified research. We do not do classified research. We have Department of Defense contracts and the Department of Defense now is funding pre-doctoral fellowships. We are asking our students to apply for them. They will not be doing any sort of classified, militarily-related research if they happen to be on a fellowship. We do not do classified research. That's what we say. We do not say we don't have DOD contracts. So I think we've got to be open and honest.

There are real issues. But we are citizens of San Francisco, just as you are. We are concerned about San Francisco, just as you are. We have different views, but we must present those honestly and not blurred by bringing in a lot of other things which only scare people and have nothing to do with the fundamental issue at hand.

WKH:

Do you wish to reply?

VENTRESCA:

I'm keeping a list. Why don't I wait until there's other comments.

Phil Lee:

I'm Phil Lee and I live on Dewey Boulevard. For the last four years I've been president of the Health Commission, and one of the things we've tried to do during that four years with public hearings every two weeks, is to involve neighborhoods and others with special interests. I would say we've been singularly unsuccessful in getting the non-interest groups involved in those discussions with respect to mental health, drug abuse, environmental health, and a range of issues. And I would hope that through the Coalition, where there are committees that have this interest, and particularly since Art Agnos was elected, to achieve that kind of participatory dialogue at public hearings.

Certainly with respect to the Department of Health -- of course UC makes the major contribution through San Francisco General, not only through the medical services, inpatient, outpatient, emergency room, but working with various other neighborhood clinics and providing support services for those clinics -- I think that there's a lot to be done, beyond just a focus on growth. There are lots of services, there are lots of needs,
and the faculty and staff of UC -- not just on the Parnassus campus -- make major contributions to the community and, I think, would welcome more communication and more open channels with the neighborhood groups.

One of the rare examples of neighborhood participation occurred in a recent hearing, when the commission decided to delay action on location of the Walden House Day Care facility in the Mission. What the ultimate decision will be remains to be seen, but the commission was very anxious to have full neighborhood participation. And I think there are other opportunities for the kind of constructive dialogue that Dr. Ralston talked about.

Bill Eisenberg:

I'm Bill Eisenberg. I live in Noe Valley, also. I had dinner the other evening with friends and neighbors of mine in Noe Valley, and mentioned that I was coming to this conference. We were talking about the University and the community, and an observation made by a neighbor of mine was, "How much do you think the community associations respond to the position of the University the way they do, because they know you'll take it to heart and have meetings like this to talk about it, whereas City Hall, when they want to grow, will just legislate what they want and do what they want. And they know that you're somebody who will, at least, take some interest and think about it and look at both sides, and maybe be an easier mark." And I thought that was a rather insightful comment, that we at least talk about it and think about it, and City Hall doesn't, and you can lash out at us and maybe win some victories and that looks good. I just wonder if that's a possibility.

Another thing that came up at this same meeting was, How much do you want to get as many members of the community involved in your groups -- do you actively go out and solicit input from everybody or do you just try and get people who are sympathetic to your causes? None of us in my neighborhood have ever been contacted by anybody from the Noe Valley citizen's group. And there were eight people at dinner, all living on different blocks. We actively went to that group and said that we would like to be members of it, and we didn't get any further calls from it, -- no return phone calls were made, no letters were sent out to us. And I just wonder how much response there is to people who want to become involved.

WKH:

Further comments, questions? Joel?
VENTRESCA:

I'll try to go through the list as they were raised. There's no doubt that minority representation on the staff at UCSF is excellent, and you surpass, probably, any other institution in San Francisco in regards to Affirmative Action and equal employment hiring. So I don't think there's any disagreement over that. I think that UCSF could be used as a model, and other hospitals could learn from UCSF on how they go about recruiting minorities from the population.

In terms of scare tactics, I went through a list of real incidents that happened. I didn't make them up, they weren't a figment of my imagination. Almost all of those incidents, if you dig into them, you find, not only criminal negligence on the part of the corporate entity involved -- you'll also find it in government, in health departments which went and did testing and monitoring and assured the neighbors that everything was ok, and another decade would go by and then the problems would get worse, the complaints would pile up, and then eventually they'd look closer and they'd find the problem. The point I was trying to make was that I think the 1980s and the 1990s are going see the development of a better educated, more sophisticated citizen in urban settings, and that's because they're learning about what has happened in other communities. And people are going to ask questions, question authority, find out what's going on in their environment around them and if there are any hazards, any potential for hazards, then they are going to be examined, and people are not going to wait so long or be so apathetic. They are going to be assertive and aggressive and they are going to seek answers to their questions. And bureaucrats in government, or health professionals or scientists, who are not cooperative are going to be gone around, and we'll go to a higher person -- we'll go to the person's supervisor, we'll get petitions, we'll keep examining the evidence, keep sifting through it to try to find the cause of some of these problems. And all these incidents keep piling up, and the thing that's underlying all of them is that there was not enough vigilance when problems were first identified, and people thought that the problem that they were experiencing was in isolation and they did not know that there was a problem for their neighbors, as well. And when they got together and they learned that they had similar problems, it led back to the environmental cause of the harm. So...I don't see anything the matter with that. I just think that people are becoming more knowledgeable and will ask more questions.

In terms of the Presidio -- the Presidio came up because of your internal operations at UCSF. You issued a report, and said you wanted a second campus of 50 to 100 acres within 15 minutes of your site. Well, fifteen minutes from your site means in San Francisco. This turned heads. People were concerned. Which neighborhood would be next? To be confronted with an out-of-scale, large-scale expansion by UCSF, based on the history which we reviewed a few minutes ago? And interested citizens attended the meeting that you were at and heard discussions of the Presidio, which is 15 minutes from UCSF. So I don't think we can fault neighborhood activists for having deductive reasoning. I also think that you can't ignore the fact that the Chronicle and the
Examiner have made reference to it. Where does that come from? It comes from your University. You present the issues that the Chronicle and the Examiner write about. So there was an editorial in the Sunday paper a few weeks ago, where it clearly spelled out that the University of California, San Francisco might expand into the Presidio. Fact or fiction? I don't know. But it makes one wonder. But we acted appropriately. We passed a motion -- whether it's fact or fiction, we didn't care -- our coalition passed a motion saying that we would oppose that, if that ever came into reality. If that ever became a proposal and you pursued it, we would fight you on it. And we were telegraphing you. I think we did you a service.

In terms of classified work, I think that whole discussion was double-talk. You have Defense Department research going on, financed by the Department of Research (sic) - - it should be disclosed, and the types of experiments that are occurring should be disclosed. Neighborhood residents do not -- should not have to jump through hoops to get that information. Disclose it. A lot of the problems that UCSF has had is because information is difficult to get. Information is given out piecemeal. Information is not accurately reflected when all the evidence comes out. This does a disservice to your institution and it creates the credibility gap that we talked about earlier.

In terms of having neighborhood activists more involved with city boards and commissions -- it's an excellent idea and we're moving in that direction. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, in this past year, set up ten standing committees which include all the major issues in San Francisco -- housing, transportation, safety, large-scale development, government, and other issues. So we have committees working in these various areas, in many cases, for the first time. We have been focused in the last decade on land use issues and we have not gotten involved with other issues. That's changing. We are multi-issue, we are tackling these other issues and we have our plate full, and we're looking at all the urban problems that exist in San Francisco, and we want to make a contribution in finding solutions to those problems. And that effort is going to continue to expand in the future.

In terms of neighborhood participation in City Hall affairs, there have been difficulties with that. We do not have the level of participation that we would like to have at this point. Only a handful of neighborhood activists have been appointed to city boards and commissions. There are over 230 such appointed positions in the city. There are 26 city boards and commissions. Hopefully, that will change.

In terms of how does the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods make its decisions? The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, as I said earlier, is made up of fifty neighborhood organizations, including all the largest ones in the city. It's seventeen years old. It meets monthly, sends out a newsletter to all of the neighborhood activists. We have a mailing list of 250 which goes to the activists throughout the city. When issues are introduced, we go through a very open, democratic, participatory process, and this is how we do it. In our monthly meetings, any member organization, or any of our
standing committees can introduce a motion. Once a motion is introduced it is referred to a standing committee for review. Then the standing committee brings it back to the full congress, at the next monthly meeting or at some future meeting, and then we hear a committee report, and articles, pro and con, have been presented in the newsletter, and people have participated in the discussion at the point of introduction and at the point that we vote on the measure. And we have a very difficult process to get a motion passed. And that's called a two-pronged test. The first test is you have to have a majority vote on the floor of the congress. Two, you have to have at least a third of the membership of the organizations voting for the motion. This means, in reality, that substantial consensus is required before a motion can be adopted, a process which is open and democratic and participatory is gone through before the motion is adopted.

And in my six years experience with this organization, we have yet to reverse a decision once we've taken it because we don't take the position until there is substantial consensus for it. If it's a minority view it doesn't get passed, it's not adopted, we don't advocate it. I'm involved in many organizations in San Francisco and I think this organization is the most open, democratic and participatory in the city. Because there are so many checks and balances and there are so many hurdles that have to be jumped over in order to help build the substantial consensus. And it's the only one, and everybody wants to participate in it. We've expanded our membership by a third in the past year and I anticipate that we'll see the same kind of growth in our membership until we represent all neighborhood organizations in the city. There are approximately 200 neighborhood organizations. We have 50 and we're continuing to grow.

In terms of the Noe Valley issue, the Noe Valley group that you mentioned is not a committee of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, so I would suggest that you re-contact that group and ask to participate. The Noe Valley group looking at the cancer cluster is not an entity of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. The Friends of Noe Valley has yet to bring any motion or any report from their neighborhood organization to our congress yet. They may, but they haven't yet. Usually things percolate within a given neighborhood, and if it has a city-wide implication, then that issue is brought to the city-wide congress and then it's reviewed and we take a position if it's appropriate. And I think we are in the initial stages on this issue so I don't know if that issue will come before the full congress or not. It's up to the Friends of Noe Valley to make a determination of whether they want to bring the issue to the congress.

Are there any other issues? I think I hit everything -- did I miss anything?

WKH:
I don’t think so, I think you covered that well. I think that we have accomplished what we set out to do. The idea was to bring somebody here to talk to us so that we could maybe see us as others see us. There is a specific comment that has been made about the San Francisco Chronicle. Maybe the City Editor would like to respond to that. As usual, we’ll give the press the last word.

DAN ROSENHEIM:

Well, I do want to make just one comment. I’m Dan Rosenheim and I’m City Editor of the Chronicle. For the record, I don’t know what plans UCSF may or may not have with regard to the Presidio, and for the record I don’t know the origin of any speculation that may have appeared in editorials or news stories in either the Chronicle or the Examiner on that topic. The only point I’d like to make is talking to you about drawing a conclusion, that because such speculation appears in the newspaper, UCSF must be somehow the source.

If, for example, in the case of editorials in our paper about the intentions, the future course of action of Art Agnos, you were to draw the conclusion that Art Agnos must somehow be planning that, or be giving us that information, I suspect that Art Agnos might be highly offended, particularly given the nature of the content of some of our editorials. So I think it’s unwise to draw the conclusion that (and I repeat my ignorance of UCSF’s plans; but because the media along with so many other people, are speculating about possible uses for the Presidio) somehow this reflects some real undertaking that UCSF is involved in.

I have two other questions for you, and they’re kind of academic ones, but I gather that that’s ok tonight. They’re academic in the sense that they don’t bear directly on UCSF, but I’m just curious about your views on these two things. One is that it seems to me that a big dimension of the growth debate in San Francisco has involved high-rises, and you’ve mentioned high-rises a number of times at the beginning of your remarks tonight. I was talking to a reporter on the staff the other day, Frank Diviano, who has been interested in talking to a number of people who are grappling with how we might approach a number of our problems on a more regional scale and he mentioned to me that there’s a surprising concurrence among groups that have been identified as pro-growth and some groups that have been identified as slow-growth or anti-growth, that a solution to the housing and transportation problems in the Bay Area, may indeed lie in building up, that there may, indeed, be no other solution to the search for affordable housing, other than clustered housing that’s built up in some sensible, reasonable way. Now I can’t identify to you what slow-growth or no-growth groups thought that, but he thought it was an unusual and surprising meeting of the minds on that issue, and I’m just curious whether there are groups that feel that way, whether there’s a growth trend in that direction, whether you consider it silly or whether it might make some kind of sense to you.
And the second question is, you mentioned that City Hall has been dominated by downtown for 20 years, and I'm just curious whether you think City Hall under the Agnos administration is still dominated by downtown or whether there's been some kind of change about this.

WKH:

Very fine. Joel?

VENTRESCA:

There were actually three issues, the first one being the Presidio. Dr. Ralston, at a February 18, 1988, meeting is the first indication that our group had that the Presidio was being considered for UCSF expansion -- proposal; also with the fact of the report which was put out by the Chancellor's office. It was very clear that we were talking about 50 to 100 acres within fifteen minutes -- so based on that comment at a public meeting, our organization reviewed the issue and took a position. We also obtained a copy of the Faculty Report and reviewed that as well. It was not reassuring to us. Subsequent to that, subsequent to our action is when the newspaper accounts have continued to talk about it, in unsigned editorials in the Chronicle.

The second issue, the growth debate and that there may be a possibility that there is consensus on building high-rise housing in San Francisco. That's ridiculous. That is not true. The growth control movement in San Francisco, for two decades, through six ballot measures has been fighting the Manhattanization of San Francisco. Manhattanization means dense buildings, it means a lot of people in a small area, it means the quality of life deteriorates. We don't want Manhattan. We don't want high-rise housing buildings in San Francisco. We have pushed and City Hall has accepted this, which is quite a relief. The entire city of San Francisco, to a large extent, has been downzoned, meaning it had a high zoning which would have allowed tall buildings to be built, but we went to the planning commission and the Board of Supervisors and we reduced the zoning so that it would basically prohibit high-rises in the neighborhoods of San Francisco. The first neighborhood in San Francisco to downzone as a result of runaway growth was the Haight Ashbury, which is right next to UCSF. It's no accident. As soon as the Haight Ashbury, in the early 70s, downzoned, other neighborhoods followed suit. Pretty much at this point most neighborhoods of San Francisco have been downzoned to prevent high-rises from being constructed.

In terms of regional cooperation on other issues, I think there is consensus. I think regional solutions to air pollution, transportation, a port authority -- I think there is a building consensus throughout the region and in San Francisco, that there are a number
of issues that would be better addressed at a regional level -- airports, ports, transportation, environment issues, especially those environmental issues that affect all of us in the region that live there. I think down the road, that the growth control movement, and what that means and how that's interpreted in the various counties and cities in the region will also be subject to perhaps a regional effort in some areas.

Ok, the last issue. Is City Hall dominated -- or is City Hall more responsive to the neighborhoods now than it was the year before? I lose sleep over this question. I keep asking myself that. Our organization has repeatedly made overtures on the phone and in writing to the Mayor's office requesting a meeting so that we could come and talk to him about the issues that we're concerned about. We have yet to meet with him. We had annual meetings with Diane Feinstein, which is a constant irony to me. Art Agnos was elected using the rhetoric of being pro-neighborhood. He has taken a number of steps in the last year which have been good for neighborhoods, but he has taken a number of steps which are not good, for example, setting up a task-force on demolition and having the meetings closed. That was not a positive approach. City Hall needs to be open to neighborhood participation. Neighborhood leaders and representatives need to participate in the decision-making process in City Hall. Neighborhood activists need to be on city boards and commissions, and a vital part of that process. Citizens need to be involved with the decisions that affect their lives. I think incrementally we're moving in the right direction, but there are a number of problem areas, and hopefully those can be addressed and we can continue to try to make City Hall more responsive. But we had meetings with Diane Feinstein and we have yet to have a single meeting with Art Agnos.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

One thing that was sort brought up by Pete Ralston and other people getting back to this thing about Chernobyl. I think what affects a lot of us in these discussions is -- I guess the best way to put it is magnitude, in the sense of comparing Chernobyl to what we do, I think, is a vast difference in the magnitude of the problem or even in the risk of the problem. While I appreciate the point you are making, we should be concerned about this as well. There is also a very big difference in terms of the kinds of risks. What really brings this point home to me is a meeting that I didn't attend but was reported to me where, I guess it was the Sierra Club meeting, where somebody from some neighborhood group said something about how one atom of a radioactive isotope of phosphorus could kill a person. And there were snickers among some of the professors who were there. And it really underscores something that I think is an important point which is that to us that's funny, and it shouldn't be funny because we don't necessarily appreciate how much knowledge lay people have about what we do. We work with that isotope routinely and we don't think of it as a major danger to us because we know something about the activity and we know the likelihood of something like that actually harming us. And I guess what I'm
trying to determine is whether the neighborhood councils appreciate the differences in magnitude like the differences between Chernobyl and UCSF. Do you feel there is room for more education in that area? What do you think is the best way for us to do that kind of education if there is a misunderstanding about that sort of thing?

VENTRESCA:

Well, the point I was trying to make was that because of these accidents that have occurred, it's created more vigilance on the part of residents in San Francisco. I think there is a clear difference in perception of risk. Risk assessment and how you do it, and how you present the evidence is, I really think, a novel field, based on what I've read about it in terms of Prop. 65, which was passed a few years ago, and how that's being implemented and the state regulations that are coming out and lists of carcinogenic chemicals as well as the list of other substances that are suspected to be carcinogenic - and we have research going on in that process. I mean, last week the State just released a list of three hundred chemicals, approximately, that are cancer-causing. And the State, every year, is going to update that list. It's important to be careful where those chemicals are used and we have to be careful about the quantities that they're kept in, and where they're kept. And that kind of vigilance I think is going to continue.

WKH:

Joel, I think a direct question was asked, I believe, that at least I haven't heard the answer to, and that is that there is some real discrepancy between what is known by a group of knowledgeable people, be it the risk from one atom of a radioactive -- from the comment that was made from ____________ that was made by the member of the neighborhood group that was at that meeting...

VENTRESCA: Ok.....

WKH:

Let me just ask, is there room for benefit from some education?

VENTRESCA:

Right. I think when people make statements that are not accurate, they should be immediately corrected, in a friendly way. I mean, if I make any misstatements and
someone tells me about it and shows me that that's wrong I don't repeat the statement. I don't -- once I learn -- once I make a mistake I learn from it and I don't repeat it.

SCHMID:

Excuse me, where did you get the 15 minute distance?

VENTRESCA:

It's in the Faculty Report.

SCHMID:

Fifteen minutes?

VENTRESCA:

Fifteen to twenty minutes. Quote, unquote. I think it's 15 dash 20, unquote. But I think if we could have a greater dialogue between scientists and the public, I think we would all benefit by it. I think the key to that process must be that when dialogue occurs, no matter what the educational level or experience of someone, every person who participates in the discussion should be treated with dignity and respect. Because once you have a group process, and everyone feels that they are treated with dignity and respect, a lot of good information comes out and the result is informed decision-making - - better decisions are made, and people feel better about the decisions.

WKH: Thank you, Joel.
I never used to think much about medical schools or hospitals but in the last week I’ve suddenly become one of your biggest fans...

The other day, while I was trying to figure out what I wanted to say to you this morning, I went for a stroll in an alley behind my house. This was in pre-crutches time. As I was walking I noticed a mother cat standing by a garage door with two teeny kittens. The kittens were so small, it seemed obvious that the mother was taking them on their maiden walk out in the Big World.

While I was watching, I suddenly noticed a big mongrel dog come strolling around the corner and head straight for the cats. The mother cat noticed too, and she backed her kittens up against the garage door, and stood in front of them with her back arched.

The dog kept coming straight at the cats, and when he was only a foot away, the mother cat suddenly stuck her face into his and went: Bow! Wow! Wow!

The pit bull was so frightened by this that he turned on his heels and ran, at which point the mother cat turned to her kittens and said: "Children, There is a lesson in this - never underestimate the importance of a second language."

Well, instead of second languages, I actually think what’s useful about a retreat like this - and about your decision to include folks like myself in it - is that it gives us an opportunity to make sure we’re all speaking the SAME language - that we share basically the same perceptions about, in this case, UCSF and its relationship with the community - or that, if our perceptions are different, we acknowledge the fact and perhaps examine why.

I’ve been asked - repeatedly - to speak as candidly as I
can, and I will do so. And I suspect I don’t need to encourage you to speak as candidly as YOU can in the question and answer period about what you think of the press coverage UCSF gets.

I’d like to begin by making four assertions about the university’s relationship to the community and then try to back up those assertions by filling in the view of your institution as it appears from the city desk of the San Francisco Chronicle.

The four conclusions - and I’ve resisted the temptation to expand them to 17 for competitive reasons following last night’s talk - the four conclusions I’ve reached are:

1. Your community relations are less than perfect; in fact, it seems to me you’ve got a real problem with the way in which you are perceived.

2. You should care about this. You may think your mission is teaching medicine and practicing medicine and doing research and that you shouldn’t have to worry about politics. But as you have discovered, above all, in the case of Laurel Heights, bad PR can be a big obstacle to fulfilling your mission and maintaining a vital, first-rate institution.

3. The problem is by no means all your fault. You are, in many respects, a victim of the times. AND

4. The problem in some respects IS your fault and there may be some steps you could take to improve matters.

So let’s start with 1. The fact that you have a problem with the way you are perceived.

The most obvious manifestation of this problem is in the bitter controversies that have surfaced over the university’s expansion plans, starting with the dental school debate of the 1970s and continuing through this day.

But I think that debate reflects in part a deeper, more fundamental difficulty facing UCSF and that is that most people - in this community and elsewhere - don’t really
understand as well as they should who you are and what you do. As incredible as it seems, they have very little idea of what kind of institution UCSF is and how many you employ, not to mention the nature and scope and caliber of your work.

People really don't seem to know the difference between SF State and UCSF and USF.

I talked to one of the top management people at The Chronicle - I guess that's not necessarily a guarantee of being well-informed - about the topic for your retreat - he's a man who grew up in San Francisco, in the West Portal area - and his comment was: "I've always had the impression it's just a hospital up on a hill. They also show some pretty good movies up there and they have a swimming pool."

The pool, by the way, I consider very important, since both of my kids take their swimming lessons in it.

It seems to me you have this problem both nationally and locally. Medical schools, almost by definition, tend not to be particularly famous institutions. Beyond Johns Hopkins and Harvard and Mayo, I don't think the average person is familiar even with the names of most medical schools.

But it seems to me that the work of UCSF is sufficiently distinguished in many areas that it really ought to enjoy a better reputation than it does among reasonably educated people who may not have much to do with medicine.

This is not to fault your press relations on scientific matters. We all love Michelle Reichman. There isn't a major biomedical science writer in the country - and I'm thinking of people like Harold Schmeck at the NY Times or Christine Russell when she was at the Washington Post - who doesn't recognize and write about the work you do, and I know that programs like Nova draw heavily on your expertise.

But - and I'm not sure how you solve this - programs and stories like these are directed at a relatively small part of the national population, and for one reason or another they don't seem to have created the broader awareness that it seems to me your school might expect.
Just two examples. If you discuss AIDS with people outside the Bay Area, it's often likely that they will be familiar with San Francisco's pioneering efforts to cope with the epidemic. The San Francisco model is held up in cities across the nation. Likewise, San Francisco General Hospital is famous for the quality of the care it provides to AIDS patients - a level of treatment that probably surpasses any other American medical institution. Yet, despite your close ties to SF General and despite the groundbreaking research into the disease performed there and at your school, the name of UCSF comes to mind among only the most knowledgeable.

Likewise, in the field we've come to know as biotechnology... I don't have to tell you that UCSF is arguably the preeminent institution in the world - the source of many of the discoveries that are fueling the startup industry of genetic engineering. Yet, when you ask people about biotech, they think of Chiron and Genentech, Cetus and Xoma, rather than the academic institution that provided those companies with their founders and scientific impetus.

Maybe this is more a comment on my ignorance than I'd like it to be, but if someone had mentioned UCSF to me before I moved here four years ago, I would have thought they meant the school that guy Hayakawa used to run.

Part of this, I think is a function of being both part of and distinct from UC Berkeley. You not only don't have a football team, you don't even have an animal name: you aren't Cardinals or Gators or Nittany Lions.

Now perhaps you're sufficiently well known nationally among those who count - research scientists and doctors and alumni and prospective students - that the perceptions of an erstwhile Chicago journalist like myself don't make much of a difference.

But where the failure to be understood really hurts you, it seems to me, is at the local level. I don't think most people in the Bay Area have any idea that you're San Francisco's second largest employer. :: don't think they understand the
significance of the research you do. I think they see San Francisco General as 'the county hospital' and have no idea where the doctors come from.

But beyond that I have the impression - and it's just an impression - that people don't have the sort of intangible feel for UCSF that they have for some other big institutions in our midst. This is a hard thing to define, and even harder to prove. But my sense is that when you mention The Bank of America to people, or Pacific Bell, or Stanford, or the Presidio Military Base, they have a better intuitive sense of what goes on in those places than they have for your school.

I'm not sure why that is. One doctor at Mt Zion hospital said to me recently that UCSF has never been very community oriented. He said you have lots of glossy literature on who you are, but you don't have a tradition of being in the blood of the city.

'When I see them trying to engage the community in a milieu of suspicion and distrust,' my friend said, 'I can't help but feel they are hampered by a lack of history of having strong community ties.'

That may be grossly unfair. You may be much more and do much more than you're given credit for. But the perception that you are just The Tower on the Hill is a widely held one and it seems to me that one of the purposes of a meeting like this is to ask yourselves why.

Point 2. Does-it-matter? - yes-it-does is, I think, not difficult to support. You NEED to be concerned with your image and your relations with the outside world and, I would add, those of us who believe that a healthy UCSF is vital to the city, also ought to be concerned.

Laurel Heights is, of course, the premiere example. Four years after you bought the Fireman's Fund building, important work that you had planned for that facility has been brought to a virtual standstill. You are spending enormous amounts of time and money on protracted litigation and public relations efforts.

And yet it seems to me that Laurel Heights is merely the
opening, inauspicious test of the university’s ability to grow with the time.

I don’t pretend to have any inside knowledge of your future expansion plans.

But it seems obvious to me that you are going to need more room if you are to remain the kind of dynamic, first-rate institution that you have been.

Your own faculty future committee report last spring recommended the acquisition of additional clinical facilities - which I assume the Mt. Zion merger helps accomplish - and it also favors obtaining up to 100 new acres to develop as a major campus site.

Two years ago, when I was working on a series of stories on biotechnology, I spent some time interviewing people in your labs. As someone whose education has been fearsomely restricted to the Humanities, I confess I’m not sure what science labs normally look like, but yours looked kind of cramped.

In the series he wrote for the San Francisco Examiner nearly two years ago, reported Eric Best cited UCSF ‘‘deans’’ - maybe some of you? - as saying that talented researchers were already being wooed away by competitors with more space to offer. And those same deans expressed fears that UCSF’s competitive edge would go along with the talent.

Then, there’s the biosciences center that has yet to come to pass, but which has been much talked about in recent years by your chancellor and others.

I suppose that if I were in your shoes, I’d be casting a hungry eye at some of the Presidio property like Letterman right now, and maybe at some of the land around Oyster Point or Hunters Point or Mount Zion Hospital, with an eye to future expansion. And I’m sure the appropriate planners at your school are doing just that.

But can you imagine how important good community relations - a squeaky clean reputation not only for distinguished work
but for candor - is going to be for any institution that wants to bargain for as emotion-laden and magnificent a piece of property as the Presidio?

The critical role of public perceptions can be painfully obvious when you work at a place that is still widely referred to as The Comical. You think you have image problems!

I work at a newspaper that I think has undergone considerable improvement in recent years and is, I think, a far better paper than generally believed. That gap between perception and reality can be hard to swallow on the level of personal pride, but it also has some big practical implications. When it comes to recruiting talented staff members or developing good sources or expanding circulation and advertising, perceptions of a newspaper's caliber are critical, and I know the same goes for academic institutions.

My third point is that sticky relations with the surrounding community certainly are not all - or even mostly - of your own making.

When I moved to San Francisco from Chicago in 1985, one of the biggest changes I noticed - other than, I'm sorry to say, the quality of the football - was a difference in the key issues that seem to be confronting the two cities.

In Chicago, it is the issue of race that seems to be part of virtually every issue of policy that comes along. The city's population is roughly half black and half white, and as with so many American cities, race relations are quite strained. So whether you're talking about politics, or employment, or education, or health care, or housing ... the issue of race is inevitably pre eminent.

In Northern California, I would submit, the equivalent of race in Chicago is the issue of growth.

Growth - and how to regulate it - has become an issue in other parts of the country but, as with our regulation of gasoline emissions and our toxics-labelling proposition 65, the growth debate is more intense and more advanced in
If you think of some of the major controversies that have occurred in this area during the last few years, virtually all of them revolved around growth.

There is the whole issue of a downtown plan: where on the one hand it is argued that you ought to limit the height of buildings and mandate their design in order to preserve the character of a city that offers an architecture and general quality of life that are rarely found. And on the other hand, it is argued that doing so will drive away more businesses from a city whose economic vitality may already be in some jeopardy.

Proposition M, the city's anti-high rise measure passed in 1987, has made San Francisco a case study for national observers. No other city in the nation has even contemplated the types of controls imposed by Prop M. As just one example, just about everyone agrees that - for better or worse - the preservationist policies contained in Prop M forced St Mary's Hospital to scale back drastically the ambitious office complex it had planned on Lone Mountain.

Another manifestation of the growth debate is the big fight over offshore oil and gas drilling. The oil industry argues that the reserves off the coast of northern California are significant ones, that they can be developed relatively cheaply, and that they promise to reduce our dependence on oil from abroad. Opponents counter that offshore oil development will jeopardize one of the nation's last stretches of pristine coastline - an area of incomparable beauty that should be preserved not only from the ravages of possible oil spills but from the mere sight of oil derricks.

And then there's silicon valley. This is an area that has arguably been on the cutting edge of both the American economy and the development of technology during the last decade and a half, but that vanguard position of growth has also produced terrible traffic jams, air and groundwater pollution problems and a shortage of affordable housing.

Well, I think the whole growth debate has obviously been at
the center of some of your problems and you are not alone among health institutions.

I did a quick library check of other hospital with fights over growth and turned up dozens in the last year alone.

In Orange County, plans to build an 80-bed psychiatric facility caused a year-long battle with neighbors who feared the facility would create a safety hazard and lower property values.

In Los Angeles, the announcement last summer that Phoenix House to would buy the Lake View medical center and operate a drug rehab center caused the Lake View Terrace Improvement Association to organize a protest march and collect thousands of signatures. Leaders of the group say they will demand a full environmental assessment of the project, which could delay the permit by years.

In Los Angeles last February, the opening of a six-bed hospice for dying AIDS patients drew protests from neighbors who said they weren't afraid of catching the deadly disease but did fear lower property values.

Locally, too, you're not alone.

You know of the series of setbacks suffered by Kaiser Permanente in attempting to expand its San Francisco Medical Center on Geary Boulevard, or the fight over the addition to Stanford's biology building, or the neighborhood opposition that has developed to UC Berkeley's latest expansion plans.

The litany of the critics has become predictable and, often, justifiable: loss of open space, loss of parking space and traffic congestion.

And in cases like yours, there is another obstacle - namely the growing fear that through toxic chemicals, or radiation, or some strange new mutant organism, the expansion of the university poses a threat to our health.

We may decry this fear, but it is a real one and, I suspect, a growing one - the feeling that anything involving
the mysteries of science, including radioactivity and chemicals of any kind, poses major hazards.

And it is not altogether unfounded. Chernobyl taught people that; so did Love Canal, so did Bhopal. And my point in mentioning disasters like these is not to imply that UC might be involved in a catastrophe of similar magnitude, but to suggest that the fear and confusion people feel has been greatly fueled by real disasters involving nuclear fission and manmade chemicals.

I’m not sure I can offer anything more than generalities about why such fears are proliferating in what ought to be an Age of Great Reason. But I am certain of one thing, and that is that the problem is greatly exacerbated by the feeling people have that they are not being told the truth, or at least not the whole truth.

There is a tremendous amount of confusion and distrust out there. Hardly a day goes by that you don’t read about some new community finding that its drinking water has quietly turned to poison. In the face of all evidence to the contrary, people are told by some of the highest officials in the federal government that there is no clear link between coal-fired generating stations and acid rain. And in the face of all evidence to the contrary, one of our major, heavily subsidized agribusinesses continues to insist that no definitive link has been established between smoking and disease.

So it’s not totally surprising that people tend to wonder whether they’re being dealt with in candor.

And that brings me to my fourth point, namely, that I suspect you have yourselves to blame for some of the problems you are experiencing.

It isn’t a question of honesty; rather, I think it’s a failure to handle community relations with the kind of skill that is required by the very charged situation I’ve been describing.

I should point out that in my current job as an editor, I
normally don't deal with the university directly, so I rely very heavily on the views of the reporters I work with in reaching any conclusion. As you know, the Chronicle has supported UCSF editorially. Among our reporting staff, there are varying degrees of sympathy for your institution, but your mission and accomplishments are applauded by all, and most particularly by our science writers. Yet, I can tell you that among those same reporters, the view is unanimous that UCSF has displayed considerable ineptitude in its handling of community relations, both in the Laurel Heights controversy and elsewhere.

At this point I might add parenthetically that we journalists undoubtedly make matters more difficult for you at times. (No, you say!).

I suppose there may be some of you, for example, who would question our judgement in having decided to write about a cancer cluster of uncertain statistical validity and even less clear origin in Noe Valley. We can talk some more about that later but I should point out that decisions on whether and how to run such stories are not made lightly.

In the case of Laurel Heights, though, it's widely believed among my staff that the University made far more enemies than it needed by treating the community in a condescending manner and with something other than total candor.

Specifically, the charge is made that you were less than straightforward in spelling out the nature of the work that was to be conducted at Laurel Heights by saying only administrative and educational activities (I think the term was "academic purposes") were to be conducted there. Your selection of words may have been inadvertent, and it is, I suppose, true that laboratory research is an educational activity, but such semantic distinctions do not inspire community confidence.

Instead, they contribute to an atmosphere in which a puff of cigarette smoke coming out of the firemen's fund building is going to be viewed by some as plutonium.

Listen to what one reporter told me:
"UCSF is the victim of a small, highly organized group, a group that is skilled at fostering threats about anxieties that are probably not real. But the school was inept and less than candid about the high level of research it planned to conduct. Maybe they were afraid the community would misunderstand them, but they tried to finesse the issue and it backfired. Almost every reporter in this town who has covered this issue has gone in with a giant reservoir of good will, but the school has been arrogant and deserves some kicking."

Others suggest that as positions have hardened in the Laurel Heights dispute, the university has stopped talking to its critics. Of course, these things happen in battle.

But the debate you are having isn’t aimed at winning over the leadership of the Neighborhood Coalition. It aims at winning over the 53 percent of the respondents to your poll who said public opposition to UCSF is good because it slows things down.

But at least among some there is the sense that UCSF tends to fall for the provocation, to its detriment.

"The university representatives are public figures, and they’re being paid to take abuse gracefully, but they’re not doing that," says another of my reporters.

Let me give you two more examples of actions that seem counterproductive from my perspective. These are, of course, the accounts of individual reporters and some of you will have different versions—but they at least give you some idea of what’s being said in my newsroom.

In one case, a reporter tells me he was called by a representative of the university and told that UCSF would be unfairly linked to an alleged cancer cluster at a public meeting planned in Noe Valley. The reporter suggested the school send someone to the meeting to respond to any such
charges. Here is his account of what happened.

"They sent a few people and there was a lot of flak, but not a single representative of UC got up and spoke for the school. Two faculty types did speak, but not as representatives of the university. The administrators never got up. I think they dropped the ball. They have recognized for a long time that they have a PR problem. They have spent more than $1 million on their environmental study responding to community concerns, but they just don't seem to have a good grasp of the dynamic.

"In fact, I sort of resented how they handled it. It is almost as if they planted faculty people without admitting they were spokesmen for the university. They would have come across better if they'd been more upfront and had some guy say 'Hi, I'm the head of environmental whatever and here is how we see things.'"

At the risk of thoroughly wearing out my welcome, I'd like to offer one more example of a situation that didn't seem to have been handled as well as it might - and that's the shutdown of the teen psychiatric unit at Langley Porter.

In the Chronicle article that appeared last Wednesday, Lori Olszewski wrote:

"The university's decision to close Langley's 22-bed unit for at least three months was almost immediately questioned by community health advocates because the university did not go through a public hearing process mandated in a city ordinance passed at the polls in November.

Now I gather there is some debate over whether the university is exempt from the law.

John Hopkin from your psychiatry department is quoted as saying the university did not intentionally skirt the law.

"I think we had vague advice about what the law means and how it will be implemented. If the city tells us it applies, we will do everything the city wants. The lawyers are looking into this."
I personally have no idea whether Proposition Q (which requires private hospitals to post a 90-day notice before they reduce or eliminate a service and have a hearing before the health commission. A similar law applies to public hospitals like general) applies to the Langley decision, and I known there is a lot of genuine confusion over that law.

But it seems to me in the current climate that the university ought to be bending over backward to comply, not only with the letter but also with the spirit of the law. And it ought to have figured cut what it is going to do before the news hits the newspaper. Instead, I suspect the Langley story can’t help but fuel the perception that the university is inept or insensitive in its approach to community relations, and for those with an adversarial perspective, the charge of insensitivity translates quickly into arrogance and deceitfulness.

Part of the problem here may be the freedom from local land use controls enjoyed by California’s public universities. With the growing tendancy of community groups to use CEQA and other regulatory instruments aggressively, the university’s freedom of movement has been abridged. I’m sure it isn’t easy getting used to community input into decisions that were once largely unilateral.

Having said all this, I think there is some good news, and that is that the tide may be turning.

It seems to me, for example, that your decision to hire a second independent consultant to study the university’s environmental impact after questions were raised about the credibility and methodology used by Radian is likely to score you some points and reflects a shrewder appreciation of the niceties of PR and the importance of enhancing credibility.

The evolution of the Sierra Club’s position on your expansion plans in Laurel Heights reflects, it seems to me, significant progress in winning the battle of public opinion.

And, while I have no idea about the likelihood of new
litigation, it looks pretty clear to me from a lay reading of the state Supreme Court decision that your chances of winning the Laurel Heights fight once you redo your Environmental Impact Statement have been greatly enhanced.

From my personal point of view, that is all to the good.

The Bay Area needs a healthy, growing UCSF. Cities across the country would kill for an institution that embodies such absolute excellence as do you. You are an integral part of the Bay Area’s future - in terms of our health care, our economy and our intellectual life.

I hope my candor this morning hasn’t offended. I feel just a little ungracious having accepted your hospitality at this lovely spot only to have bitten the hand that fed me dinner last night.

But I have tried to give you as honest an evaluation as I can of how a bunch of newspaper people size up your community relations.

Obviously, you are doing many many things right.

But if you were a cat, I guess I might say you ought to learn how to bark.
QUESTIONS OF DAN ROSENHEIM:

BRUCE ALBERTS:

I always thought that part of the problem was that people don't know what we do or who we are. I would like to see some way of getting people -- San Francisco supervisors, people in the newspapers, all kinds of people -- to come to UCSF. It seems to me that this is a very important thing to do, to see our students, to see what kind of people we are here. I personally have written to the supervisors but nobody's ever taken me up on this. I think if 5% of the population had been through UCSF, it would make a big difference.

ROSENHEIM:

One of the things I didn't say anything about was the political process. It seems to me that's a tremendously important part of both the opportunities and the obligations that you face. It was mentioned last night by the speaker that there's a war going on, and while that was in the context of some pretty charged rhetoric, in some respects I think it's true. There is a war going on in the sense that decisions of enormous consequence involving the lives of thousands and thousands of people are at stake in these debates, and at the extremes there's not very much likelihood that one side is going to convince the other. So there is a war going on, a political war taking place, for the hearts and minds of the people of this community and northern California, and in fact, in the context of the national concerns of the nation without trying to overdramatize it.

And talking to political people, it seems to me, is a crucial dimension of conducting that war. Those are people who respond to constituencies, and one of the things you need to do is clearly to make your cases as compellingly as you can. I suspect that's done in a lots of ways that I don't see. It's clear to me that Chancellor Krevans is someone with a rather keen grasp of the political realities of the city, and when I see him in action my sense is that in his work with the city administration, Chamber of Commerce, Board of Supervisors -- a number of people -- he is quite committed to making the case for UCSF. But to the degree that it hasn't happened with the Supervisors, it seems to me, you have nothing to lose by getting them in, showing what you do, and laying out your case to them.

MIKE BISHOP:

I just want to follow up on what Bruce said. I regret that Mr. Ventresca is not here so that we could invite him into the campus. I really think it's important, even for
somebody as obviously devoted to his cause as he is, to understand what he's opposing. I think what Bruce is saying is that we need to show the community what we are. We clearly do impact on the community locally and throughout the city and that there's no ignoring that -- that we are a mass of buildings that's very recognizable outside of downtown -- all of these things are realities, and yet we need to convey some understanding of who we are and what we do. And I think many of us are frustrated in terms of knowing how to do that. I think what many of us are asking is if you have any advice for us in terms of how to do this, not that you can function as a resentative of our campus. It's very different to talk about it removed from the site than speak to our students and see what motivates them to be there, what kinds of things they get excited about, and see our clinical programs, and talk to our patients who are getting care there. That gives you a very different perspective on what our daily life is really all about. It's not only for political reasons, although we need to be in that arena at certain times.

ROSENHEIM:

Well, in a way, my immediate reaction is to say, or to think, I'm the last person who ought to be coming to you with a prescription for your solutions, partly because of some of the points I made about the Chronicle, but more seriously because I have an outsider's perspective, which may or may not allow me to see a few things that you don't see from the inside. But I suspect you all really know a great deal more about your situation than I do. It seems clear to me that the most important thing has already been accomplished, and that's embodied in this retreat. That's a) the recognition that there's a problem, b) recognition that something ought to be done about it, and c) the process of arriving at the solution.

I was most interested by the conversation this morning which I suspect may even be better in the small groups about the whole question of name. The question of do we make ourselves more palpable to the community by increasing, as one gentleman said, the medical services we provide -- the heck with the name and all this stuff -- or do we need to provide, as someone else said, services that are not related to our academic functions? Do we need to open the pool more to the community? Or would it help if we had a games room at Laurel Heights? I suspect that wouldn't solve your problems, but are there steps along the those lines that we ought to be taking?

I confess I'm a newcomer here and I'm at a little bit of a disadvantage; however, I'm baffled when I hear the statement made by my friend the doctor at Mt. Zion who's a great admirer of UCSF, but he says they're really not in the lifeblood of the community. And then I look at the list of clinics you have all over the city and I think what does it take to be to be part of the lifeblood of the community? What's the ineffable something that seems to be missing? I guess what I was getting at is that there isn't the kind of easily identifiable name, characteristic, or bunch of services. So beyond gross
generalities, such as it obviously makes sense to consider all these things, the solution, it seems to me, is going to emerge in serious discussions among yourselves, such as these.

LEON LEVINTOW:

Speaking of this war that you referred to, it really is a reality. Maybe you can explain to us why in the Chronicle this morning, printed on page two, a large picture of a UC-Presidio and -- put out by some students, some unidentified students -- why is that news? It certainly provides fodder for the paranoia our speaker last night manifested.

ROSENHEIM:

Well, I'm at a little bit of a disadvantage because I haven't seen the Chronicle. One of the luxuries of being away here is that I don't have to look at it the first thing every morning, although I feel very guilty about that. But I guess my response to you would be that outside of our editorial pages our judgment about what constitutes news is something that we could spend some time talking about, and that doesn't lend itself to clear definition, but the one thing that I would suggest to you is that it's not very much influenced by the editorial positions of the paper. In other words, my guess is that the thinking that went into putting this picture in the paper went something along the lines of, the Presidio is the hottest story in the city right now. It's a tremendous news story, it's one that we are going to write a great deal about because of the magnificence of it, and for all the obvious reasons. The issue of UC and the Presidio which has been largely absent from the paper today adds another dimension to the news value. This is something that's going to set tongues wagging, and I suppose the argument can be made that it is irresponsible to simply set tongues wagging without regard to the consequences, but I would submit to you that if we attempted to determine the consequences from a political point of view and in terms of our own editorial point of views, of the decision to put photographs or stories in the newspaper, it would be a very dull paper, indeed. We wouldn't put anything in it at all.

PHIL LEE:

One comment and one question. In relation to what you said, Larry, and to what Bruce said, it seems to me that if you look at the politicians, and why do they visit the AIDS ward at San Francisco General? Every one of them has been there, politicians actually from all over the world have visited the AIDS ward at San Francisco General. This is the "news" ward and it gets them some publicity which is, of course, what they like more than anything else, I think. We need to find some things that they can relate to and get some actual benefit from in relation to the things on the campus.
Dan, I’d like to ask you about the growth question -- I quite agree with you that this is an environment in which we’re functioning -- do you have some perceptions about where that movement is going to go and how it’s going to affect UCSF? What’s your perception of where this is going to go?

ROSENHEIM:

Well, I guess the hope is that when you have two extreme points of view, as seem to be emerging from the growth debate, for example, with all kinds of points of view in between, the interplay between those points of view leads to some creative leap forward, some solution to the problem that may not have immediately been apparent. It seems to me, for example, that some of the talk I’m hearing now about regionalism that goes beyond just the rhetoric of saying we ought to solve our problems on a regional level is now beginning very quietly, and I think you are going to read a lot more about this in the next year, but beginning very quietly to take the form of concrete discussions about regional agencies and regional governments among people who are in a position to implement and to block such things. And that’s what I was talking about last night when I talked about environmentalists and business leaders sitting down, reflecting a coming to terms, hopefully, a coming to terms with a situation that has been up to now, deadlocked. And with any luck the growth movement and the anti-growth movement will lend itself to some discussion that will bear fruit.

It seems to me we have a terrible, terrible problem and I feel it very much as someone who has just moved here because I’m profoundly aware of the "golden egg" of this area and the danger of the "goose that laid the golden egg" nature of the area. One of the things that attracts people to this area is its enormous beauty, and there is a tremendous risk in unfettered growth, that we will destroy things that are of great value to all of us. My hope is that between the extremes of blanket anti-growth -- the kind of views that were expressed last night, and the complete market-oriented view -- full speed ahead, Contra Costopolis forever, that we’ll be able to come up with some kind of rational approach to these issues. I’m very struck by what’s happened in Marin County, certainly not necessarily a master plan, but a very inspiring indication of what can be done; there are all kinds of problems with it including the issue of equity in housing for low income people. But the preservation of west Marin County situated cheek by jowl with the heavily populated areas is to me a very encouraging sign.

ALEX MARGULIS:

It is obvious that the purpose of every politician is that he is ambitious to get re-elected to a higher post. I want to talk to these politicians as relatively minor actors. The battle is that the people that vote for him need to give him the impression that they love
UCSF, what UCSF does. And therefore, we cannot talk to all the readers your ten or twelve or fifteen reporters can reach. How can we establish communication with your fifteen reporters on a wider scale than just through Michela Reichman, so that these reporters can communicate these things and actually be interested that this is something worthwhile, that there is a story that is always as good as that picture. We made a big deal with a penguin. There are many, many, many stories and you know Michela does a superb job, but Michela is probably considered by your reporters as one other administrator, another bureaucrat that is very friendly and knowledgeable. We would like somehow to get your reporters to come, to be interested, to listen to, to visit the place, to find all kinds of human stories, and communication they are establishing with you shows us how important it is to talk to each other. If we could have something that would result in the fact that newspaper people get to know UCSF, I believe that they would convey to the voters that there is something worthwhile for them on the hill.

ROSENHEIM:

The one reaction I have is that despite our frequent ineptitude and questionable influence -- and I don't want to sound immodest -- but it is true that every institution wants to do the same thing that you are describing. In other words, whether it's another medical institution, another public institution, the mayor's office, Hewlitt-Packard, or for that matter, many individuals, they all want to establish close relationships with the media that will allow them to tell their story through the media and have maximum impact on people. So you run into practical problems in getting lots of reporters over to UCSF a lot. How you organize your public affairs is an internal matter for you to decide how best to work, but I think that when it works, in my experience, it usually works best when you have someone in Michela's position acting as a funnel. Not as the only contact for people in the press, but as the person who can say, "The guy you want to see, who really knows about epidemiology is this guy. The guys you want to see for that series you're doing on biotech are these guys." And she does play that role of facilitator, I think generally very, very well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

It seems to me there are two types of public relations that we're talking about. The first is sort of a promotional public relations of saying how great we are and the wonderful things that we do, either for ourselves or for the community or for the world of art. And the second is the kind of public relations involving crises. Which is more important to the problems that we're facing?
ROSENHEIM:

When you move around the newspaper business as much as I do, you have to have a theory of new jobs. And my theory of new jobs is that you buy yourself an enormous amount of good will in the first six months you spend on a job. This may seem like a total nonsequitur in response to your question, but the performance, the way you work during the first six months establishes, almost indelibly, your reputation. It buys you a lot of time and a lot of slack to pursue things you want to do in subsequent periods of time. Similarly, I would say, in PR, the way you handle your PR day in and day out is going to have a tremendous influence on what happens when crises occur.

In other words, have you established the kinds of lines of communication to newspapers, radio, and TV that make it easier for us to get in contact with you, that make you know which reporters you want to talk to and make us know that we can get the information we want? Have you established the kind of credibility that in a situation of a mistake or crisis, the presupposition is that it was probably an accident, rather than the presupposition that they were probably trying to pull a fast one on us again? They are both very, very important. I've never done public relations, I don't know much about the theory of it, but I'm sure you have to spend a certain amount of time thinking both about long range image as well as having plans for dealing with emergencies. But I suspect how well an institution emerges from an emergency is in many ways a function of the kind of image that you've established over a period of time.

BILL EISENBERG:

I get the sense, from some of the things that have been said, that we're doing ourselves a disservice when talking about the issue of who we are and what we do, to focus primarily on research or a special operative procedure that we've perfected and talking about those things, and we don't concentrate much on actually telling people in our community who we are as people. I had a first-hand experience with that in court. We were to appear and I was working with a guy who lived there and just because I was the only person who could handle sheetrock and at the end of that time he said, "You know, I probably understand a lot more about what you do ("), he might accept changes that this university might suggest in his community a lot better if he knew me as a person, regardless of the fact that I was a medical school student researcher. I think we're all talking a lot about what we do every day, but we don't talk about people, and we don't convince people that we're just San Franciscans first, who also enjoy the community. And maybe we should spend a lot more time on those kinds of efforts.
NICK PETRAKIS:

Well, I was going to say what Rudi did and just add that, the Pharmacy School decision was made over a year or so after the building was purchased. It was just done because, I guess, Jere Goyan suddenly saw the opportunity. Universities don't work like corporations. How do you get that point over to the community of people who suspect us of not being straightforward?

ROSENHEIM:

You know, in some respects, you have such an enormous task, and that's why I've decided I was going to stay away from nostrums for cures because I don't think there are any easy ones. You have a huge, huge problem. Now I think in all seriousness the things that were said last night -- I don't know whether you were surprised by them, but I was kind of a little surprised -- they reminded me again of how really far apart you are from some of the people who have cast themselves in opposition. And while I think the idea that was just expressed, that there are little things that everyone could do, is a lovely idea and probably is something we all ought to apply to all of our lives, that's not going to make much headway with the people that are really determined to do you in.

At the same time I applaud you as having this conference and say I think you ought to have this conference, I keep checking myself because I feel like saying you shouldn't ought to be having this conference. You should ought to be able to come out here and talk about molecular biology or whatever your academic fields are. And I admire you for facing up to the problem you have because I think it's a great one and there probably aren't easy solutions to it.

ZACH HALL:

I would like to ask specifically about when you alluded to the Noe Valley story. The Presidio thing seems sort of a prank. But the Noe Valley situation seemed to many of us, exploit the University's troubles for the newsworthy story in a way that was irresponsible, not only to the University, but to the people in Noe Valley who might be concerned about their, either real or potential concerns.

ROSENHEIM:

I think there's been an interesting evolution to the Noe Valley story which has kind of brought it full circle back to the point to where the Noe Valley people themselves have kind of repudiated some of those who came in and offered them their assistance. All
I can say to you about the way we handle a story like this is that we try to be as sensitive as we can to the danger that printing a story like this will inflame the situation. But at the same time we have to weigh against that our desire not to let our own judgment about the correctness of the fears stand in the way of our responsibility to respond to print news that's of importance to a number of people, and seems to be important to official agencies.

What made the difference to me, as the editor, in the Noe Valley story was the fact that a cancer cluster had been determined by the state Department of Health. I don't know anything about cancer clusters, and when I looked at those numbers I thought they sure didn't seem very meaningful to me. I don't know anything about statistics, but when I looked at those numbers I thought well, if the average is five and they have eight, or whatever the numbers were -- and I don't recall them offhand -- but it seems to me that within the law of probabilities there will be communities that have eight and twelve and fifteen just to arrive at that five average.

Nonetheless, people who know much more about the situation than I do, from the state Department of Health arrived at this designation, and whether for mechanical reasons that they couldn't avoid, in terms of how the law operates or because they wanted to, the city Department of Health had conducted an investigation. And in addition to that there were individuals expressing concern and in some cases making charges. In other words, if it had just been the individuals we would have had to say who are they, who's John Barry, is he a nut, is he a half a nut, is he a legitimate guy? It's not our place to make ultimate decisions about that but that factors into a news judgment somehow. But the fact was that it was not just John Barry, but four or five other people in the community who came to us and the state Department of Health and the city Department of Health.

Had we not done any kind of a story, it seems to me we would have been open to the charge that you're covering this up. Here is a development that has taken place. You may or may not agree that it is significant, San Francisco Chronicle, but the state Department of Health is involved, and who are you to say you're not going to run that kind of story.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

But I remember UC's name was linked to it from the very beginning...

ROSENHEIM:

What we tried to do was include UC in a way that we thought would be judicious and not inordinately inflammatory. And as I recall UC was mentioned towards the end of
the story, in a discussion with some of the people about what they thought the possible source of the danger might be.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
That part was the headline part.

ROSENHEIM:
Well, we don’t write the headlines you see. (audience laughter)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
Well, who writes the headlines? (more laughter)

ROSENHEIM:
That’s my ultimate cop-out. But actually I may—let me see if I have the stories here, because if I do, I could see exactly what we said. I don’t know—maybe it was in the headline, maybe it wasn’t, and maybe it should or should not have been—but I guess what I’m trying to explain to you is our logic in going ahead and doing a story like that.

ANNA KAMINSKY:
I find myself really rather inundated by a rather large amount of information, and trying to come to some one conclusion to a set of questions that will never have at least one answer to it, but in some of the issues that you raise it reminds me of the many hats that I’ve worn: I lived in the Haight Ashbury for five years, have trouble parking my car sometimes, I’ve worked for UCSF for four years before I went to medical school and now pay them for the privilege of being at the institution, and during all those various times have had varied responses to what UC has meant to me and have always felt that certainly nobody could be a resident of San Francisco without knowing about UCSF. Obviously, data don’t show that’s necessarily true.

What does come to mind is the fact that it is very easy for us, I believe, as scientists, researchers, medical people, to see that as the primary function of UCSF, rather than what you’ve mentioned, is as the second largest employer in the city. And it’s always curious to me that no matter how many times that gets mentioned somehow it gets overlooked and we’re looking again at UCSF as providing services to the community
whereas it's very clear that UCSF is a compilation of the community and that it hires 10,000 people in the Bay Area. And as such I can't find how that slips by -- somehow it doesn't get mentioned as much in the papers as an economic, vital important part of the city and that doesn't necessarily come into the papers as vital and important economically. The fact that we are in the midst of expansion necessarily creates more jobs. How does that not get into the news?

ROSENHEIM:

Well, I think the place that does normally get mentioned is either in editorials or in stories that discuss the role of UCSF. In other words, when you stand back, as the Examiner series I was talking about, and say what is this institution? It's something we haven't done for a long time at the Chronicle. What is it? What does it mean? Let's take a look at it, let's take a look at some of the people who are in it. Who is Bill Rutter and what's interesting about him? And in that context you say what does the school mean to the city and who does it employ? And in editorials such as the ones both papers have done on the expansion fights, I think that's the appropriate place to make an assessment of the school.

In other words you say the school wants to expand, who is the school, here's who they are, here's what they mean to us, and that factors into our decision in this way. We don't care because they're wrong, or we do care and they're right, and that should make us care more, whatever the conclusion happens to be. But it would be a little incongruous in a news story -- it kind of has something to do with the way you write stories usually -- to say there's this fight over Noe Valley and somebody has mentioned the fact that emissions might come from UCSF comma, which by the way is the second largest employer in the city (audience laughter) -- I'm not trying to make light of your question...

ANOTHER UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

You could put in a parenthetic statement, UC, that big building that resides underneath Sutro Tower comma, da da da da....(more audience laughter)

ROSENHEIM:

Is that what we should refer to you as? The second largest employer -- I mean, say we've decided there will be a space for parenthetical remarks, what should it be? (more laughter) See what I'm saying?
EMIL TANAGHO:

We are willing to open more lines of communication between us and the media; however, whenever there is something newsworthy what we have noticed is that we get calls from the Washington Post, and the LA Times, and New York Times and the Chicago Tribune asking us for insight into the problem. We rarely get calls from the San Francisco Chronicle. This can be a source of communication and opening lines of information, to let you know that there are some people here who can field some advice, can submit information and have something to say.

ROSENHEIM:

Yeah. That's a very good point. In a way, what you're saying reflects some of the limitations of the Chronicle and some of the reasons why people still don't respect us as much as I wish they would. What I'm referring to specifically is that while the Chronicle uses its own staff to cover these days, I think quite aggressively, news in the Bay Area and in northern California, this is still a newspaper that relies very heavily on wire services for large amounts of its international and national news. That's increasingly becoming characteristic in general. Papers used to all have their own foreign correspondents, their own huge Washington bureaus. In an age of high labor costs and other cost considerations, many papers, other than the best known national ones—and I mean the New York Times, and the Washington Post, the LA Times, the Wall Street Journal and maybe the Chicago Tribune -- have generally phased out their foreign service, their overseas correspondents because those bureaus are so expensive, and rely very heavily on Reuters and AP and UPI, to my great distress, by the way. And some papers now are, on a selective basis, saying this place and this place are very important to us.

For example, the Chronicle opened a Tokyo bureau in the last year because of the great importance we attach to the Pacific Rim. Fifty years ago you would have never had a Tokyo bureau; you would have had a Paris or a London bureau, but times have changed.

This is a long way of answering your question, which is a lot of times if an operation involving a national figure takes place, we don’t write the story ourselves. We take a Washington Post story or a Los Angeles Times or a New York Times story, and hence, you don’t get the call. But I do think that on science stories in which we were involved, we actually outperform most papers in the country. There are not many papers with the science staff of the caliber of people like David Perlman and Charles Petit. And the amount of science writing that appears in the Chronicle I think is quite unusual. Certainly, far more than appeared in the Chicago Tribune when I was there. And I think when they're involved in stories, frequently UCSF should and does have a lot of input.
The other thing that I would say is that it was mentioned to me before, why do we run columns about medicine from doctors at other institutions? Why don’t we run a UCSF column? I think that’s a good idea. It’s something we’ve talked a little bit about with Michela and other people, specifically in the context of AIDS. And it might be something we want, at some point if we do that, to expand into some other areas.
I have been asked to speak on an overview of what UCSF is doing for the community. This I am somewhat reluctant to do since it is difficult, albeit not impossible, to speak with conviction about topics of which one knows little. In fact rhetoric has been defined as the art of conveying conviction without resort to logic. I am therefore going to use this time in a bifid manner - first to summarize aspects of our problem and some of the things that we are currently doing to mitigate it and second to describe some of the things that are being planned for the future in conjunction with our 125th birthday party, to be celebrated during the next academic year.

At the very beginning we can all agree that we have a problem. If you did not know it in advance, the chilling assault of last night would have brought it home even to the most politically obtuse. UCSF is a large and slow moving target that bleeds profusely when hit. The bald fact is that we are not sufficiently recognized for what we are and what we do in this community - and we continually pay for that deficit in countless overt and subtle ways:

(a) Politically. We are after all a public institution and our masters in Sacramento, although reasonably buffered by the Regents, can still assist us greatly or work us mischief, as the mood strikes them. Their mood is usually molded by a fallable assessment of the wishes of the public, too often approximated by the decibel levels of the most stentorian voices. Our masters will tend to judge us as Stalin did the Pope during WWII when he said, "How many divisions does he have?". Read here, how many votes do they have? We obviously need more divisions and assorted artillery in order to be taken seriously in City Hall or in Sacramento when conversations drift around to space ceilings and other impediments to progress.

(b) Financially. As we all know, we are state assisted and not state supported. UC's priorities for the next decade will be sharply focused on expanding the base of undergraduate university education and on accommodating, as gracefully as possible, to the remarkable demographic shifts in California. The University plans
to gently steer us into the quiet backwaters during this historic period of growth. If we are to maintain momentum, it will be through personal enterprise in earning or attracting private sources of funds - not just for the completion of the library, but for new faculty positions, renovations, fellowships and the rest of the lifeblood of academic progress. We cannot compete with the Stanfords of this world in obtaining private resources if we remain the "Cipher of Sutro Mountain" in the eyes of the community - the picture painted for us this a.m. by Dan Rosenheim.

(c) Professionally. Here I refer to the fact that the School of Medicine not only has a university function; it also has a professional role in the delivery of health care. It is uniquely through medicine that a university is thrust directly into a major industry - that of health care. Our competitive success in that industry, particularly in a saturated environment such as San Francisco, depends in part on marketing our product. Here again we must reach out more effectively if we are to maintain and expand those clinical activities so necessary for professional education and for applied medical research.

(d) Pride. Finally I shall list pride, institutional pride, which is impossible to quantify but also impossible to ignore. Obviously I am not referring to a puffed up swim bladder of self-conceit, but rather to the intrinsic spirit of the place which is capable in subtle ways in influencing performance at all levels from the custodian to the chancellor. It is not felicitous to have one's institution mixed up with, and in fact less well known than USF, for example. It is positively degrading to go to neighborhood meetings and hear us mocked as a potential Bhopal or accused of fostering germ warfare, rather than warfare against germs.

For all of these reasons, and for many subsidiary ones as well, we have to define ourselves more effectively for the community in which we live and work. I should say "communities", as Phil Lee rightly defined our segmented markets. Good works alone will not suffice. Perhaps it is true that the meek will inherit the earth, but the meek will not be able to grovel into Laurel Heights nor will the meek readily erode the rigid restraints of a space ceiling.

What Can We Do? We can begin by assessing what we are doing now in both a positive and a negative mode. As Lincoln said in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, "If we first know where we are and where we are tending, we shall know better what to do and how to do it."

What Are Our Negative Impacts: It might be useful to begin with the negative impact that we have or are perceived to have on our community, for this is the nidus of much of our problem, other than that of total disinterest. I hope that this is a more temperate recitation than that of the unmodified hypothalamic outflow to which we were subjected last night:
(a) In the past we have expanded into the housing areas huddled most closely to us. This has not happened for more than a generation, but memories and fears linger and fester. At the present time we are actually receding from our previous frontiers locally, although hoping for metastatic growth.

(b) We create parking problems. Yes. This is an authentic complaint. A lot of work goes into this. We maintain about 3,100 parking spots at our various facilities and also have 36 van pools, 64 car pools, 6 Marin commuter buses, and various shuttle buses among facilities. We have also supported neighborhood parking decals. Nevertheless parking is a continuing source of irritation, and a real one.

(c) Traffic is enhanced in our immediate vicinity. This is quoted but in fact seems trivial.

(d) Visual pollution" - an odd phrase, but it refers to the sheer mass of buildings that have accumulated here as almost a second city. Here we are less guilty than the TV tower that looms above us and is alleged to be causing cancer clusters from its malign emanations.

(e) We frighten people. Some of this fear has been cynically created and manipulated by opponents. Nevertheless it is often there, fueled by ignorance of science and by the free floating suspicion of authority that pervades much of our society. For example, people literally link the tracer use of isotopes with Chernobyl without any discontinuity and take to heart the phrase "toxic chemicals" and "chemicals capable of producing cancer" as an indication of a Love Canal coursing down Parnassus Avenue. To us this may be ludicrous and appalling, but is it not easy to mitigate ignorance and suspicion. I was told by a participant in one community meeting that she thought that we had created the AIDS virus through our recombinant DNA technology! We are doing what we can. The current $1.3 M special study of neighborhoods surrounding UCSF for signs of contamination by toxic or radioactive materials is really an investment in fear abatement. This has already been belittled by Joel Ventresca as biased and incompetent, as a preemptory strike. We also assume that the more that people know about us in general the less likely they are to consider us a faceless colony of Dr. Strange- loves playing Russian roulette with miscellaneous chemicals and rays. In Roosevelt's phrase, "The only thing that we have to fear is fear itself", but that fear is real and it is being manipulated by those who wish us ill.
We are large and successful. (Churchill story). There is an element in San Francisco that is reflexly against all that is large and running well, - that would have the City become another Carmel, a municipal Boutique by the Bay. Here we are not selectively the target, only one of the most convenient. Kevin Starr wrote about this in the SF Examiner last May, saying, "A once great city is losing its very soul." He used the problems of UCSF as one of his prime examples.

"Then there is the continuing war against the University of California in San Francisco. UCSF is a research and clinical facility of planetary importance. It is, in fact, the single most distinguished enterprise in San Francisco from the point of view of formal public culture. It is also the favored whipping boy of special-interest groups. Far from adopting UCSF as an important civic metaphor, special interest San Franciscans (are there any other kind of San Franciscans these days?) batter the institution, dragging out specious environmental arguments until UCSF seriously considers moving its research facilities out of this city entirely. I suppose it would seem a victory to some if San Francisco became the first American city to drive a major world-class medical research facility from its midst."

It is too bad that that appraisal has not permeated more widely throughout this community.

In summary, the problems that we create in the eyes of some in this community, with varying degrees of validity, are:

- a past history of invasive and metastatic growth
- problems of transportation - parking and traffic
- visual pollution
- fear - that we are a neighbor fraught with potential hazzard
- success - we are viable and vigorous when some would like us to go the way of the Presidio as part of the move to convert San Francisco from its robust past into a future of tranquil desuetude.

What Do We Do For This Community? UCSF, ne the Toland Medical College, has been a part of SF for 125 years. It grew up as an integral part of the city and as such is intimately woven into many of its activities. One can arbitrarily divide our contributions into five categories, and this is now being done in the campaign being set afoot: education, patient care, research, economic impact and community service. I shall not linger over these categories since they are so well known to all of you:

(1) Education is our central function as a university. We are all aware of the formal aspects of this responsibility with 606 medical students, 388 dental students, 490
pharmacy students, 700 nursing students, 1,000 interns and residents, and 442 predoctoral candidates. We may be less aware of the presence of 864 postdocs (generally visible only on Gordon Tomkins day) and innumerable clinical and research fellows. In addition there is a miscellaneous melange of foreign visitors, those on sabbatical, etc. As a result we have one of the largest and most illustrious centers for education in the health sciences in the world.

The above figures relate ony to our direct teaching responsibilities. We are also the main source for continuing education in medicine and the health sciences in northern California through courses, conferences, tapes, journals, books and even the extension of our voluntary clinical faculty. Speaking more selectively for medicine, the presence of the University here sets an endogenous reference standard that directly or indirectly affects the standard of practice throughout the Bay Area. Nevertheless, the teaching component does not buy us much public status since we are elitist and comparatively small.

(2) Patient Care. As noted earlier, it is uniquely in medicine the the University functions directly in a major industry, that of health care. In an average week 378 individuals receive inpatient care at the Moffitt-Long Hospital, including the birth of 27 babies, and 4,686 visits to its clinics. The figures for the SFGH are approximately 414 inpatients and 6,490 clinic visitors; and for the VA, 164 inpatients and 3,300 clinic visitors. These crude figures do not include many outreach clinics, including those from the School of Dentistry, our responsibilities in Fresno, our increasingly close relationships with Mt. Zion, etc. Suffice it to say that we render a good proportion of the patient care in San Francisco, especially in certain areas such as tertiary care, transplantation, cancer, trauma, AIDS, neonatal intensive care, and in general the introduction of new technologies in medicine to this community. We do a lot, but we can do more.

(3) Research. Here I shall make no attempt at a summary since we can roughly quantify proficiency here by our top billing in the NIH sweepstakes. This hard won ascendancy in research is more likely to be appreciated in Cambridge or Bethesda, however, than on Pacific Heights or in the Richmond district. In fact our opponents consider this to be a dubious distinction, garnered at the cost of doing injury to animals and proliferating that alarming use of isotopes and chemicals. Incidentally I am told that fully 60% of the use of isotopes at UCSF is in patient care, not research.
(4) Economic Impact. Here again I am going to be very brief since this is an important but subsidiary function of UCSF and since this has been brought together in such a lucid and succinct form in the publication, "UCSF Economic Impact". This publication impressively documents our major contributions, both direct and indirect, in furnishing jobs and creating markets in the Bay Area. With the so-called multiplier effect our total fiscal impact is estimated at approximately $1 billion annually. This does not include the biotechnology industry, for example, much of which has spun out of here. Furthermore 35% of our jobs are held by members of minority groups.

(5) Community Service. This is the area which is most difficult to define and least appreciated. In this category we refer to those activities carried out by UCSF, or by groups of individuals from the various constituencies of UCSF, for the benefit of the community - but activities not directly related to our central functions of teaching, patient care in the context of teaching, or research. It is both heterogeneous and somewhat ill-defined at the margins, since it shades off into the individual contributions of our employees as good citizens of their respective communities, for which we cannot really take institutional credit.

Perhaps my greatest surprise when I became drawn into helping to think about our relations with the community a few months back was that of learning the extent of these activities. An attempt is being made to collect and to codify these public service activities. I have distributed a draft summary, prepared by Barbara Atkinson from Tom Gwyn's office last summer. This is admittedly incomplete, for these are difficult data to obtain and the target is a moving one. Nevertheless I think that you will be impressed with the number and variety of things that are going on in public service - both on the UCSF campus and throughout the community - in education, in entertainment, in counseling, in health-care outreach programs, and in almost all possible categories directly or indirectly related to our mission and areas of expertise. Much of this is delineated in an attractive way in the publication "To Our Neighbors", of which an example has been furnished to you.

SEP - One of the most interesting community service programs, and one of the most significant, is that called the Science Education Partnership. I have asked Bruce Alberts, its progenitor, to describe it briefly for you. (see attached)
125th Anniversary. In brief we can take comfort in the fact that UCSF does a remarkable job for San Francisco in all 5 categories of teaching, patient care, research, economic impact and direct community service. Yet our problems in gaining public understanding and support remain. What further can be done?

As many, if not most of you know, the campus has decided to use the occasion of the 125th anniversary of the founding of this school in 1864 to redouble our efforts in earning this understanding and respect in San Francisco. As you know all academic planning begins with the formation of a committee - namely the appointment of the unwilling by the inept to do the impossible. Beginning about 6 months ago a rather large committee, subsequently fractionated with 6 subcommittees, began to lay plans for this anniversary celebration. Many of you here have been personally involved, so that this will be highly repetitious to you. In this planning we have been guided by the following principles:

(a) The 125th celebration will not be one of simple self-aggrandisement, of turning the spotlight exclusively on our past and current accomplishments. It will have substance as well and will emphasize increased commitment to the community, both now and in the future.

(b) Our plans, whenever possible, will build upon rather than supplant those current activities that have already proven useful and successful and with which there are already considerable experiences and background investment.

(c) An attempt will be made to emphasize activities and approaches that are most likely to have long term impact and that can be carried through to maintain momentum over subsequent years. If we put in a great pulse of energy for one year only and then lapse back into passivity and quietude, little will have been gained.

(d) We plan to reach the broadest possible target group in SF, especially those who are currently ignorant of or indifferent to UCSF, rather than being satisfied with further impressing our current friends.

(e) We hope to enlist the involvement and assistance of all elements in the broad and diverse UCSF family - faculty, staff, students, friends, former employees, etc. This will more likely ensure success; it will also be good for internal morale to have this sense of partnership.

Finally

(f) We believe that a successful enterprise will require careful planning and a considerable commitment of resources. It is because of this that we have started early and have arbitrarily chosen the academic year 1989-1990, rather than the calendar year 1989.
Where Are We Now in Our Plans? The six subcommittees have met throughout the fall and have rendered their preliminary reports. These are being collated in an interim report to the Chancellor together with a priority listing. We are also beginning to develop plans for specific responsibilities. I shall briefly describe some of the things afoot, proceeding sequentially by the suggestions of each subcommittee, although obviously these activities will be coordinated and interrelated:

(a) **Major UCSF Events** (Smith)

1. **We plan a large kickoff event to be held on Saturday, October 14 (possibly the 7th) at the main campus. We hope to close Parnassus and put up a stage. The event will be a mixture of several things – the current hospital health fair, a science fair, tours, entertainment (Lucas models, carnival, Pickle Family Circus, Beach Blanket Babylon), and most of all some announcement of our enhanced commitment of the city – SEP, teaching about AIDS, CPR, etc. We hope to have that week declared UCSF Appreciation Week, with a build up of media events, a staff appreciation party, the distribution of logo gifts, linkage with other events in the city, etc. Possible special hooks to obtain attention include: (a) items for a Guiness Book of Records (strongest bite, 125ft. birthday cake), (b) have the Mayor arrive with Dr. Toland via horse and buggy, (c) have poster sessions by SEP students.**

2. **Tomkins Lecture – Stephen Gould**

3. **Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture – Francois Jacob (Ira Herskowitz)**

4. **Founder’s Day – In the past this has been used to give UCSF medals to various worthies in this community who have been of great assistance to the University. For this one occasion, we plan to develop a special 125th commemorative medal and to honor several individuals of national scope (who might be newsworthy). Examples include Surgeon General Everett Koop, Lewis Thomas, possibly Charles Townes.**

5. **International Congress on AIDS – This will occur in June, 1990, and the co-chairs are John Ziegler and Paul Volberding – UCSF is one, in fact the main, official sponsor. Our ability to capitalize on this will be very limited, however, but we plan to work with the City to see how this can be brought off most effectively.**
6. **Library Opening and Dedication.** This will occur in late summer or early fall of 1990 and will mark the termination of the official year of celebration. Obviously we hope that there will be no abrupt cessation of activity, but that momentum on all fronts will carry us ahead.

(b) **Special Activities and Innovations (Helen Ripple).** This is a committee charged with coming up with various new ideas. It is closely allied with the Major Events Committee. It is particularly interested in seeing us develop and distribute special banner, posters, buttons and T-shirts with our logo and with our visible participation in such events as the SF Marathon, Bay to Breakers, all of the various neighborhood fairs and for us to get recognition at such ongoing activities as the SF Symphony and athletic events. Early on there was discussion of a Rock concert for the benefit of AIDS to be called "The Grateful Living", but this has not survived further scrutiny.

(c) **Theme/Logo, Press, Media. (Carol Littlejohn/ Michela Reichman).**

The work of this committee will, of course, permeate all that we do, if we are to get our message across more effectively. This committee will be concerned with developing the basic logo and relationships with the media. There will be a special issue of the UCSF Magazine and we hope for a special section in the Sunday Chronicle/Examiner. Of particular interest, for the first time we are going to work with an advertisement agency to get their professional advice as to how we can meet our goals more successfully. This innovative agency has in fact offered to donate their services pro bono for this purpose. It is too soon to say just what will emerge from this new professionalism and its alliance with our more spontaneous activities here.

(d) **New Initiatives (Bruce Alberts).** In many ways this may be the most important committee of them all since it represents substance rather than hype. Two major components have emerged:

1. **SEP (The Science Education Partnership) -** which is already ongoing and about which you have already heard in brief.

2. **Health Education Network.** The substance of this is still being developed. It may include the participation by UCSF in the teaching of CPR (Save A Life Saturday), for example, an activity organized by two of our faculty (Odelia Braun, Ellen Weber). It may also include a larger commitment to AIDS education in the schools.
3. Extension courses in the evening - computer science, English as a second language, etc.

(e) Public Exhibits (Leslie Benet/Pete Ralston). The idea here is to develop educational exhibits relating to science or medicine for the benefit of the public, backed up by a strong identification of the exhibit with our campus. Several are under development or consideration:

1. An exhibit at the Exploratorium on Molecular Modeling - (Bob Langridge)

2. An exhibit at the California Academy of Science - on the pathogenesis and approaches to prevention and treatment of AIDS. (Pete Ralston, Marc Kirschner)

3. The development of an exhibit on "Art in Science" that can be displayed downtown; perhaps in corporate lobbies. (Janet Norton)

4. Possibly an exhibit for the UA terminal. (Les Benet)

(f) Community Outreach (David Sanchez, Tom Gwyn). In a sense all of our proposed activities will represent an outreach to the community. This committee, however, has looked more specifically at how we can interact with particular neighborhoods and ethnic groups. Although planning is not yet complete, current discussions relate to meeting with community leaders to plan jointly for a "Partners in Service" outreach program - to determine how we can celebrate together what has been achieved in those communities in the area of health education and health care and to plan what we can do further - health fairs, educational programs, etc. There is also discussion of planting trees in various neighborhoods in our vicinity.

This summary is a quick overview of some of the things that are being discussed. It is unlikely that we shall finally do all of these things because of limitations of time and resources. Other ideas may arise that will turn out to be more valuable than the above. Nevertheless we hope that the initiatives that will cluster around our 125th birthday will give us a significant boost in bringing UCSF to the attention of our neighbors in San Francisco and increasing their understanding of who we are and what we stand for. We have paid an exorbitant price in the past because we have not had that understanding and support. Perhaps we can use this celebratory year as a point of departure for improving our performance in the future.
BRUCE ALBERTS, M.D.: (Chair, Biochemistry and Biophysics) on the Science Education Partnership

Holly asked me to say some things about the Science Education Partnership (SEP), which is now only a year and a half old -- and still changing. The basic idea for SEP came about at one of these very boring dinners that we have to go to as chairs. I sat at a table with David Ramsay and we were talking about his past efforts to do something along these lines -- working with local schools to improve science education. He's had a lot of interest in this, and one of the things we came up with is the fact that we always ship out all this surplus equipment, such as centrifuges -- they get outmoded, we get new ones, but the old ones are still worth something so we don't want to throw them away. And yet, we don't know what to do with them, so we send them out to Oyster Point where they sit around for forty or fifty years and then finally get thrown away.

David had already done something about this and had resuscitated some pieces of equipment for various high schools. So, with his support, we started the SEP program, which stands for Science Education Partnership. Though some thought has been given to including private schools in the program, we felt that we should concentrate on the public schools -- because they were the most in need. From the very beginning, we worked with the San Francisco Unified School District, with Superintendent of Schools Ray Cortines giving his full support to the effort.

In any event, the partnership as it exists at present has three basic aspects:

The original idea was to bridge the gulf that has existed for years between teachers of science in lower schools -- mostly middle and high schools -- and scientists. These are completely different communities; basically they don't even talk to each other. In particular, UCSF is located in the middle of an area with an immense urban school district, with complex fiscal problems and large minority student populations, most of them traditionally underrepresented in science.

We initiated discussions with people at the schools. What came out of our conversations was the idea of one-on-one partnerships between teachers and scientists. We have things we could give them -- which we are already offering -- things like fruit fly embryos, dry ice. But, as you know, UCSF is this huge intimidating place. You can imagine that for the high school teacher to come up to this huge building and try to find some dry ice can be a bit overwhelming. So, our original idea was for a UCSF partner to be a tie-in to the University network. This person makes available the resources at UCSF, ranging from acquisition of surplus equipment (which has been quite successful) to biological agents, such as embryos and fertilized chicken eggs. Perhaps the most important of these resources are the partners themselves as intellectual resources and
role models going out to the schools.

What these UCSF volunteers actually do depends on the individual partnerships themselves. They were designed to be very flexible. Some of them -- the most active ones -- have done things like go out to schools once a week and run a science club or, like Josh Labaer, a graduate student volunteer, bring the teacher into his lab once a week to work on designing experiments for the classroom. Others have gone much less often; but, that's left up to the individuals. We've tried to support the partnerships this year by giving the UCSF partners lists of suggested things to do, resources that are available to teachers (for instance, library cards, embryos, and agar plates -- and where to get them). We're also trying to encourage them to feel more self-confidence in their dealing with the teachers, because part of the problem, interestingly enough, is that some of the UCSF people feel a little bit insecure about what they can do to help the teachers. Especially since many of the volunteers are postdocs and graduate students who are younger than their partners.

This is one of the three aspects of the SEP -- these one-on-one partnerships. We had 80 last year from the 240 or so science teachers of various sorts in the San Francisco public schools. The number 80 is a little misleading, however, because a lot of those weren't very active. We cut down somewhat on the number of partnerships this year -- to about 50 or so -- and tried to make the ones we have more productive. We're taking a much more active role this year to help the partners become more involved and encourage them with ideas and incentives.

This program takes a lot of energy. It's just like anything else -- in fact, it's like a cell. If you don't put energy into it, it just runs down. I got the bright idea that my talented secretary, Dave States, could do this 20%-time; it has kind of back-fired for me, because it takes at least half his time. I therefore can see directly now how it takes a substantial input of intelligent coordination time to keep a program like this going. The people who are the volunteers go out into the schools and do the actual scientific work, but it needs coordination. Just to give away equipment is complicated. You've got to make sure it works, store it, log it, get it to the schools, and then distribute it fairly to the teachers; all of these things take time. So there is a need for some long-term funding. And we've put together a number of plan to try to get additional support -- both from the University and outside sources.

The second aspect, which maybe you've read about in the newspaper, was Stan Glantz's idea -- the Science Contest. We had $5000 we got from Herb Boyer's Tomkins Fund - what could we do with it? Originally, our SEP steering committee, which is mostly teachers and a few of us from UCSF, suggested that we buy equipment that we could put in a central place for lending out to classrooms. The Stan had the really interesting idea of using it to bribe kids to get them interested in science. Only Stan could come up with an idea like this. And so we set up a contest with he idea that kids, with the help of their teachers, would prepare a week's worth of science lessons to teach to their
peers or younger students. First, second and third prizes would be given to winners in two divisions -- middle and high school.

Last year we had 68 entries. Some of them were on smoking, other on water-power as an energy source -- a whole range of subjects. The students had to write up a week's worth of lessons which were submitted to us, and out of these we chose 28 finalists to present one day's worth of the written lesson plan to a classroom of kids. This was in front of judges from UCSF -- grad students, postdocs, faculty.

Well, these presentations were terrific. I think Stan's idea was wonderful. And he inadvertently hit upon a wonderful way of helping schools like ours that have money problems. On one level you have the kids helping to teach other kids. I judged a class of eighth graders presenting to third graders, and the third graders were really impressed by the fact that these eighth graders were teaching them this stuff. They paid a lot of attention to them -- it was great. On another level, as all of us who teach know, the best way to learn something yourself is to have to teach it to someone else.

At any rate, we are continuing the Science Lesson Plan Contest on a yearly basis, perfecting it as we go. In fact, it's just about to start up again. And to get even more activities in the schools out of our $5,000, this year we are encouraging a larger number of initial entries to actually be taught by student groups. Classroom teachers will screen the best ones and finalists will be picked to present the plans again to a new group of students in front of the UCSF judges. We believe we'll get more activity per dollar this way.

The third aspect of SEP I'd like to talk about was the idea of Emil Fogarino -- one of the school district's "mentor teachers" who is very active in the program. What he's done is set up a monthly talk to a group of science teachers from throughout the City. It takes place the second Thursday of the month at a central facility called the Parkside Center with speakers from UCSF. We present talks like AIDS, chromosomes, etc. In each case, we're given the material that the public school teachers now use to teach a general topic. So you get to find out how inadequate the books really are and the kind of materials the teachers have to work with. I did the one on chromosomes, what we now know about them, and why I thought the text material was no good, gave some handouts, things like that. Other faculty, like Marc Kirscher and Zach Hall, have done updates on cell development, the nervous system, etc.

One of the side benefits of the regularity of these talks, is that a kind of science teachers' club has developed out of them. You have to understand that the teachers don't get a chance to really meet with each other and discuss their problems. All the teachers (about 240) are invited, but you find a core group of about 30 that attend on a regular basis. We've been distributing surplus equipment through the same building and there are plans to really solidify the place as a Science Resource Center. Meanwhile, the teachers are getting to know each other and they've now become a
political power in the system. They never really had a chance to do this before, and now we've made visits to the schools' central administration office. A lot of good comes from this -- things that empower the teachers to make decisions on important concerns like textbook selection, which normally gets made by administrators. And the truth is, the school district can be an awful bureaucracy, treating the teachers like kids. In a way, Cortines realizes this, and he has encouraged this empowering of teachers.

We have other plans underway as well. In the fall, we're starting a small experiment that we hope to build into a significant aspect of the program. For this we're finding labs where kids can get credit from school for coming two afternoons a week to UCSF to design an experiment to bring back to their class. It's modelled after a program that already exists at the University of Washington, Seattle.

As part of the 125th Anniversary Celebration, we're also trying to see if we can get support to set up a summer workshop for science teachers on campus, using our lab facilities and team teaching the workshop with UCSF experts and exceptional classroom teachers. Lane Conn, who now runs a successful workshop that the NSF sponsors at San Francisco State, is trying to carry the ball and get this going. But it requires substantial funding because these programs have to pay the teachers for their attendance -- about $40 a day to attend these workshops.

The last thing I have to say is that during the committee discussion about the 125th, we came to realize that there are lots of things already underway in the health area that use such groups as the nursing staff at the hospital. However, they're not coordinated in any way. We've come up with the idea of establishing a parallel organization called HEP, or Health Education Partnership. This would take someone else to run, since in the basic sciences, we don't have the expertise or the credibility in that arena. But there is so much potential there that we'd like to see something get rolling. One of the reasons that I'm happy to be here is to get more involvement from anybody who has ideas or things we could do on the more clinical side, such as lab visits, or visits to open heart surgery, or whatever -- a clinical counterpart to what we're doing in the basic sciences. Anybody with ideas of ways in which you can help would be much appreciated.
RUDI SCHMID, M.D., Dean, School of Medicine: Closing Remarks

I may have the last word, but not necessarily the ultimate wisdom. I find it very difficult to summarize these two days because the theme considered is so broad and relatively diffuse. It occurred to me that for the first time in these Asilomar retreats, we have selected a topic for discussion over which we have little direct control, but which in a manner of speaking has been thrust upon us, and we react to it in a somewhat defensive manner. We all recognize, of course, that because of their structure and governance, academic institutions are relatively poorly equipped to deal with problems of this nature and we tend to resort to amateurish and often ineffective approaches to defend our position.

A bit overwhelmed by the immediacy of the anti-intellectual opposition of our neighborhood and community, we need to realize that this is not an isolated event but part of a pattern of much wider scope. In fact, it is a pattern that is recognizable all over the world, in Europe, Asia, and in our country from coast to coast. Moreover, if one is taking a wider look at it, it becomes apparent that this is not a novel phenomenon but the recurrence of a public reaction that has occurred in past times when science and technology progressed rapidly and in unaccustomed directions. There are interesting historical parallels with the 19th century which, as you may recall, was a century of political restlessness, trying to digest the immense impact of the French Revolution. There was also a simultaneous, enormous evolution of science and technology the dimensions of which were probably just as stunning at that time and just as threatening as what is occurring in our own time. Think of the development of electricity, the telegraph, the steam and combustion engines, railroads, bridges, tunnels, the Eiffel Tower -- which was perhaps the most demonstrative embodiment of it all. And under the leadership of outstanding and visionary minds, such as Pasteur, Koch, Darwin, Roentgen, and Virchow, medicine began to acquire a scientific basis which fascinated the 19th century society. People of the Western World passionately identified with this unparalleled progress of science and technology and believed in it. They had the confidence and hope that science promised solutions to some of society's major ills. But underneath there was also concern and anxiety about the direction in which contemporary science was taking humanity because of the alleged perils and dangers, the unknown and mysterious scientific progress. Felix Bloch, referring to the first use of radioactivity in the atomic bomb, once mused what would have happened if the first use of electricity had been in the electric chair! Remember the amusing stories of opponents throwing themselves before the puffing locomotives invented by the devil, or the claim that pregnant women could not ride faster than 20 miles per hour, lest they abort. These stories, entertaining as they may be, remind us of what is happening today. And then
quite unexpectedly, toward the fin de siècle, progressive disillusion with science and technology set in, a disillusion based on unfulfilled expectations and hopes. And the dream of scientific progress came to an abrupt end when the Titanic hit an iceberg in the North Atlantic.

It is easy to recognize the parallels to what is happening in our time. We easily forget and take for granted the enormous scientific progress that has occurred since the world wars, achievements that were far beyond anybody’s imagination: the atomic energy, exploration in space, the landing of man on the moon, computers, transistors, and the communication technology that has opened every corner of the world to almost instantaneous inspection. And later, the revolution in biology and medicine, the full impact of which was only gradually appreciated by a society that lacked the educational background to realize its full meaning. These events are profoundly altering our way of life and the way peoples look at themselves and at each other. But not unexpectedly, they also are causing apprehension, if not anxiety, about the direction and potential of modern science, and reservations about its impact on human health, the environment, morality and the eventual survival of humankind. Fears, perhaps caused by the sheer dimensions of the scientific potential, the unknown and the mysterious, are fueled by popular science fiction and the mass media. A major segment of society all over the world seems to harbor lingering reservations, if not doubts, about where it all will end, where we are going on a planet which for the first time has become finite. This is a societal reaction which is understandable and which, as scientists, we are nearly powerless to change in the short term. The religious fundamentalism which is observable in many parts of today’s world may be part of this anti-intellectual reaction.

One of the most difficult problems for society is to evaluate the risk-benefit ratio of scientific progress and to appreciate the immense differences in the dimensions of perceived or potential dangers. For example, it seems quite unreasonable to compare the accidental release of tens of thousands of curies of radioactivity at Chernobyl with the spilling of a few microcuries of C¹⁴ in a research laboratory. In its recent unanimous decision the California Supreme Court properly addressed this issue, but it is a distinction which seems to escape lay people. The recent accidents at Chernobyl, Three-Mile Island, Bhopal and Soweto -- some releasing radioactivity and some chemical pollutants -- were of a very serious nature which caused the world to stop and think. And it is frequently overlooked that at Chernobyl and Three-Mile Island, relatively few people were injured and fewer were killed in comparison to the thousands of victims claimed each year by accidents related to fossils fuels, not to mention the environmental pollution by oil leaks and the atmospheric pollution and health hazards caused by burning of fossil fuels. Here again, the difference in dimensions seemed to dim in the face of the immediate impact of the actual catastrophes.

I am carrying home two messages from this retreat. The first is that our current problems with our neighbors and community are not an isolated phenomenon, but part of a world-wide expression of lingering reservations and unease about both the directions
and the rate of progress of contemporary science. As scientists, we seem to have outraced the public’s educational resources to assimilate the new information. Our own shortcomings in keeping society properly informed may have aggravated this unfortunate situation. It does little good to dispute and argue with the relatively small number of activists and demagogues who are taking advantage of this loss of societal confidence to pursue their own personal causes. Rather, we need to enter into a broader informational and participatory relationship with society which, despite its bewilderment and lingering doubts, still has a solid belief in scientific progress for the benefit of humankind. We need to do this candidly, openly, with honesty, and on an ongoing basis, rather than as a measure of attempted damage control in time of crisis. In our own location, a good and promising beginning has been made under the leadership of the chancellor and Michela Reichman, but we need to institutionalize this new attitude as a permanent responsibility of our scientific community.

The second message is that we need professional help in turning around our community’s attitudes and feelings about the eminent scientific and educational institution in its midst. This is a long-term project requiring a focused and concerted effort with continuing guidance by professionals who make it their business to influence public opinion and attitudes. I am fully persuaded of the power of public relations firms, and I believe that the campus’ and School of Medicine’s leadership, as well as the faculty, deserve and need this sort of guidance to hone and focus their own attitudes to public needs and concerns. We have made a promising start with the campus’ ad hoc committee on UCSF’s future, but subsequent follow-up of this body’s provocative recommendations lost momentum because there was no suitable mechanism to carry them forward. I believe that we need a permanent council, composed of faculty and administration which regularly meets with professional advisors to develop policy and process to solve the public relations problems which currently are such an impediment and frustration to the future evolution of our institution. I am confident that this Asilomar retreat may go down in history as the turning point in our relationship with our community and may serve as the beginning of a new era of sensitivity to, and heightened awareness of society’s concerns. Thank you very much for your patience and commitment.
UCSF and the School of Medicine are obviously of great importance to the city of San Francisco, with respect to the city's economy, its health care, and its national and international reputation. Yet it is clear that the institution's image locally is less than totally positive. People in the city, if they are aware of the institution at all, see it as a large, forbidding place, walled off from the rest of the environs, "the tower on the hill." Even with all the current efforts, one hears of the School referred to on local radio reports as "USF" and cab drivers still take our visitors to that school on Turk Street.

It is also clear that for the University to thrive in the city it needs to be regarded by the local citizenry as a positive force, one of which it is proud. Although the faculty might find questions of "image" anathema, reality dictates attention to this matter.

Realistically, what image can we project to the local population that might not see direct benefits from our presence?

What should the University administration be doing for us in this regard? What should we as faculty be doing ourselves?

Are we in fact as cognizant of and responsive to the community as we superficially believe? For example, has our response to AIDS been as clearly demonstrated to the community as it could be?

Are we, on the other hand, too concerned about this matter? Would we perhaps be better off just "doing our thing" and letting the results speak for themselves?

HAILE DEBAS:
(reporter, group one; members are: Bainton, Bernett, Debas, Marton, McDougle, Ralston, Reichman, Schmid)

We would like to start by answering the last question that was posed to the group, which was, "Are we too concerned about our image and our concerns of what the community thinks of us?" And the resounding answer from us to that group, "Obviously not!" We have identified a number of areas which need to be addressed if we are to improve our image and community relations.

We felt the time has come that the faculty, students and staff should be more involved in grassroots activity. The identifiable concerns of the community include those of housing, parking, and the perception that the UC hospital is not their community hospital.
We also felt that our relations with the political structure of the city need to be improved. We feel they do not know how great a resource UCSF is to the city, its economic impact, and its value to the city.

From these discussions we've made a few specific recommendations.

The first recommendation is that it would be important for us to know what our neighbors want. We felt there should be a meeting with neighborhood leadership and the local supervisor of the Haight Ashbury neighborhood district to determine what the needs of the local community are. We felt the University should have evening courses in a number of subjects. Two possibilities are English as a second language, and science courses for lay people. To organize all of this, a task force should be put together, and this task force should develop the program and the budget. We felt the evening courses should have a small fee associated with them because this makes them more valuable to the individuals taking them.

Our third recommendation had to do with the parking. At the present, it's very easy for the faculty to park. In fact, when the parking lot is full, there are valet assistants who come and park our cars, but there's no such service to the patients. The patients' area is rapidly filled and then they don't know where to go. We thought a valet service should be organized for the patients. And there should be an immediately identifiable uniformed individual at the top of the elevators on the Parnassus level, who can direct patients appropriately. This should be combined with improved information desks, both inside the hospital--which we thought was much better organized now--and in the medical school area, where we felt it was very unorganized.

Our fourth recommendation had to do with medical services we provide the neighbors. There should be a way of treating the neighbors so that they could get immediate attention in the emergency rooms and in the admission processes. This recommendation should go to the Medical Center for development.

The fifth recommendation is an important one. One of the major problems the community has -- and our faculty, staff, and our nurses have -- is the lack of an adequate childcare center. It would be very important for UC to team up with community leaders, church groups, etc. to jointly develop a major childcare center. We identified the need for two of these; one near the UC campus. The second area would be at San Francisco General Hospital. There we felt the childcare center should be developed on campus for safety reasons, and because there is space to do it there.

The sixth recommendation had to do with our relations with supervisors and political leaders in the city. We recommend that an advisory committee made up of faculty, students, and staff should be organized to work with Tom Gwyn's department. A program should be established for inviting political leaders onto the campus to talk with us, not only so we can present them with our glorious accomplishments, but so they can know why we do what we do -- what interests us, what motivates us, what makes us
tick.

And our final recommendation was for all the department chairs here to go back to their departmental meetings and take ten minutes to discuss this conference.

ZACH HALL:
(group four reporter; members are Brodsky, Colby, Gastel, Hall, Holmberg, Murray, Smith, and Wolff)

Let me begin with the question of whether we should be doing something to improve our image. There is a bias in science and medicine against self promotion, or perhaps I should say against blatant self promotion and it is legitimate to pose the question: Are we comfortable with the idea of promoting our image in this self-conscious way?

It was the consensus of our group that every weary resident and ill-dressed postdoc on our campus realizes or has a feeling that we are in some sense under siege and embattled, and they are as bewildered and confused and disappointed by this as we are. I think any effort to improve our image in the community would be met with gratitude by the entire community. So there's no question about the need to publicize ourselves and the good things that we do. We are paying the price for our failure to do this in the past. It obviously needs to be done with dignity and without hucksterism.

One of the ideas was that we should, in fact, increase our identity with San Francisco as a community by emphasizing our historical roots. It was pointed out that we are one of the great San Francisco institutions that goes back with Wells Fargo and Levi Strauss to the very earliest days of San Francisco, and that people should be aware of that. We should become associated with what's good about San Francisco and why San Francisco is a good place to live and work and do business.

Now, out of that discussion we had one specific suggestion, which I wanted to broach to you, one very concrete proposal having to do with our image. The question has come up several times this weekend of our confusion as an institution simply over the question of our name. There's been some nostalgic discussion about the old days when we were known as UC Med Center, and one of the suggestions that came up was in fact to change our name to the UC Health Center. The idea of doing this is, number one, it would provide some continuity with our older identity as the UC Med Center, which is the name, after all, that is guaranteed to bring your taxicab to Parnassus Avenue from any point in San Francisco. It would include our colleagues in the other health professions on campus, the dentists, the pharmacists, the nurses, as all being part of a health center. It would take advantage of the current attraction and interest with what's
positive in medicine -- the emphasis on health and well-being as opposed to sickness and disease -- and it might imply that we, rather than being the center and source of bad chemicals and ill-dressed faculty and post-docs and too many cars are perhaps a source of health and well-being. I think the 125th Celebration provides a wonderful opportunity to try to change our logo if we wish to do that. Once we're past that it will be some time before we would have an opportunity again.

We discussed areas in which we could increase our positive impact on the surrounding community, and those came under three headings, one of which was in the area of research. The feeling in our group was that our research achievements and accomplishments are very well publicized. However, there was a feeling that there is a hunger for scientific and medical information in the community that UCSF could meet, and that could be done in several ways.

One idea which has come up in several other forms at the University is the idea of having a public lecture series. The model for this is one that's done at Cal Tech, in which, at regular intervals, distinguished scientists -- in our case these would be either physicians or biologists -- come and give a public lecture that (it is my understanding) is at a sort of Scientific American level geared to an intelligent and educated and somewhat scientifically literate audience, but not technically informed. At Cal Tech these are well publicized, they are prestigious, they are attended by 50 to 100 people, they are quite well known and it's considered an honor to be asked to speak. The speakers are not simply Cal Tech luminaries, but people who are brought in from the outside as well. Laurel Heights Auditorium would be a wonderful place to do such a thing.

The second suggestion was perhaps short courses dealing with topics of interest in biology and medicine. For instance, a series of lectures on the biology of AIDS. There is a tremendous hunger and thirst for information about AIDS in the San Francisco community. There's a tremendous amount of self-help that people are trying and I think any well-publicized attempt to have a course that would simply inform people about what's known would meet with a tremendous response. Another possibility would be something to do with diet and nutrition. Anybody who's looked at the best seller lists realizes what perennial and fundamental appeal such topics have, and again, a well publicized four- or six-lecture course on that, which would be open to the community in the evenings, would get a tremendous response and give us the opportunity to do something for the community, at the same time associating ourselves with that educational effort.

It has been somewhat of a surprise to me this weekend to find out how persistent a concern patient care is at the UC Health Center, I'll say. It has come up again and again in the small group meetings, and in the discussion about Mt. Zion Hospital yesterday, and in dinner-time conversation. In spite of the fact that the exit polls may be overwhelmingly positive, there is still, even though it may be a minority, a group of people who come to our medical center and go away unhappy and dissatisfied. Perhaps it doesn't take very many of those to create the opinion which is common, that it's difficult to have a pleasant experience at Moffitt Hospital. What what one can do about
that comes under several categories. One has to do simply with the physical situation and the creature comforts, and some of the remedies that Haile mentioned are very pertinent to that. That is, simply arriving, having to find a place to park, having to figure out how to get into this big building and having to traverse the elevator systems is already a major battle. So some attention to those matters would seem to be very, very important.

The second topic that came up is a matter of attitude, and that takes several forms. That is also expressed often in ways that make people unhappy. I heard this weekend, for instance, of a service which makes all appointments at only two times during the day. At 9:00 o'clock and 1:00 o'clock. Everybody comes at those times and then waits until somebody is ready to see them. Someone appeared at nine and after some period of waiting asked what the problem was and was told, "Oh well, the doctor won't be out of class until 10:30 but we only schedule at 9:00 and 1:00." It's that kind of attitude that, obviously, one would like to change. I think it is clearly a matter of concern and one which we pay for. It's a great concern that people be treated considerately by faculty, by staff, and by students.

The last thing that I wanted to mention is the question of the value system of the University and how that affects the patient care. There are two topics that came up with respect to that. One is a personal experience that I had that I'd like to recount. In the course of discussions concerning the selection of a new dean in the medical school and the search committee, I had a chance to talk to several people, some of them at UCSF and some of them from the outside, and one of the things that I was curious about was, "What is the level of clinical care at UCSF and how are we viewed from the outside, how is it considered?" I was somewhat surprised to be told it was ok, it was good, but not special. And one person made the remarkable assertion to me that in some areas, we were not even the best in the Bay Area. On further questioning and asking how does such a state of affairs come about, one of the answers was simply "it boils down to the values of the university." Are we placing a high premium on patient care? Are we doing the best we can to be an excellent patient care center? This is a topic I know that Ron Miller has been concerned with and has brought up in previous years. This was reinforced by one of the student's comments yesterday in our small group session that, in fact, it's very clear to students on the wards that there is much greater value put on a good researcher than on a good clinician. It's not clear to me that we have to pit one against the other. And we would propose that a suitable topic for a future Asilomar conference might be consideration of patient care and all of its aspects at our center. I think we all felt that this is a topic of very great importance, that our most fundamental relation to the community was through health care, and that it was through that that we would gain the loyalty and the interest and engage the people around us in what, after all, is one of our major missions.
GROUPS II AND V DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

San Francisco and California are very "political" environments in which UCSF must live and work. The city has a very visible government, but local politics are strongly influenced by neighborhood groups and special interests. In addition, the political influences seem to go through periodic swings of power, difficult to predict, largely understood only in retrospect.

The state legislature is very interested in the University, and the Office of the President has crafted a well working but delicate relationship with the members as well as with the Governor. In this context, UCSF is part of a large, complex, multi-faceted organization, not an independent agency.

Finally, UCSF is the home of "biotechnology" and talk of the development of a Biotechnology Center has been widely publicized. Yet the public is concerned about safety, and although they may applaud research, they want it tried out elsewhere (Not in My Backyard!).

How much influence can and should the School have with local politics?

With a large number of faculty, students, and staff living in San Francisco, are we all doing enough to articulate the School's interests on a "grass roots" level?

With relations at the State level clearly a function of the campus administration, how do we insure that well-intentioned faculty work cooperatively with administrators to the benefit of all concern? Does everyone really understand how "the system" works?

Will the biotechnology initiatives help or hurt UCSF? Are we ready to or capable of dealing with the risks of this activity? Should we care about a vocal minority, confront them or ignore them?

DAVID ALTMAN:
(reporter for group #2; members include Altman, Baxter, Kaminsky, LaBaer, Littlejohn, Wintroub)

In our discussions we came to the conclusion that when one looks at politics in San Francisco, one finds that there really is no identifiable dominant political force such as the good old machine politics of Mayor Daly in Chicago twenty-thirty years ago. Perhaps the concerns that we have relate to the diffuseness of political influence in San Francisco as we try to understand it.
Politicians are important to us not so much because of how they can help us, but more because of how much they can hurt us as they have this ability to block our efforts to grow or expand or to develop new initiatives that may have an impact on the political environment. In fact, we do live in a political environment, and it was the feeling of our group that given this reality, we must do better at doing what politicians do. We need to speak clearly and with some pride about what we can do and what we can accomplish and what we have accomplished. And we need to take advantage of the opportunities available to us to speak of these things. We must talk to neighbors, we must talk to politicians, we must use our contacts and we must at every opportunity talk with great pride about what our institution is about. Many of us have contacts with people who are either directly or indirectly in positions to influence the political forces in the community, and although we would never want to encourage our faculty to commit the sin of the "end run" to try to influence legislators to get personally supported programs developed, there is a sense that at the level of discussing the overall philosophy and goals of the institution, and what we can accomplish, such discussions can be nothing but beneficial.

We also sense that the institution needs to work better in the political environment, at least to have our faculty and students and staff better aware of issues related to neighborhood organizations, have lists maintained of the neighborhood organizations and when the meetings are, and know who, for instance, lives in a particular neighborhood and muster the forces available within our faculty, students, and staff to get involved in neighborhood organizations and their meetings.

That raised a second major issue and that has to do with the whole problem that comes under the rubric "public relations." We feel that we have done a superb job in the last decade or so with respect to press relations, community relations, donor relations, but we now are facing a problem and potentially a crisis with respect to the whole issue of public relations. There are a number of examples of inattention to public or political implications of new issues. Examples that we've heard about over this weekend included Laurel Heights, the closing down of the program at Langley Porter, and a sense we all had of some discomfort with how these issues were handled -- how what might be called damage control was managed.

We talked at length about Mt. Zion yesterday. One question that the group raised and I think it is an important one for us to discuss during the next few hours and certainly over the next few weeks is, "What are the public relations plans and the public relations implications of the Mt. Zion move?"

And in fact this raises a larger issue with respect to public relations. And that is, "Do we really have a sense, as an institution, as a school, a university of what our public relations themes might be? What are the program themes that we wish to have the public understand?" Now, a lot of this is coming out of the 125th birthday celebration which we heard about considerably yesterday, yet there's a sense in our discussion that these issues needed to develop greater focus. And finally we had a sense that our
faculty does not always do as well as perhaps we'd like in dealing with the TV, radio, and other media. There are skills that can be learned in how to respond to questions posed by a potentially hostile TV or radio interviewer. How to manage that and keep one's head about one is a skill that we could use some coaching on.

PHILIP LEE:

(group five reporter; members included Bishop, Dallman, Dunn-Gorn, Goldsmith, Gwyn, Lee, Margaretten, Petrakis, Tanagho)

We had four questions and I'll just address those as they were asked us. "How much influence can and should the school have with local politics?" We felt that on the "should" question, as much as possible; on the "can" question, more. We did not separate the medical school from the campus. If you think about it, the medical school, because of San Francisco General, which is a county hospital; Moffitt-Long and Langley Porter which are state hospitals; and the VA, which is a federal hospital, has a particular stake in our ability to deal effectively in those environments.

At the local level, we saw politics as including a variety of constituents, and the first group are patients. A suggestion was made by one of the medical students that their badges -- I mean the students are all over town, they are in various settings, they're interacting with hundreds of patients every day from San Francisco -- and everybody has a little badge and it says their name and it says "student". It doesn't say UCSF, no matter where they are. Just a simple little thing like a label that says they are from UCSF. That might also apply to the faculty who also interact in many different sites with patients.

Organized labor is a constituency that as a campus, we've largely ignored. As a matter of fact, I think that we have the reputation in the community as being anti-organized labor.

With respect to big business and small business, we've done a much better job, but this area should not be neglected by members of the faculty. Department chairs and faculty members are treating some of the senior people in major San Francisco firms. There are opportunities for communication there and I think that's been an important part of our good relations.

At the level of local elected officials, we should coordinate and not have a piecemeal approach to either the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor's Office. Also we should not neglect social contacts with politicians. Additionally, rather than just inviting people to come and see what we are doing, we should invite them to come and tell us what they are doing, so that we learn more about what's going on in the city as well as improving the communication.

With respect to the second question, it says, "With the large number of faculty, students, and staff living in San Francisco, are we doing enough to articulate the school's interest
on the grassroots level?" Well I think that we felt pretty unanimously that we were not, although a number faculty members and staff are members of various neighborhood organizations. Tom Gwyn's office is very willing to assist any faculty member -- and I think we should communicate this to faculty and staff -- who wishes to join one of these organizations, to provide the name of the organization in their neighborhood, the leadership of the organization and information about it. However, some of these organizations in the coalition have a very rigid advocacy agenda that's hostile to the university so we are unlikely to benefit from membership. There are a variety of other organizations where participation can be helpful -- it isn't just the neighborhood organizations where influence can be important.

There was uniform agreement to improve the parking for the patients. Valet parking has been suggested. This is clearly a problem that can improve our relations with the grassroots.

The third question said, "With relations at the state level clearly a function of campus administration, how do we insure that well-intended faculty work cooperatively with administration to the benefit of all concerned? Does everyone really understand how the system works?" I think we do understand how the system works. I would cite Proposition 102, the AIDS initiative, where leadership from a number of faculty was very, very important.

This year, the big issue according to Willie Brown -- and he ought to know -- in the legislature is going to be the uninsured. Now if something could be done effectively about the uninsured in California it would have enormous benefit, particularly at San Francisco General Hospital. So that's an area we might pay some attention to.

In a fourth area, the question was "Will the biotechnology initiatives help or hurt UCSF?" Are we ready to, or capable of dealing with the risks of this activity? Should we care about a vocal minority, confront them, or ignore them?" Well, we had some very knowledgeable individuals in our group on this issue, and it was felt we should not exaggerate the importance of what the university can do in terms of biotechnology, the benefits that we can give to industry. There has been this biotechnology initiative, the notion of a biotechnology center, and we should be very clear about what, in fact, the basic scientists really can contribute to industrial development. Because of the presence of UCSF and it's role in the early development of the biotech industry, it's felt that we have some major thing to contribute, and I think it was a very important point to be made.

With respect to the risks, we simply need to be honest about what we are doing and to inform the public about that. With respect to this vocal minority, it certainly exists, and there is no question that we will not be able to convert those people. It reminds me of the story about when my dad was born, he was one of a third set of twins. His father was a Presbyterian missionary in Mormon Utah, and his church was not filled with converts. But when my dad and his twin brother were born, my grandparents got a telegram from the church that was supporting them in New York. It said,
"Congratulations, Reverend. If you can't convert them, outnumber them." I think that's what we should try to do with respect to some of these issues.
A University is a complex operation with multiple tasks. Our missions of teaching, scholarship, and service are at times in conflict, yet this can have an effect on the community at large. For example, new medical procedures can be exciting to the public and attract referrals, but patients do not want to be "experimented on." New programs can appear to be "flashy" with respect to the public image, but may not fit in well with ongoing programs in the School or a department.

In addition, the "service" component of our institutional mission is generally translated for the individual faculty member being considered for promotion as activity in patient care (if it is considered at all). Yet University and public service not only is a matter of responsibility, it could have a beneficial effect on the University's relationship with the city in which it exists. The faculty is already subjected to concern about how to balance teaching, research, and patient care. A new emphasis on public service might be seen as another burden for the beleaguered faculty.

How can the School manage the potential conflicts as they may affect our relationship with the community?

How can we encourage and reward community service by our faculty? What is our role in keeping them apprised of opportunities?

What new programs can be developed so that faculty can become engaged in local activities? How many current such activities are we in fact aware of?

LEON LEVINTOW:
(reporter, group number three; members include Alberts, Cheitlin, Fink, Hamilton, Isenberg, Levintow, Phillips, Rensenbrink and Root)

Don Fink was actually our shepherd and directed the discussion. This group started with the premise that service to the local community by the faculty, staff and students has intrinsic value and it also can enhance the institution's image. And the fact is that we do an astonishing amount. So many things of value are actually going on, and yet the effect of all this effort is remarkably invisible. And it goes largely unappreciated. What our group focused on was some suggestions for improving the situation. And the specific suggestions follow:

Send a clear signal that such activities are important for promotion. How about separating out local community service from the generalized grab bag of community and public service in the promotion criteria which can include service on study sections or
university committees. Solicit letters from the recipients of such service. There exists a Chancellor's Award for public service. Why not expand this? Develop some mechanism for the Dean's office to acknowledge the outstanding or exceptional service on the part of faculty.

The second category of suggestions that were made was to provide better organization and support of community and public service programs, provide more staff in Tom Gwyn's office. Perhaps have a central clearinghouse which would be available both to the providers of the service and to the users of it so that the users or the potential users might know what sorts of services were available and how they might avail themselves of it. There should be better publicity about the available programs.

Another matter would be a better outreach program so that the providers of services could know who might benefit from their efforts. Someone made, perhaps a not entirely ironic suggestion, that one source of such outreach might be the list of organizations on the left-hand side of Joel Ventresca's letterhead. Other target groups might be investigated; the elderly, in particular, was mentioned, and the Asian communities which are growing up in the vicinity of UC Medical Center.

And finally, the idea was proposed that we might explore the availability of grant support to faculty, staff, and students who wanted to provide community services.

THOMAS HUNT:

(group six reporter; members include Bland, Bourne, Crede, Hunt, Margulis, Miller, Osborn, Risse)

The first question we had was, "How can the school manage the potential conflicts...?" We started by observing that resistance is inevitable, conflict often helpful, and that we should not assume that perfection brings peace. Conflict is a necessary part of change. Joel Ventresca illustrated that he is for vigilant resistance, this will be his role, and we should realize that he is not the only person who does that and the phenomenon that is happening to us is happening to other institutions all over the world. This is why we need PR departments and attorneys. The point of making that remark is that no matter how good we are, there will be conflicts, and in a certain sense, the better we are, perhaps the more conflict there will be. We should recognize this as healthy and fight the good fight relatively cheerfully, in a statesman-like manner, and realize that is part of our role. Ventresca clearly expressed a great fear of change. And all of us share that.

Our position must be to take a role of trust with our community, so that the fear of change can be mitigated. In that respect, prevention of course is the better part of damage control. In this sense we felt that we must take Joel Ventresca's word; we must plan in advance, we must all be candid, honest, and open. We must expect resistance; however, and I think this is kind of important and I'll elaborate on it, we have to approach many of these goals as equals with our communities. To do this we must
convince the community that we have their interests at heart. In this respect you would see UCSF as emerging from a century of autocratic isolation, but we are perhaps in danger of exchanging autocratic arrogance for a kind of patronizing arrogance. And I must say that if I'd been a community member here this weekend, I would leave with mixed feelings. I would say I was very pleased with the interest that's been put in my community, I would be pleased with the importance that's given to me, but I'd wonder about how much they'd done to me as opposed to how much they would be doing with me.

In that respect San Francisco General is better off than the UC Moffitt campus. They have a pretty clear record there of identifying segments of their population and taking joint action, direction from the community, and even relinquishing control to it. UC Moffitt tends to be more patronizing, more monolithic, and perhaps we can take an example from SFGH's success. We'd suggest, in that regard, that sharing our facilities and being a participant in the community would be very important.

Space is tight, but not at night. Our group also suggested night classes, for perhaps chronic use, not just intermittent use as the last group suggested -- night schools with specific courses, counseling on health careers, the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, other organizations of that sort need counseling for their children. There are many people, particularly in the Black community who are looking for counseling for their kids, role models -- we have that -- space to give that, faculty to give that. And we have night times to give.

I'd like to repeat, then, that the essence of good citizenship is not necessarily so much what you contribute as it is joining in the process. And I think we need to join in that process, although identifying a community to join with is not all that easy. For some purposes you may have to manufacture a community, identify leaders in order to arrange joint actions.

The second question we dealt with was, "How can we encourage and reward community service?" We've learned the power of the promotion process and, certainly at departmental levels, a review of public service should count. That is probably the level at which it is best enforced. We should also recognize publicly in the UCSF community the efforts of individuals. We also recognize the Chancellor's Public Service Awards but regretted that there are only one or two of them. Certain categories of public service could be recognized. Awards could be given by the Dean's Office in categories such as political service, health-related services or services to the Boy Scouts or the schools, and so forth.

And we felt that we could only admire Bruce Alberts' efforts with the Science Education Partnership Program and working with the schools, but we felt that the thing that really distinguishes you, Bruce, was not so much that you were out there teaching people, but that you were participating with the teachers in teaching people. And that your humble services, the dry ice and the rats, may be more important in the long run than the lectures.
"How can we keep faculty apprised of opportunities?" We had relatively little to offer except to say again that as we participate with the community and consult with them, needs will become apparent and that joining in that process will identify needs. We may not be in as much of a position of offering opportunities as going out and actually recruiting people to participate. Our emphasis was really pushing the process of prevention, developing participation and common interest, and taking joint actions with the community so that we're a very important element for them. And then when the inevitable resistance arises, they have to consider that there is positive value, and that we're part of the process.
CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, April 14, 1989
12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m.
S-118

Members in Attendance: Trinity Orbona (Chair), Ethel Adams, Kathy Balestreri, Karen Eldred, Linda Erkelens, Michele Graf, May Huang, Carolyn Koster, Steve Leonoudakis, Valli McDougle, Anne Poirier, Steve Reynolds, Isabel Roma, Byron Sigal, Barbara Wilson, Christine Yee

Liaisons: Barbara Atkinson, Paula Carien Schultz

Guests: Atty. Anna Shimko (Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Robertson & Galk)


CHAIR'S REPORT

The meeting was brought to order by Trinity Orbona at 12:10 p.m. Minutes from the March 10, 1989 were reviewed, corrected to state that Trinity Orbona was absent, and approved.

New members were introduced: May Huang (CVRI), Isabel Roma (Library), and Bill Thomas (Environmental Services). Susan Heath and Carolyn Roberts have resigned membership, so that SAC now includes 40 members total.

Cards of condolence were sent to Suzanne Gottschalk and Karen Newhouse for their recent family losses.

S-118 has been reserved for possible SAC meetings during the summer (July 14, Aug. 11, Sept. 8); although meetings in July & August have not been scheduled yet, activities surrounding the 125th Anniversary and EIRs may necessitate them.

The budget of $6,000 has been approved to carry SAC through September. This figure will probably be doubled next year. Most of the funds go toward publicity costs for Community Outreach and Staff Education events. The Executive SAC Committee suggested investigating funding for media training, and after general discussion, it was recommended that we examine this proposal. Trinity asked Karen Eldred to look into it.

Communications between Friends of Noe Valley and Roy Balzer & Tom Gwyn were summarized with regard to concerns about cancer clusters, disposal of hazardous materials, particularly burning radioactive material in exhaust stacks, and the status of UCSF wind studies. These are attached.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

Community Outreach

Byron Sigal announced that two refurbishing projects have been identified which match our criteria for neighborhood and ethnic associations: 1) painting the dining room of the Hamilton United Methodist Church in the Haight, which operates a food program for the
homeless, in June; and 2) assisting in the construction of a mini-park near the day care center Las Americas at 20th and Mission next year.

Christine Yee reported that the Toy Drive, titled "Children Helping Children", has been scheduled for May 15-22, and will involve collection of toys and books for children up to twelve years of age from UCSF, neighborhood public schools, and local merchants. There will be an informational kickoff meeting on April 19 @ 11 a.m. in S-940 and all were encouraged to attend. Distribution of toys at the end of the drive is still being explored and suggestions of associations which meet our targeted criteria are welcome.

Staff Education

Anne Poirier announced that the "Toxins in the Workplace" seminar has been scheduled for May 18, 12 noon - 1 p.m., in HSW-302. Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and Assistant Vice Chancellor Roy Balzer have agreed to participate in a similar question and answer format. A discussion followed about contacting staff liaisons at off-campus sites to increase participation.

Information and Advocacy

Valli McDougle reported that she has received permission to invite President Gardner to address SAC about UC expansion, particularly at UCSF, and the role he sees staff playing in promoting the University's goals, hopefully in conjunction with the 125th celebrations.

Valli also distributed handouts from the 1989 Leadership Retreat, "The Community and Its UCSF," including transcripts from Joel Ventresca, President of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods and Don Rosenheim, City Editor, SF Chronicle. She encouraged any questions or comments on the recommendations.

There were no Liaisons reports.

PRESENTATION:

Animal Rights Day

Barbara Atkinson and Atty. Anna Shimko made several general announcements. Monday, April 24 has been designated "World Laboratory Animal Liberation Day" and a special alert announcement has been disseminated around campus, though the anticipated focus is Sacramento. An article entitled "Research versus Animal Rights: Is There a Middle Ground?" from American Scientist was distributed (see attached).
Radiation License Hearing at Laurel Heights

The attached UCSF News release on the Laurel Heights Radiation License was distributed. The Radiation Hearing to extend our license to use radioactive materials at the Laurel Heights research lab for the Intercampus Program in Molecular Parasitology will be held Friday, April 21 from 9 a.m. - 5 p.m. in the Laurel Heights Auditorium. This will be run by the State Department of Health Services and, though not mandatory, was requested by the Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association. Barbara Atkinson’s office has been coordinating a strategy of supporting presentations inviting faculty, staff, laboratory workers, retirees and community members to speak on our behalf. All staff interested in sitting in the audience are most welcome.

EIR Process

The EIR process was reviewed, illustrated by the diagram at right. An EIR will have to be prepared for both Laurel Heights and Mt. Zion over the next year. No dates have been set as we are at the first step of the diagram, gathering data to do the EIR. Following this, several optional steps may be taken: 1) briefing the legislators; 2) holding initial information meetings to such UCSF staff representative groups as MAG, ABOG and SAC; 3) organizing a general campus informational meeting in Cole Hall; and 4) convening an informal public information meeting. A draft EIR is prepared, and for the next 45-60 days while this is being reviewed, a formal public hearing is held and comments are invited. Presentations to such groups as SPUR, the Chamber of Commerce, neighborhood groups, and the Jewish Community Center may be offered, as well as another campus informational meeting in Cole Hall and briefing the legislators. At the end of the review period, a final EIR is produced, taking into consideration all the comments, criticisms and suggestions provided. The Regents evaluate, and hopefully approve, the EIR, and forward a Notice of Determination to the State declaring that we used this EIR to come to this decision. There is a 30 day Statute of Limitations once submitted.
Questions from the committee were answered, including the following:

1. **What did we do wrong with the last EIR for Laurel Heights?**
   The last EIR did not contain a large enough scope of options for other uses of Laurel Heights space and locations for UCSF programs at other sites. We were not as well organized and prepared for the public hearings, not anticipating the public protest, not involving attorneys, and not encouraging staff to participate more. Our next EIR will be greatly improved from what we have learned.

2. **Should we anticipate a challenge to the Mt. Zion EIR?**
   We don't know yet, but Mt. Zion is not as controversial as Laurel Heights, in that there is already a functioning medical center at Mt. Zion.

3. **What kinds of things included in both EIRs would be objectionable?**
   The biggest issue at Laurel Heights will be the safety concerns of research laboratories. At Mt. Zion the issues include serious traffic and parking problems.

4. **Are we doing different things for this second Laurel Heights EIR, or the same things better?**
   Both. The process is basically the same, but it is under more scrutiny. More professionals are involved in reviewing every step. And, very crucially, we are developing a better program to present at public hearings.

5. **Who prepares the EIR?**
   The documents are prepared by Environmental Science Associates, a professional company which prepares EIRs, and UC is in constant contact with them.

6. **Are the two EIRs considered the same project?**
   There are two separate EIR projects. Although each EIR will have its own alternative section, they will also be cross-referenced; that is to say, when analyzing alternate sites available to Mt. Zion programs, Laurel Heights space will be considered, and vise versa. The same will be true of the required section on cumulative impacts.

7. **Will the word 'academic', which confused the public, be used in this EIR to describe potential programs at Laurel Heights?**
   We are trying to avoid this word; programs will be described as 'biomedical,' 'instructional,' or 'administrational.'

8. **How will program options for the remaining space at Laurel Heights be described in the EIR?**
   In the project description of the EIR, three different scenarios will be outlined for the remaining Laurel Heights space: 1) 100% used for biomedical research; 2) 50% biomedical and 50% instructional (including teaching labs); and 3) 50% biomedical and 50% administrational. In the alternatives section of the EIR, we will also have to consider other uses for the remaining space, such as 100% administrational, 100% clinical, and other sites available to UC to develop these programs. All this was done in the last EIR, but it was not well written.

9. **What has happened to the "Breach of Promise" suit at Laurel Heights?**
   This suit is in the 'discovery stage' now where we are producing documents for evidence and will take quite some time.
Trinity closed in summary, encouraging all to attend the public hearings for the EIRs and/or write letters of support to become part of the record during the 45-60 day period following the development of the draft EIR. The Information and Advocacy Subcommittee has already contacted several staff members willing to testify. Barbara’s office will keep us informed of what we can do and the timeline of the EIR process. Probably draft EIRs will be out by late summer or early fall.

The meeting was adjourned by Trinity Ordon at 1:30 p.m.

Submitted by Anne Poirier

Enclosures:  Memo from Ordon to Spaulding/Balzer 3-16-89
File notes from Michaels 1-25-89
Letter from Balzer/Gwyn to Barry 4-5-89
"Research versus Animal Rights"
*UCSF News release on Laurel Heights Radiation Hearing

*Attached only for those absent from the April 14 meeting.
March 16, 1989

To: Bruce Spaulding and Roy Balzer

Fr: Trinity A. Ordoña

Departmental Administrative Analyst

Dear Bruce and Roy:

Thanks for speaking to Staff Advisory Committee last Friday. I am sorry I missed it, as I have only heard good things about it.

I am enclosing the 1/23 memo summarizing the Friends of Noe Valley meeting about cancer clusters. Have you seen it already? I am concerned about the accusation of UCSF burning radioactive material - what's the answer? Perhaps this should be addressed in writing? When we do hold an educational forum on hazardous waste, it is very likely that this same accusation will be made again. Our events are open to the public and I'm sure our friends at Laurel Heights will come. Your thoughts?
January 25, 1919

Memo To: FILE

From: MEREDITH MICHAELS

Subject: JANUARY 23RD FRIENDS OF NOE VALLEY MEETING

MEETING OVERVIEW

The second in what is likely to be a series of community meetings regarding the cancer cluster in Eureka/Noe Valley was held on Monday, January 23. Not including members of the panel, there were approximately 40 people in attendance. To my knowledge, the only press person present was Lori Olszewski with the San Francisco Chronicle. Lew Schalit, representing the Friends of Noe Valley, chaired the meeting. Other panel members included Phil Wolfson (also with Friends of Noe Valley and chair of the newly formed citizens group), Duncan Saunders (epidemiologist with the Department of Public Health), Bill Lee (head of the toxicology division with the Department of Public Health) and John Barry.

MEETING SUMMARY

Duncan Saunders reviewed his initial study. Much of what he reported was a repeat from the December 12 meeting. He summarized the three possible explanations as: 1) the expected numbers are wrong because they used data from the 1980 census; 2) it is a statistical phenomenon; 3) there is a real increase, i.e. there may be something in the Noe/Eureka Valley such as a toxic hazard or a virus.

He again reported that in 1986 there were no new cases of childhood cancer reported in the Noe/Eureka Valley. Ditto for 1987. He made the point that sometimes you have to look closely because 1987 was the year during which John Barry's daughter, who lives in the Inner Sunset but spent 50+ hours a week in Eureka Valley, was diagnosed. Preliminary information (not from the tumor registry but from calls to all the hospitals in San Francisco) is that there are reports of 3 cases city-wide, one of which is in the study area, for 1988. This information is not complete; all three of the reported cases were from Kaiser Hospital.

There were several questions from the audience regarding birth rates in Noe/Eureka Valley, comparisons with older children and so on.

With respect to the next steps, Saunders reported that they now have the names and addresses from the tumor registry and hope to interview 60+ families whose children were from ages 0 - 4 when diagnosed with cancer between the years of 1981-1987. These represent both the age group and years (note: increase applies only to 1984) in which there was an excess. They brought it out to '87 because the main purpose is to determine if there are any present hazards. They are not looking for the cause of childhood cancer, simply to determine whether any environmental hazard is or was present.

The focus will be on determining whether there were any areas in common -- schools, residences, day care, known exposures, parents' work places. Questions will also be asked about the prenatal history, the child's health record (x-rays, medicines, etc), family history and so on. Saunders will contact the child's physician, first, to
determine if there’s any reason not to contact the family. The data will be analyzed and then a decision will be made regarding the need for further data, i.e. is there a need to interview a comparison group?

In summarizing, Saunders reiterated that there is not necessarily a great problem out there. The follow up is being done because it is prudent not to simply assume there is or was no hazard. Saunders estimates it will take up to 6 months to complete the follow up study.

Bill Lee was the next, and final speaker. He indicated that his office was working with the following agencies:

1) Sutro Tower. He has met with the owners, toured the tower and has previous study data regarding the emission/effects of non-ionizing radiation. Instrumentation has been made available to him for further measurements. There were no questions from the audience.

2) UCSF. He has met with Balzer, indicated the city’s concerns regarding "the exact number of stacks, how many of these stacks are filtered, and determining which way the wind blows." Lee continued that, according to UCSF, the wind blows away from UCSF 90% of the time, but does go in the Noe Valley direction 10% of the time. He also cited the "controversy over Radian, the firm hired by UCSF to compile airborne environmental data" noting that UCSF has agreed to "let the Health Department, with the assistance of an advisory council (UCSF rep, BAAQMD rep, Health Dept. rep, neighborhood reps), subcontract for a third party oversight of the study." He said he asked for, and had either received or would receive, information on any air emissions. He also mentioned the Water's bill, saying that in 1991 the University would be required to provide certain information to the city. He said he has "assurances that they will provide us with the data."

Someone in the audience asked for clarification on a point made in last month’s meeting whether different types of radiation cause different types of cancer and if this wasn’t true, didn’t UCSF emit radioactive materials until 1985 and therefore you couldn’t discount that as a potential source? Bill Lee responded with a brief, and unclear, discussion of alpha/beta/gamma rays and the concept of concentration and distance. His response was not clear. Lew Schalit said it was just too early to draw any conclusions. Margaret Verges said that "UCSF was asked to stop incinerating in 1985 because of excess levels of radioactive materials in the ash...there were no profiles, though, so can't determine exactly what the levels were..." Schalit responded that the records are there and it would be quite easy to determine what and how much was burned. Neil Gendel (Sierra Club rep. on the EA Task Force) said that "as far as the 1985 date, UCSF was tagged for mishandling of radioactive materials." Verges responded "Well, we have a copy of the stop order..." (According to Roy Balzer, there was no stop order).

Schalit redirected the discussion at this point noting that we are all using more toxics in our everyday life -- gas, solvents. There were a few questions from the audience, nothing significant.

3) BAAQMD will provide the city with information regarding point source emissions.

4) HEALTH DEPARTMENT issues permits for hazardous materials. Bill Lee will check the records for locations in study area, past complaints, spills and so on.
5) **WATER DEPARTMENT.** Lee's unit will work with the water department for some chemical analyses (apparently when water is fluoridated, there are resulting organic compounds).

Bill Lee estimates this process will take 4 - 5 months.

As the meeting was winding down, Lew Schalit asked that specific concerns be funnelled through the citizens committee (chaired by Wolfson, 550-1700). Before adjourning members of the audience suggested asking about 1) increased pollution from cars on local streets; 2) radon testing; 3) bottled water. And, then, Regis Kelley asked whether the city was going to look into hospital facilities, other than UCSF, which might be down/up wind from Noe Valley. He objected to singling out UCSF because all hospitals use and emit radioactive materials. As a matter of fact, he said that 90% of the radioactive materials used at UCSF were at the hospital and that you could get rid of all research at UCSF and there would be a negligible impact on the quantity of radioactive materials used. Someone from the panel responded (I think it was Lee) that they were looking at what came out of the stacks.

**REACTIONS**

Margaret Verges' statement that UCSF had been ordered to stop burning radioactive material and that she was in possession of the stop order (According to Roy Balzer, UCSF was not under a stop order of any kind. The decision to stop burning was made in light of community concerns and increasing financial pressures. I think it would be valuable to discuss this point and the facts surrounding UCSF's license at the February 3 meeting with Barry and Wolfson) was of some concern. Carol Fox indicated that she may be contacting the reporter from the Chronicle to set the record straight.

cc: Tom Gwyn
    Barbara Atkinson
    Tim Dayonot

MM: Jan
R: Cancer Cluster
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Mr. John Barry
J. Barry Realtors
1619 10th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

As you requested during our meeting on February 3, 1989 we are providing you with written responses to the questions raised in your letter. We hope that the meeting we held to deal with your questions was helpful, the responses set out below are essentially the same as what we verbally shared with you.

You asked that we "accelerate the search for answers to the cancer cluster in Eureka-Noe Valley" and "adopt new management patterns to eliminate the cloud of concern that now bothers so many in San Francisco, about UCSF."

Over a year ago we initiated our UCSF Environmental Assessment. This scientific study is designed to determine the environmental impact on air, soil and water from the release of contaminants at UCSF's diverse facilities. The purpose of the study is to help all of us understand any potential and significant environmental impacts upon the neighboring community. The Chancellor has committed over one million additional dollars to finance this study. Here at the Parnassus Campus the surrounding neighborhood associations have been involved with us from the outset in the conduct of this study.

In addition, the present campus administration has developed a "Memorandum of Understanding with the City of San Francisco" for the express purpose of improving our communications with the city.

As we said during our meeting, we hope you are getting the sense that we have been concerned and active in addressing the issues for some time, not just since the Noe-Eureka Valley cancer cluster announcement.

Now to your specific questions:

ITEM 1: To whom is UCSF accountable in matters of hazardous materials use disposal:

For almost all Federal and State regulations there is a State of California agency that is responsible for enforcement. These agencies have the right of entry and enforcement at any time. Based on their own hazard classification priorities and available resources, they determine the frequency and scope of inspections. Following is a list of the major agencies and codes that they enforce at UCSF.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Permits certain operations such as our power plant boilers, pathological incinerator, paint spray booth and hospital ethylene oxide sterilizers. Also responsible to enforce toxic emissions regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, State of</td>
<td>Licenses hospitals and their clinical laboratories, CCR Title 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health Services Hospital Licensing and Certification</td>
<td>Handling and disposal of radionuclides. California Code of Regulations CCR Title 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health Services Radiological Health Branch</td>
<td>Packaging, labeling, transportation and disposal of non-radioactive chemical and infection waste. CCR Title 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health Services Toxic Substances Control Division</td>
<td>Inspects and permits boilers, elevators and pressure vessels. CCR Title 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Industrial Regulations - Division of Industrial Safety</td>
<td>All aspects of worker safety and health. CCR Title 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal. Department of Industrial Relations Cal/OSHA</td>
<td>Inspects waste transporter vehicles and issues a certificate of compliance. CCR Title 22, CCR Title 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Enforces the building and fire codes. CCR Title 19, CCR Title 247.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>Monitors and enforces the underground tank storage regulations. CCR Title 23. Enforces Hazardous Material Emergency Response Requirements, AB 2189.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, City &amp; County of</td>
<td>Monitors and enforces regulations for waste water effluent streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health Toxics Unit</td>
<td>Accredits hospitals complying with its Accreditation Manual for Hospitals. Hazardous material programs are required for accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>NIH grant funding requires each campus laboratory to comply with NIH guidelines for laboratory safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations</td>
<td>Regulates &quot;controlled substances.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice FDA/Drug Enforcement Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The California Code of Regulations contains 25 titles or codes dealing with various topics of administrative law. For example, Title 13 is the Motor Vehicle Code, Title 17 is the Public Health Code, Title 19 is the State Building Code, etc. Each of these codes contains sections that pertain to "toxics." To facilitate finding these sections the State developed Title 26 which is a compilation of all of these "toxics" sections.

ITEM 2: Would UCSF permit City of San Francisco officials to exercise equal supervision of UCSF as they would be able to supervise and monitor and assess a private facility of like nature?

In general the City of San Francisco does not exercise "supervision" over private entities. Within the domain of their authority they promulgate and enforce their regulations and also enforce delegated state regulations. From the table above you can see that they do indeed have and exercise some enforcement responsibility over UCSF. It seems to us that to assume oversight, in an area where the State already has jurisdiction, would be a wasteful duplication of effort. Our view is based on the recognition that there has been no evidence that UCSF, or similar institutions, has ever been a health hazard to its neighbors.

We have also developed a "Memorandum of Understanding with the City of San Francisco" to facilitate our interaction. As we pointed out during our meeting there is new legislation that will result in San Francisco having more information from State departments and universities.

ITEM 3: Exactly how many exhaust stacks are now on the UCSF Parnassus Campus? How many are filtered, by what type of filters? How many are filtered, by what type of filters? How many are unfiltered? With filters being as low as $25, should not all stacks exhausting chemical or toxics or radioactives be filtered.

There are approximately 419 fume hoods at Parnassus. Since some fume hoods are ganged (connected together) to a common exhaust stack the number of exhaust stacks is less than the number of fume hoods. There are approximately 332 exhaust stacks.

Five chemical exhaust stacks are filtered, the remainder are not filtered. The filter bank includes a prefilter (for large particulate matter), a high efficiency particulate aerosol filter (HEPA) and a charcoal filter to remove most volatile organic compounds.

You suggest that exhaust stack filters cost on the order of $25. The installation of the filter bank on the exhaust stack on the Agabian laboratory at Laurel Heights (this stack serves only one fume hood) cost more than $5000. We have been quoted a price of approximately $1500 to remove, dispose of and replace the filters.

Of course, the real question is whether or not fume hoods should be filtered: the cost is important, but secondary. The emissions from these hoods should be below the level that is deemed a public health risk acceptable to the community.
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Ordinarily, regulatory agencies decide what is acceptable risk and promulgate standards that permit emissions in accordance with this risk. Private and public employers assume that if their facilities and operations are in compliance with regulatory emission standards, they are operating within acceptable public health risk criteria. Even the State Supreme Court, in the Laurel Heights Case, accepts the concept that compliance with regulations is acceptable.

The agency (BAAQMD) which is responsible for regulating emissions from fume hoods in laboratories and hospitals has excluded such hoods from regulation. We recognize that some of their decisions are based on insufficient data and our Environmental Assessment, based on EPA protocol, is intended to give more specific data and information to support this exclusion.

ITEM 4: What carcinogens must be filtered to comply with state law? Were any measurements made at the point of emission of the filtered and unfiltered stacks? Were any records made that show the results?

The Cal/OSHA *Carcinogen Standards, CCR Title 8 - Section 5209* states that emissions of regulated carcinogens are not permitted. This standard does not limit control options to filtering; any method of collection and/or destruction is acceptable.

Emission tests are not now required and have not been conducted pursuant to this regulation. Of course, considerable emission testing has been conducted as part of our Environmental Assessment and we expect to have the results early this spring.

ITEM 5: What incinerators have been used, and for what periods, and for what materials, in the 1980's? Who logs their use, maintenance, and repairs? What records have been created to show how the fumes of these incinerators are?

In the 1980's the only incinerator at Parnassus has been the "permitted" pathological incinerator housed in the building on Medical Center Way, adjacent to the relocated EH&S facility. The permit is issued by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The unit is used solely for the purpose of incinerating pathology specimens and animal care waste. Small amounts of infectious and chemical materials in these incineration of animals containing radionuclides was discontinued in 1984. The decision to stop incinerating animal carcasses was based on the costs associated with staffing required to monitor this activity. There was no "stop order" issued by the State. Those records are available at the campus EH&S office.

The incinerator is operated and maintained by the UCSF Physical Plant Department. They maintain the records of maintenance, repairs, frequency of use and loading.

Our current Environmental Assessment Program included source sampling at the incinerator, following the EPA sampling protocol, and this data should be available in early spring 1989.

ITEM 6: Is "BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY" always used? Or is "wind dispersion" something opted for? Are there any reports that would show the intra-UCSF dialogue that leads up to said decision?
The discussion in Items 3 & 4 explain the rationale. It is clear that regulatory agencies presume that the wind will dilute emissions to the point of acceptable public health risk. It is clear from the regulations that the best available control technology (BACT) and wind dispersion are not mutually exclusive. In fact, there are times when wind dispersion is the BACT. Our environmental assessment may indicate where a new BACT is needed.

The reports that contain the UCSF dialogue leading to our decisions are public documents such as minutes of our health and safety committees, the Vision Center EIR, Library EIR and the Laurel Heights EIR.

ITEM 7: Is there any type of research lab work that is considered too inherently risky to be undertaken at UCSF, given the population density around the campus?

Our campus has decided that classified Department of Defense Research is not to be conducted at UCSF. During our meeting we indicated that the level of containment for most campus labs is P-2, we have no P-3 labs on the Parnassus campus nor on the Laurel Heights campus. The costs associated with developing and maintaining a P-3 or higher level labs is very prohibitive, and that cost is a restraining influence.

Most of the research conducted at UCSF must be reviewed by academic committees, i.e. the Radiation Safety Committee. The intent is to protect human and environmental health.

ITEM 8: Why does the 87/88 Bay Area Smog Board Handbook not measure UCSF's output of 3 of the 5 categories of pollutants that it tabulates on page 58 of the Handbook? Is it that UCSF exhausts NO measurable amounts of particulates, total organics and SO2?

Pages 37-38 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's "Air Quality Handbook 1987-1988" is attached for reference. This is the point source emissions table to which you are probably referring; the handbook is only 45 pages long. The emissions listed in this table actually represent the 1986-87 annual average emissions in tons per day; the handbook erroneously indicates that they are 1983 data.

The UCSF entry represents the total emissions for the whole source at Parnassus. The whole source includes the "permitted sources," that is, the four power plant boilers and the pathological incinerator. These boilers ordinarily use natural gas as a fuel. Natural gas is the "cleanest" fuel, that is, it results in less air pollutants than burning fuel oils. In any boiler combustion process where natural gas is the fuel, Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), Particulates (PART), Total Organics (TOG), Sulfur Dioxide (SO2), and Carbon Monoxide (CO) are reaction products.

We contacted the BAAQMD to assist us in better understanding the data in the table. Mr. Bill Deboisbianc, an Air Pollution Engineer with BAAQMD, indicated that the numbers in the table are not "measurements" per se; they are computer-generated from the fuel consumption information provided by the permittee. He calculated the current UCSF NOx emissions based on the actual fuel consumption that we submitted in March 1988. The current emissions are 0.114 tons per day which is significantly
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less that the 0.47 tons per day listed in the table. The 0.47 figure was originally calculated from the maximum boiler fuel capacity data reported on the 1980 permit application for the then new Train Murray boilers; the 0.114 value is calculated from actual fuel consumption.

In developing the point source emissions table, the BAAQMD computer calculates the emissions for the approximately 300 permitted sources in the Bay Area and then ranks the top 100. Mr. Deboisblanc said that for the current emission value 0.114 tons NOx/day, UCSF would not be ranked in the table.

You asked about the other pollutants for which no value is listed. Yes, we do have those emissions (all boilers do); however, they are less than 0.01 tons per day. The BAAQMD considers emissions below this level as negligible and does not publish them, they simply insert a dash (-) in the table.

One final comment about our NOx emissions: The BAAQMD attempts to set source emission standards low enough so that the state’s ambient air quality standards are not violated. The ambient air quality standard represents the level of public health risk that is considered desirable to achieve. You can observe on page 36 that the Nitrogen Dioxide ambient air quality standard was not exceeded in 1986 in the Bay Area. From this one can conclude that NOx emissions throughout the Bay Area are within acceptable levels. Also you can see from the table on page 39 that mobile sources (trucks and cars), not stationary sources are the major generators of NOx emissions in the Bay Area.

We hope that the above is responsive to your questions and is helpful to you. To repeat what we said in the meeting, if there are any areas where you want more information or clarification you should feel free to just pick up the phone and call Roy Balzer, 476-1300.

Sincerely,

J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D.
Environmental Health and Safety

Thomas W. Gwyn, M.P.H.
Public Service Programs
TO: STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: COMMUNITY OUTREACH
RE: TOY DRIVE AND SPECIAL PROJECTS
DATE: APRIL 14, 1989

OUR PROPOSED PROJECTS ARE:

1. REHAB OF SEVERAL COMMUNITY BASED AGENCIES

2. TOY DRIVE

MEETING: APRIL 19TH - 11:00AM S 940 (OPEN TO ALL)

DRIVE IS SLATED FOR THE WEEKS MAY 15TH AND 22ND

IDEAS AND SUGGESTIONS ARE ALWAYS APPRECIATED!

ANY QUESTIONS...CALL CHRIS YEE AT X 5683 OR PAGER 739-9232 OR ELLY SHIMOSAKA AT X2800.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 21, 1989

TO: SAC Subcommittee on Staff Education

FROM: Anne Poirier & Suzanne Gottschalk

SUBJECT: Toxins Seminar May 18, 1989 12 - 1 PM, HSW-302

Thanks to everyone's efforts, we have now organized our seminar on toxins for **THURSDAY, MAY 18 FROM 12 - 1 p.m. in HSW-302.** Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and Assistant Vice Chancellor Leroy Balzer have agreed to answer questions in the format employed at our general SAC meetings in February and March.

Attached please find the list of questions we developed and which we will ask from the audience. Please call Suzanne @ 6-1373 to sign up for asking one question at the seminar, and start notifying colleagues of this event. Also, if anyone is especially interested in being the M.C., please call us.

At our recent Executive Committee meeting, Trinity discussed ideas for a staff appreciation day on campus in lieu of the annual Christmas party at the Millberry Union gym. How would you feel, representing our campus community, if we had a holiday breakfast, or free tickets to a campus-sponsored concert, or a holiday turkey, or mementos such as a UCSF cup and t-shirt, or sponsored a community outreach project or a campus improvement project? With it being essential that we have a positive sentiment next year during the 125th celebrations with extra community publicity, would you feel a sense of having something taken away without the Christmas party? Or do you have other ideas for alternatives? Please call Suzanne before May 1st with your ideas.

See you at the next General SAC meeting on Friday, May 12 12-1 p.m. in S-118.
DATE: February 24, 1989

TO: Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding
    Assistant Vice Chancellor Leroy Balzer

FROM: Anne Poirier and Suzanne Gottschalk
      Co-Chairs, Staff Education Sub-Committee
      Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

RE: Toxins Presentation on March 10, 1989

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee is looking forward to sponsoring a general campus seminar on toxins to educate staff members on current issues and information. As a first step, we found Roy Balzer's presentation on February 10 very interesting and the question format effective. To guide you in the next committee meeting on March 10 at 12 noon in S-118, we offer the following list of questions. Thank you very much for your assistance.

1. Define "toxin." What is the difference between "toxin" and "irritant"?

2. Compare, if possible, toxic emissions from UCSF to a similar 5 block area of nearby Irving Street businesses. Are UCSF's toxic emissions comparable to those from other hospitals in the Bay Area? If not, why? How are toxic wastes disposed?

3. Does the ventilation system circulate toxins? Why can office workers occasionally smell chemical fumes and car exhaust from the ventilation system?

4. With the space crunch on campus, offices are being partitioned into smaller and smaller areas. Employees complain of lack of temperature control and air flow. Is this a serious, or just an uncomfortable, problem?

5. Are there toxins produced by general office supplies and equipment, such as from felt tip markers, xerox machines, VDT's, ceiling tiles, rugs?

6. Are headaches, dizziness and nausea possible allergic reactions to the work site? Have you noticed trends in certain buildings?

7. Are construction sites toxic to UCSF workers and neighbors?

8. Define "Sick Building Syndrome." Is this a concern at UCSF? Does UCSF have an asbestos problem?

9. Does UCSF have measurable radon levels?

10. Are lead pipes a safety issue at UCSF?

11. Employees in HSE have been told not to drink the tap water due to algae contamination. Is this true?

12. What are the metal boxes labelled hazardous with rubber hoses draining into the street on Parnassus Avenue?
13. Do you have results from the wind studies of UCSF emissions allegedly causing cancer clusters in Noe Valley?

14. How does EH&S service complaints?

15. How much education are lab employees given in the safe use of hazardous materials? Does this education begin before employment starts?

16. What is the procedure for handling toxic gases?

17. Is there a chemical safety policy manual?

18. When a toxic spill occurs, have employees been trained how to handle it and to whom to report?

19. Lab workers wander outside their labs still wearing lab coats and rubber gloves. Is this following campus safety regulations?

20. What can staff members do to educate themselves and community members on these issues?

21. Do you think this is the appropriate group and the appropriate time to sponsor a toxins seminar for UCSF staff members?
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

June 9, 1989

TO: Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee
FR: Trinity A. Ordoña, Chair

RE: Staff Appreciation Program within the 125th Anniversary Celebration

The following is a brief summary of ideas on the Staff Appreciation component of the 125th Anniversary Plans generated from a meeting on May 17 (attended by Thena Trygstad, Paula Schultz, Mark Jordan, Sandra Norberg and myself). At the suggestion of the Information & Advocacy Sub-committee in an earlier discussion, we agreed to "uncouple" Staff Appreciation from the Holiday Party and leave the latter decision to campus administration.

This left us free to brainstorm on how staff should be recognized and appreciated. Our basic concept is to have Staff Appreciation as an integrated part of the entire year-long celebration, with many staff recognized, involved, and appreciated in many ways. Please give me your feedback on these ideas, and feel free to add others. The basic features of the plan are:

A. 125 STAFF CELEBRITIES

1. 125 top employees will be chosen (by 125 campus departmental units or some equivalent divisional breakdown) for recognition of their contributions and service. (criterion? work performance? campus or community service? both?)

2. 10 of those employees to be featured each month through professional photo displays in the Med Sci Lobby display window.

3. These photo displays would also be shown on kiosks that would be placed in strategic locations (i.e. Med Sci, Nursing Lobby, Moffitt Hospital, SFGH, CED, Oyster Point, VAMC, etc.); these kiosks would be used to publicize ongoing 125th Anniversary Events and would remain in these locations afterwards.

4. Feature articles would also appear in NewsBreak/MedSounds, School and Department Newsletters, and other campus publications.

5. All 125 Staff Appreciation recipients would receive a plaque and/or certificate and be hosted at a reception to be held at the Chancellor's House.

B. OFF-CAMPUS SITE VISITS:

Chancellor Krevans and Holly Smith (Chair of the 125th Committee) would visit all the off-campus sites (SFGH, CED, VAMC probably for sure; Oyster Point? Laurel Heights? Buchanan Street? Harrison?) with an appropriate event for the occasion; possibly continental breakfast and short program? Entertainment? Staff and faculty speakers? Community speakers?

C. CAMPUS COMMUNITY TALENT SHOW:

Great idea -- to be organized by EMPACT! as their major fundraiser?
On 11 September 1981, the Silver Spring, Md., police, armed with court warrants, raided the laboratories of Edward Taub at the Institute for Behavioral Research and seized 17 monkeys that animal rights activists charged Taub had mistreated. Though the activists eventually lost the ensuing court battle, the raid marked a turning point in an increasingly bitter debate.

For more than a century, animal welfare groups in this country and Europe have clashed with scientists over the use of animals in research. Buoyed by the precedent-setting Silver Spring raid, however, a new, bolder group of American animal rights activists has emerged. Across the country these activists are capturing public attention with well-planned demonstrations, successful boycotts, political lobbying, break-ins and thefts of animals, and even scattered acts of violence.

At issue, according to the most recent estimates, is the use of approximately 20 million lab animals annually—around 80% rats and mice. The animals are divided almost evenly between basic research and product testing. Most of them are sacrificed during or following the experiments. According to the Department of Agriculture, in 6.6% of experiments with animals, due to the nature of the tests, painkillers are withheld.

Treatment of research animals, with the exception of rats and mice (a huge exception, some contend), is federally regulated by the 1966 Animal Welfare Act, a law which has been amended several times, most recently in 1985. In addition, most federal agencies and professional organizations promulgate their own standards for experiments with animals. And, finally, many institutions, including universities, have established their own review boards to train and monitor researchers.

For decades, many animal welfare leaders accepted the necessity of scientific experiments and campaigned instead for more humane treatment—better cages, administering painkillers, sanitary facilities—for the animals. Many still adhere to this strategy. "Taking good care of animals," says Christine Stevens, founder and director of the Animal Welfare Institute, "is just good science." But in 1975, with the publication of Peter Singer's book Animal Liberation, a new hierarchy of values changed everything.

Singer, a philosopher at Australia's Monash University, argues that animals have the right to pursue their lives without human interference and that placing humans above animals constitutes "speciesism." "We believe that animals don't belong to human beings," says Ingrid Newkirk, director of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). "The world is not just a supermarket for us."

Newkirk claims that much of basic research with animals is wasted work, not leading to anything practical or simply an exercise that proves the obvious. Research monies, she says, could be better spent on programs that advance "human needs and disease prevention," such as alcoholism clinics or epidemiological studies.

Animal rights groups also oppose testing new products on animals, contending that the tests are not required by law nor truly predictive of what happens in humans. They question whether the value of products such as food additives, household cleaners, and cosmetics is worth the expense of animal suffering. Newkirk favors using "known, safe ingredients" such as those on the Food and Drug Administration's Generally Regarded as Safe list. If tests are needed, says Newkirk, more "modern techniques" such as human patch tests can provide data.

The animal rights philosophy is finding a receptive audience. In just nine years PETA has grown to a quarter of a million members with a budget of over $3 million.
Research animals constitute only a small percentage of the roughly 5 billion animals Americans use for food, clothing, and other domestic purposes each year. Along with scientific research, animal rights groups have targeted modern agriculture (many in the movement are vegetarians), hunting, circuses, and even zoos as abusers of animals' rights. In just a decade, they have achieved several major victories.

**Animal rights victories**

Last year Cornell University terminated a research project on barbiturate addiction using cats after the animal rights group Trans-Species claimed that the "research was unjustifiable on scientific, financial, and ethical grounds." What made this case unique was that no one accused researchers of mistreating the animals, but rather Trans-Species charged that cats provided a poor model for human barbiturate addiction. Cornell officials said they halted the project, funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA), because of misunderstandings that led activists and politicians into thinking the study had ended earlier. Although Cornell officials emphasized that the issue was credibility—they did not want to be perceived as lying—and disavowed any notion that the university had capitulated to protesters, NIDA's director, Charles Schuster, labeled the decision "a disastrous precedent."

In some ways, the animal rights movement's easiest target has been the multibillion-dollar cosmetics and toiletries industry. The Draize test for ocular irritancy, in which rabbits are used to screen potentially eye-damaging chemicals, has given the movement its most poignant cause.

In May of 1980, 30 people, some wearing rabbit costumes, marched in front of Revlon's New York City headquarters to protest the firm's use of the Draize test. This sparked demonstrations against the company in other countries. The ensuing bad publicity led Revlon to donate $250,000 to Rockefeller University for research on alternatives to Draize.

Rabbits remain a potent symbol. PETA's boycott last year against Benetton, an upscale retailer whose line includes fashionable toiletries, featured posters of white rabbits with severely ulcerated skin. Emotional appeals like this pressured Benetton to abandon testing on animals. Thus, the company's products join others labeled "cruelty free."

Researchers have been caught short by the success of the animal rights groups. "Scientists have full-time jobs and can't always respond to this," says Frankie Trull, president of the Foundation for Biomedical Research. Trull leads one of the groups mounting a counterattack. Working with an annual budget of approximately $700,000, raised largely from charitable (tax-deductible) donations, one wing of her organization trains scientists to rebut animal rights charges. Another wing, with about $300,000 in annual dues from universities and corporations, lobbies Congress.

"The public doesn't recognize the slow suffocation of the research process," Trull worries. "Animal rights people are driving bright young minds out of research."

The seriousness of the animal rights debate prompted the National Academy of Science's National Resource Council (NRC) to spend three years studying the problem before issuing its own assessment of research using animals. The 1988 report, *Use of Laboratory Animals in Biomedical and Behavioral Research*, found animals a "critical part" of human health care research. Citing a long list of accomplishments, ranging from the polio vaccine to a better understanding of memory, the committee concluded that lab animals "will continue to be necessary."

"Certainly some members of the scientific community have been found to mistreat or inadequately care for research animals," admits committee chair Norman Hackerman. However, Hackerman sees "no convincing evidence that this is a widespread phenomenon."

The NRC report decided against suggesting any major new regulations, though it did recommend an ongoing review of federal laws protecting animals. The committee also urged Congress to appropriate about $10 million annually to the Department of Agriculture to monitor research and enforce existing regulations. In addition, the report recommended that federal agencies reduce the number of vertebrates used and "consider" alternatives to tests using animals.

Predictably, opinions on the report are divided. The differing views are reflected in the dissenting opinions two of the committee's members filed with the report.

Christine Stevens, the only committee member who did not sign the final report, complained that the NRC "refuses to face the widespread, ingrained problem of unnecessary suffering...[and] the serious problem of poor research using excessive numbers of animals." Citing examples of problems found by inspectors, Stevens charged "nothing in the report even hints at the long drawn-out pain and suffering undergone by many laboratory animals."

Conversely, Arthur Guyton from the University of Mississippi's School of Medicine attacked the report for failing "to make clear how..."
seriously the animal rights movement and increasing government regulation are impeding essential medical research.”

Guyton and others believe that the time has come for researchers who use animals to become “proactive.” American Physiological Society president Aubrey Taylor calls on members to “develop strategies to counter animal activists’ battling—hell, yes, it’s a battle and the line has been drawn—to abolish all animal research.” The physiologists are pushing Congress to classify as a federal offense any breakin, theft, or vandalism at a federal research institution. In addition, they are monitoring legislation and launching their own informational counteroffensive.

The middle ground in this debate, to the extent one exists, lies in the search for alternatives to animals, especially for screening new products. The goal is expressed in the three Rs: refinement of tests, reduction in the numbers of animals, and finally complete replacement.

Alternatives to animals

The Ames test for carcinogens, developed by biochemist Bruce Ames in the seventies, provides one of the few examples of an alternative to using animals (although research on alternatives is picking up, spurred by the animal rights movement). The Ames test identifies carcinogens by their ability to promote mutations in a special strain of Salmonella bacteria. But this test is not without problems: a chemical that passes the Ames screen could, in humans, be metabolized to a carcinogen or trigger a cancer-causing oncogene. Still, says John Frazier, associate director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT), it is a “great test.”

CAAT, with funds primarily from private industry, awards approximately $300,000 each year for research. At present, Frazier and others are working to replace the controversial Draize test. In a sense, their focus on Draize concedes the agenda to animal rights activists, since researchers might ordinarily concentrate on replacing tests more difficult and expensive than Draize.

“Over 30 tests have been developed,” says Frazier; the hope is to validate several reliable alternatives. “No one test will evaluate every possible mechanism of ocular irritation.”

The most likely outcome of this search for alternatives will be a tiered system of testing. Beginning with computer simulations, and moving through Ames-like tests, products will need to run a gauntlet of studies that will eliminate most harmful materials. Ideally, only safe materials will reach the final stage of testing on animals, reducing the number of animals required. “We’ve convinced a large portion of the scientific world that it is doable,” says Frazier.

The NRC report, however, seems unequivocal on one point: “The chance that alternatives will completely replace animals in the future is nil.”

In the end, economics may determine the future as much as any argument. Without a doubt the cost of lab animals is rising. Twelve states, and several local communities, now prevent researchers from acquiring animals from pounds. Though researchers use only about 200,000 of these animals annually, less than 2% of the number destroyed by pounds, they represent a significant cost savings. The average price of a dog from a laboratory supplier, for instance, has gone from $100 in 1981 to almost $200 today. At the same time, daily costs for maintaining the dogs have risen 48%.

Regulations covering animal welfare are also adding to the growing bill. Last year, Science reported that the total cost of changes mandated by the 1985 amendment to the Animal Welfare Act could run as high as a billion dollars. The most controversial rules specify exercise periods for dogs, larger and more stimulating environments for primates, and new cage sizes for a variety of animals. The report in Science was apparently based on a news leak from a federal agency, possibly intended to stiffen opposition to the new regulations.

$1 billion for better treatment?

Animal rights activists dispute the billion-dollar estimate, yet are delighted to see researchers squeezed financially in an era of cutbacks. “You have to prorate [the costs] over the decades of animals sitting with nothing,” says Newkirk.

Costs are apparent to researchers too. “It’s money that isn’t going to treating schizophrenia or to cancer research,” complains Alan Kraut, the American Psychological Association’s executive director of science. On top of that, says Kraut, “I hear all the time of department chairs spending more on animal security than on graduate education.”

Clearly those who experiment or test with animals face a new era of higher costs, greater supervision, and increasing questions about the validity of their work. However, as Hackerman observes in the NRC report, “The discussion in its modern form has been ongoing for more than a century and is almost continuously at a critical point.”

—Alan Newman

Alan Neuman is an editor for Analytical Chemistry.
Is UC Med Center KILLING BABIES with AIDS for Science or for $? 

Tell UCSF, Moffitt and Oakland's Children's Hospitals to **stop** the injection of placebos into babies and children with AIDS!

A National Institutes of Health (NIH) sponsored study is being conducted with children between the ages of 1 month and 12 years with a drug which must be administered intravenously - IVIG. IV administration of any substance creates a risk for infection. The sponsors of the study claim that to get scientifically valid results, they must expose another group of babies and children to the same risk of infection by giving them a placebo intravenously. What kind of science deliberately increases the risk of infection in any individual, let alone immune-suppressed children and babies? CHILDREN WITH AIDS, MANY OF THEM CHILDREN OF COLOR, ARE NOT GUINEA PIGS; THEY DESERVE TREATMENT, NOT GENOCIDE!

**ACT UP!**

Saturday, June 17 at 12 Noon 
UCSF Medical Center, 
505 Parnassus

For Information, Call ACT UP at 563-0724
DEALING WITH ARAFAT
A Homeland for the Palestinians?

The Battle Over
Animal Rights
A Question of Suffering and Science
Of Pain and Progress

A growing social movement raises a thorny ethical question: do the practical benefits of animal experimentation outweigh the moral costs?

For 14 years, Michiko Okamoto heard nothing but praise for the medical experiments she performed on animals. By force-feeding barbiturates to groups of cats for periods of several weeks, then cutting off their supplies, the Cornell University pharmacologist learned a lot about the dynamics of addiction and withdrawal. She showed that the moderate drug doses prescribed by physicians can, over time, be as physically addictive as the fixes sold on the street. And she explained why addicts die from overdoses even after their bodies have grown tolerant of particular drugs. Okamoto's work won numerous grants from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and her findings are cited in standard medical texts. According to Keith Killam, a professor of pharmacology at the University of California, Davis, the cat experiments are "a shining, crystal example of how to do science."

Steve Siegel of Trans-Species Unlimited, a Pennsylvania-based animal-rights group, calls them "the worst of the worst." Last year Siegel's group mounted a massive campaign against Okamoto. It printed brochures describing, in her own words, how her cats would stand "trembling [and] salivating" after she suddenly stopped pumping drugs into their stomachs—how they would hiss at imagined tormentors or collapse and die "during or soon after periods of continuous convulsive activity."

For four months Trans-Species' supporters picketed Okamoto's laboratory and barraged her with phone calls. Cornell and NIDA officials received more than 10,000 letters condemning the experiments. This fall, after making a statement that was widely, if mistakenly, viewed as a promise to stop the cat studies, Cornell and Okamoto surrendered. In an unprecedented gesture, they wrote NIDA to say they would forfeit a new $530,000 three-year research grant. It was, depending on your perspective,
moral victory for abused and innocent creatures or a defeat for science and medicine. Either way, the case of the Cornell cats was just the latest example of America's growing preoccupation with the moral status of animals. Scholars say more has been written on the subject in the past 12 years than in the previous 30. And grassroots organizations are proliferating wildly. Just 15 years ago, talk of animal welfare was pretty well confined to the humane societies. Today there are some 7,000 animal-protection groups in the United States, with combined memberships of 10 million and total budgets of some $50 million. Says Carol Burnett, spokes­woman for the Washington­based group People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals: "We're really gaining steam."

That's not to say everybody's riding the same train. The activists' demands range from securing better lab conditions to setting all animals free, and their tactics range from letter writing to burglary. Yet they've become a potent collective presence. Animal advocates have sponsored numerous local ballot initiatives to regulate the treatment of farm animals, or ban the use of animals in product-safety tests, or exempt school kids from mandatory dissection lessons. They've declared war on the fur industry and agitated against particular scientists, as in the Cornell case, and organized to block construction of new animal­research facilities. At Stanford University, plans for a new $18 million animal lab were held up for more than a year when the Palo Alto Humane Society opposed the project before the county board of supervisors. Construction is now under way, but the delay cost the university more than $2 million.

There has been civil disobedience, too—even violence. Just last month a woman affiliated with the animal-rights cause was arrested outside the United States Surgical Corp. in Norwalk, Conn., and charged with planting a radio-controlled pipe bomb near the company chairman's parking place. Fires and break-ins, many of them linked to the militant Animal Liberation Front, have caused millions of dollars' worth of damage at labs around the country. The fear of such incidents is fast turning research centers into bunkers. After two bomb threats and at least five attempted break-ins, officials at Emory University's Yerkes Regional Primate Research Center recently spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on new alarms and electronic locks. Other institutions, including Harvard Medical School, have taken similar steps.

In short, the debate over animal rights is forcing basic changes in the way universities, corporations and government agencies do business. More than that, it's prompting a reconsideration of mankind's place in the web of life. As the political scientist Walter Truett Anderson observes in his recent book "To Govern Evolution," the cause of animal rights is not just a passing fancy. It is a "principled attempt to redefine some of our most basic concepts about the nature of political rights and obligations."

**Immense benefits:** The number of creatures used in research, education and product testing each year is indeed staggering. Though estimates run as high as 100 million, federal agencies place the total at 17 million to 22 million—a figure that includes some 50,000 cats, 61,000 pri­mates, 180,000 dogs, 554,000 rabbits and millions of mice and rats (which fill 80 to 90 percent of the demand). The killing is not without purpose; it has immense practical benefits. Animal models have advanced the study of such diseases as cancer, dia­betes and alcoholism and yielded lifesaving treatments for everything from heart disease to manic-depressive illness. Vaccines developed through ani­mal research have virtually wiped out diseases like smallpox and polio. "Every surgical technique was tried first in an-
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**The Toll on the Animal Kingdom**

- At least 17 million animals are used in laboratory experiments each year. About 85 percent are rats and mice.
- In 1987 the nation's 1,260 registered research centers used 180,169 dogs, 50,142 cats, 61,392 nonhuman primates, 538,998 guinea pigs and 554,385 rabbits.
- Ten federal agencies, including the departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, Interior and Transportation sponsor or conduct lab tests with animals.

**Sources:** Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, National Research Council.
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Image: "Measuring the hearing loss caused by different types of noise" by Tony Bullard.
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**In the service of science**
The fruits of reform: Researchers at LEMSIP tend to their chimpanzees' social needs

The Growing Furor Over Fur: A Brutal Status Symbol?

For a movement known for its shock tactics, the third annual Fur-Free Friday was surprisingly mild. In Greenville, N.C., a handful of shoppers returned their credit cardstodepartment stores selling fur coats. In San Francisco, women piled 25 somewhat shopworn pelts at the feet of animal-rights advocate Amanda Blake ('Gunsmoke's" Kitty) in a gesture designed to "cleanse their conscience and clean their closets at the same time." In New York City, Bob Barker led a line of 2,000 protesters five blocks long down Fifth Avenue, shouting "Fur is murder! Don't buy fur!" All told, there were demonstrations in 67 cities the day after Thanksgiving. The only violent incident was an early-morning fire at Del Conte's furrier in Santa Rosa, Calif., that caused $100,000 damage. A caller to the Associated Press said the shadowy Animal Liberation Front was responsible and warned that "ALF will continue its war against this Nazism until the bloody fur trade is abolished forever."

From a sporadic 1960s effort concerned mainly with endangered species, the antifur movement is fast becoming the most visible arm of the animal-rights crusade. Partisans insist that the fur industry is also the easiest to attack, since it trades on vanity and status symbols. "It isn't necessary to torture and kill animals to show people how much money you have—you can buy a nice cloth coat and pin money to it," says Barker, who resigned as host of the Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants this year when officials insisted on awarding the winners fur coats. Antifur ads now appear on subway cars in New York City, highway billboards in Texas, buses in Chicago and taxi cabs in Mobile. Celebrities such as "Golden Girl" Rue McClanahan and "M*A*S*H"s Loretta Swit are lending support. Most organized groups denounce violent protests, preferring to lecture individuals caught with furs on their backs. "Let's make wearing a fur coat a miserable experience," says Steve Siegel of Trans-Species Unlimited. "We're going to make a fur coat mean 'no class.'"

Blue jeans: So far, that message has had little impact in the United States. Fur sales have tripled in the last decade to $1.8 billion, thanks in part to a flood of cheap imported pelts. The average customer is a 26-year-old career woman buying for herself. Sales were flat last year—but industry spokesmen attribute that to the stock-market crash and confusions over hemlines; they predict $2 billion in sales this year. "Fur is fashion, fur is warmth. Now it's a lifestyle," says Sandy Blye of the American Fur Industry. "Women wear them to work and on weekends over blue jeans."

It is just that casual attitude that activists hope to combat. They not only decry the brutality of trapping wild animals, they charge that fur-bearing creatures suffer "physical and psychological" torture in small pens on fur farms as well. Industry spokes men counter that most ranch-bred animals aren't strangled or electrocuted, as protesters suggest, but are rendered unconscious with painless gas. Until then, "they're happy," insists Robert Buckler of the...
development within the visual cortex. "We have kids being born who are going to go blind without this research," Boothe says. "By me doing this research, we can prevent them from going blind. Most people, given that choice, will think it's justified."

**Moral costs:** If the issue were that simple, animal experimentation might never have become so controversial. But as the philosopher Peter Singer demonstrated in 1975, it's not. In a book called "Animal Liberation," Singer questioned the assumption that securing practical benefits for mankind automatically justifies experimentation on other animals. Indeed, he condemned that notion as "a form of prejudice no less objectionable than prejudice about a person's race or sex," and he urged that we "consider our attitudes from the point of view of those who suffer by them."

To provide that perspective Singer had only to recount what scientists themselves had written in mainstream professional journals. In a chapter titled "Tools for Research," he sampled the recent literature from such diverse fields as toxicology and psychology, and it wasn't easy reading. He described standard government tests in which beagles were fed pesticides or bombarded with radiation until they lay bleeding from the mouth and anus. And he recounted numerous experiments in which psychologists subjected intelligent animals to fear or hopelessness or "psychological death" in crude attempts to analyze these emotional states.

In a 1972 paper in the Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, for example, researchers at the Primate Research Center in Madison, Wis., described placing baby monkeys alone in a stainless-steel tank for periods of up to 45 days. They wanted to see whether confinement in this "well of despair" would cause lasting psychological damage. It did. The animals exhibited what the researchers termed "severe and persistent psychopathological behavior of a depressive nature." But the paper stressed the preliminary nature of this finding, saying further studies were needed to determine whether the symptoms could be "traced specifically to variables such as chamber shape, chamber size, duration of confinement [or] age at time of confinement." (No such experiments have been conducted at the Madison center since 1974.)

In other papers, the same scientists described efforts to gauge the effects of child abuse on young monkeys. In one experiment they designed mechanical surrogate mothers who would eject sharp
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**You should be ashamed to wear fur.**

When you choose to wear fur, animals suffer and die needlessly. It's that simple: Don't wear fur.

YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED TO WEAR FUR.

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, DC. 20037

"Buy a nice cloth coat and pin money to it": Antifur pleads combat sales

---

**Fur Farm Animals Welfare Coalition, an industry group that monitors ranch conditions. "The better the care [ranchers] provide, the better the fur product," he adds. Some industry sympathizers argue that trapping is integral to wildlife management in places like Louisiana, where overpopulating nutria and muskrat threaten the ecology of wetlands. "If you want to do something for wildlife, buy a fur coat," says Johnnie Tarver of the state's Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

'Almost taboo': Such arguments have not prevailed in Europe, where antifur protests have been far more aggressive—and effective. In recent years sales of furs have dropped 80 percent in Holland. In Britain, "wearing fur is almost taboo now," says Diana Jones of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. One deliberately repulsive ad running in British

ish cinemas depicts a fur fashion show that turns into a blood bath; another intersperses scenes of a fur shop with maggots swarming on a lump of meat. In Sweden, protesters have held "funerals" for fur coats in department stores. Radical groups have broken into fur farms, releasing foxes and minks.

Fur retailers predict that such tactics would backfire in the United States. What's more, contends Bernard Groger, copublisher of the trade journal Fur World, "women in this country don't like to be told what not to wear." But that has hardly been the history of the garment industry. If Europe's distaste for fur continues, changing notions of "fashion" may yet melt the hearts of American women—even if appeals to animal rights fail.

MELINDA BECK with KAREN BRAINTSFORD in New York, LYNDA WRIGHT in San Francisco and JACOB WEISBERG in London
brass spikes as the youngsters hugged them. The experience seemed to have no serious effect; the infants "simply waited until the spikes receded and then returned and clung to the mother." So, in a refinement of the experiment, the researchers forcibly impregnated female baboons who had been driven mad through social isolation, and turned them loose on their own offspring. "One of [the mothers'] favorite tricks," they wrote, "was to crush the infant's skull with their teeth."

These programs were not mere atrocities, Singer argued. They were examples of scientists "doing what they were trained to do, and what hundreds of their colleagues do." The peer-reviewed journals were brimming with similar stories. Researchers studying how punishment affects learning suspended dogs in hammocks and administered shocks through electrodes taped to their paws. Other investigators, curious to know how various drugs would affect a subject's responsiveness to punishment, implanted electrodes near pigeons' genitals, gave them drugs, then shocked them every time they pecked keys they'd learned to associate with food.

If Singer's work gave birth to a new social movement, a young activist named Alex Pacheco helped it grow. Pacheco, who was moved by Singer's book to help organize the group People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), took a job in 1981 as a lab assistant at the Institute for Behavioral Research in Silver Spring, Md. Once he had his own keys, he was able to spend several months sneaking in at night to document the mistreatment of 17 monkeys being used in a study of spinal-cord injury. Researchers had severed nerves to the monkeys' arms and were testing their ability to use the crippled limbs by shocking the animals when they failed. Pacheco's widely publicized photographs showed monkeys covered with open, infected wounds. Some had chewed the ends off their fingers. All were confined to filthy, encrusted cages just a foot and a half wide.

Steady progress: Since then, similarly troubling conditions have come to light at a number of respected research centers. Yet all parties seem to agree that the general situation has improved markedly since 1980.

The Price of Doing Business

The number of animals destroyed in experiments, however staggering, has declined steadily as researchers have come up with cheaper and more humane alternatives, such as cell cultures and computer models. And scientists using live animals have, as a general rule, become more conscientious and more accountable. "A lot of people are learning, a lot are trying," says Ingrid Newkirk, the Britsh-born activist who founded PETA with Alex Pacheco eight years ago.

One of the first tangible changes came about in 1985, when Congress passed a series of amendments to the federal Animal Welfare Act, the law governing animal care in laboratories and other nonfarm facilities. The amendments have yet to be implemented by the Department of Agriculture, which enforces the act (they remain stalled in the federal budget office). But they mark a congressional commitment to the "three R's" preached by moderate groups like the Animal Welfare Institute and the Humane Society of the United States: reduction in the number of animals sacrificed, refinement of techniques that cause suffering and replacement of live animals with simulations or cell cultures.

Specifically, the amendments call for the creation of a national data bank that will list the results of all animal experiments and thus prevent needless repetition. All laboratories using live animals are required, under the amendments, to set up animal-care committees and submit to annual inspections. Facilities housing dogs must let them exercise, and those housing primates must provide for their "psychological well-being." Rather than wait for the new rules to go into effect, many institutions have adopted reforms on their own. Most research facilities—including all that receive funds from the National Institutes of Health—now have committees that review proposed animal experiments. And some primate facilities, such as Yerkes and New York University's LEMSIP (Laboratory for Experimental Medicine and Surgery in Primates), are going out of their way to keep the animals mentally and emotionally stimulated. To encourage social contact among the 250 chimpanzees that LEMSIP uses in AIDS and hepatitis research, veterinarian James Mahoney has constructed wire-mesh tunnels between their cages. If an experiment requires keeping the animals separated, he makes sure they can see each other through sheets of Plexiglass. And to ward off the boredom that can turn lab chimps into blank-eyed psychotics, he gives them games.

Small pleasures: He may place tubs of canned Kool-Aid outside the chimps' cages, then give them pieces of plastic tubing that can be used as long-distance drinking straws. Noodling tube into tub for an occasional sip can provide hours of entertainment. In a variation...
on the theme, Mahoney passes out plastic tubes stuffed with raisins and marshmallows and lets the chimps use willow branches to extract the treats, just as they would termites from a hollow log in the wild. The animals’ latest craze is cleaning their own teeth with toothbrushes and admiring the results in hand-held mirrors.

The reforms haven’t been confined to research laboratories. For 50 years, consumer-protection laws have effectively required that cosmetics and household products be tested on animals before being sold to humans. But major firms have recently started seeking, and finding, less noxious methods of quality control. The LD-50 test, which consists of gauging the dose of a given substance needed to exterminate half of the animals in a test group, is already falling by the wayside; a survey by the Food and Drug Administration shows that its use has declined by 96 percent since the late 1970s. The Draize test for irritancy, which involves squirting high concentrations of possible irritants into the eyes of rabbits, is still the industry standard. But Procter & Gamble now exposes rabbits to concentrations somewhat closer to those a consumer might encounter. And it has joined other firms in pledging to halt all animal tests as soon as alternatives are available.

Still, the changes of the past decade hardly signal a new consensus on the proper use of animals. Some scientists consider the reforms excessive. University

**Is a Lab Rat’s Fate More Poignant Than a Child’s?**

**BY JANE McCABE**

I see the debate about using animals in medical research in stark terms. If you had to choose between saving a very cute dog or my equally cute, blond, brown-eyed daughter, whose life would you choose? It’s not a difficult choice, is it? My daughter has cystic fibrosis. Her only hope for a normal life is that researchers, some of them using animals, will find a cure. Don’t misunderstand. It’s not that I don’t love animals, it’s just that I love Claire more.

Nine years ago I had no idea that I would be joining the fraternity of those who have a vital interest in seeing that medical research continues. I was a very pregnant woman in labor, with my husband beside me. We gave birth to a 7-pound 1-ounce daughter. It all seemed so easy. But for the next four months she could not gain weight. She was a textbook case of failure to thrive. Finally a hospital test of the salt content in her sweat led to the diagnosis of cystic fibrosis.

The doctor gave us a little reason for hope. "Your daughter will not have a long life, but for most of the time, it will be a good life. Her life expectancy is about 13 years, though it could be longer or shorter. As research continues, we’re keeping them alive longer.”

"As research continues.” It’s not a lot to rely on but what’s our alternative? We haven’t waited passively. We learned how to take care of our little girl; her medical problems affect her digestion and lungs. We protected her from colds, learned about supplemental vitamins and antibiotics. We moved to California where the winters aren’t so harsh and the cold and flu season isn’t so severe. Our new doctor told us that the children at his center were surviving, on the average, to age 21. So far, our daughter is doing well. She is a fast runner and plays a mean first base. She loves her friends and is, in general, a happy little girl. All things considered, I feel very lucky.

How has research using animals helped those with CF? Three times a day my daughter uses enzymes from the pancreas of pigs to digest her food. She takes antibiotics tested on rats before they are tried on humans. As an adult, she will probably develop diabetes and need insulin—a drug developed by research on dogs and rabbits. If she ever needs a heart-lung transplant, one might be possible because of the cows that surgeons practiced on. There is no animal model to help CF research, but once the CF gene is located, new gene-splicing techniques may create a family of mice afflicted with the disease. Researchers would first learn to cure the mice with drugs, then cautiously try with humans.

There are only about 10,000 people with CF in the United States. But the number of people dependent on research is much larger. Walk with me through Children’s Hospital at Stanford University: here are the youngsters fighting cancer, rare genetic illnesses, immunological diseases. Amid their laughter and desperate attempts to retain a semblance of childhood, there is suffering.

**Human suffering:** I think the motivation of animal-rights activists is to cut down on the suffering in this world, but I have yet to hear them acknowledge that people—young and old—suffer, too. Why is a laboratory rat’s fate more poignant than that of an incurably ill child?

There are advocates for animals who only seek to cut down on "unnecessary research." They don’t specify how to decide what is unnecessary, but they do create an atmosphere in which doing medical research is seen as distasteful work. I think that’s wrong. Researchers should be thanked, not hassled.

Every time I see a bumper sticker that says “Lab animals never have a nice day,” a fantasy plays in my brain. I get out of my car, tap on the driver’s window and ask to talk. In my fantasy, the other driver gets out, we find a coffee shop and I show her photos of my kids. I ask her if she has ever visited Children’s Hospital at Stanford University: here are the youngsters fighting cancer, rare genetic illnesses, immunological diseases. Amid their laughter and desperate attempts to retain a semblance of childhood, there is suffering.

I have other fantasies, too, that a cure is found for what ails my daughter, that she marries and gives us some grandchildren, and does great work in her chosen profession, which at this moment appears to be cartooning or computer programming. We can still hope—as long as the research continues.

Jane McCabe lives with her husband and children in northern California.
of Mississippi physiologist Arthur Guyton, for example, warns that the trend toward stricter regulation threatens the very future of science. Even the 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act could prove ruinously expensive, he says. The "very arbitrary" rules governing cage size might force labs all over the country to renovate their facilities. "While medical research using animals has not been killed outright," Guyton concludes, "it is slowly bleeding to death."

We Must Find Alternatives to Animals in Research

BY ROGER CARAS

I believe that animals have rights which, although different from our own, are just as inalienable. I believe animals have the right not to have pain, fear or physical deprivation inflicted upon them by us. Even if they are on the way to the slaughterhouse, animals have the right to food and water and shelter if it is needed. They have the right not to be brutalized in any way as food resources, for entertainment or any other purpose.

Since animals must be classified as property if we are to have the power of life and death over them (and we must, even over our pets), there is a vast philosophical/legal rift to be negotiated. No other property has rights, yet animals must. It is going to take some fine legal minds to work out the details so that we can get across that gulch.

One of the most difficult problems is our unrelenting use of animals in biomedical research. Until recently the arguments between biomedical researchers and the humane movement centered on the conditions under which laboratory animals are maintained. Lately, in keeping with our "age of activism," it has become a raging name-calling contest over whether one species, ours, has the right to use other species to solve our own health problems. If tens of millions of people elect to smoke and expose themselves to the risks of cancer and heart disease, do we have the right to subject animals that would never smoke to those same cancers and heart diseases?

A great many researchers I have met would love to have alternatives. They are against vivisection in spirit but believe it is needed. They have the right not to be forced to work in conditions which, although different from our own, are just as inalienable. They are against vivisection in spirit but believe it is needed. They have the right not to be forced to work in conditions which, although different from our own, are just as inalienable.

Activists, for their part, complain that the reforms have been too modest. A lot of needless suffering is still being perpetrated in the name of science and medicine, they say. Consider the situation at Sema Inc., a government contract laboratory in Rockville, Md., where AIDS and hepatitis experiments are conducted on chimpanzees. Visitors aren't normally welcome, but the renowned primatologist Jane Goodall got a tour of the facility last year, and later wrote an article for The New York Times, describing what she saw. Unlike LEMSIP's chimps, Sema's spend years of their lives in total isolation, confined to tiny boxes that resemble nothing so much as microwave ovens. After watching a chimp stare blankly into space as her caretaker approached, Goodall wrote, "I shall be haunted forever by her eyes and by the eyes of the other infant chimpanzees I saw that day. Have you ever looked into the eyes of a person who, stressed beyond endurance, has given up, succumbed utterly...

Since scientists know that stress alters any animal's power to respond to invading organisms, why do they stress chimps by confining them in isolation when the research protocol doesn't demand it?

What has happened is analogous to current geopolitical problems. Everybody is so angry at everybody else nobody is really listening. The animal-rights groups are at odds with each other. That could be because they are all looking for the same membership dollars, the same bequests. Then, of course, there are the antivivisectionists vs. the pro-vivisectionists. They are so busy shrieking at each other no one can be heard.

One day animals will not be used in the laboratory. How soon that day comes depends on how soon people stop screaming and make the search for alternatives a major research imperative. As long as conferences on the subject sound like feeding time in the monkey house, monkeys along with millions of other animals are going to stay right where they are now—in the laboratory.

Roger Caras reports on animals and the environment for ABC-TV News.
to the crippling helplessness of despair?" Katherine Bick, deputy director of the National Institutes of Health, denies that the situation is really so grim. She adds, as she did last spring, that larger, better cages are on the way. Meanwhile, says PETA's Paccheco, conditions sanctioned by the federal government are "needlessly driving intelligent animals insane."

Empty cages: Even more divisive is the question of where science should be headed. Many activists dream of a day when all the cages are empty. "Our bottom line," says Newkirk, "is a day when there are no animals in labs." Researchers find that idea ludicrous. They tend to dismiss it as a product of ignorance ("People with no science education don't recognize that the pyramid of knowledge, built upon basic research, depends on animals," says one federal official), or of sentimentality ("a bizarre elevation of a touchy-feely, do-gooder's view of the world," in the words of Yerkes administrator Frederick King).

The moral dilemma behind this bitterness was nicely crystallized in a recent report by the National Research Council. "Research with animals has saved human lives, lessened human suffering and advanced scientific understanding," the authors observe, "yet that same research can cause pain and distress for the animals involved and usually results in their death."

It would be nice, of course, if there were alternatives to vivisection that could deliver the same benefits without the death and suffering. But there is a limit to what can be accomplished with cell cultures and computer models. "You can't mathematically model this disease," says Murray Gardner, head of the U.C. Davis team studying early drug treatment in AIDS-infected monkeys. "You've got to experiment in a living system, where all the things we don't know about are going on."

The question is whether the practical benefits of vivisection constitute a moral justification for it. If mankind's interest in finding a better treatment for AIDS doesn't justify conducting lethal experiments on individual humans, an ethicist might ask, why does it justify performing them on monkeys? Why doesn't a monkey deserve moral consideration? What is the relevant difference between a human subject and an animal subject?

To reply that the human is human and the animal isn't only begins the question. Peter Singer likens it to sanctioning racial discrimination on the ground that white people are white and black people aren't.

Another possible answer is that we humans enjoy certain God-given prerogatives. We are, after all, the only creatures the Bible says were made in God's image. "Most Judeo-Christian religions make distinctions about the special nature of man," says Frederick Goodwin, director of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. "To me, that is a distinct, qualitative difference between our primate relatives and man."

The evidence? It may be a difference, but it's not an empirical, observable one. It has to be taken on faith. Are there certain things about humans that make us inherently more valuable than other animals? Language and rational thought are the two traits usually cited as setting Homo sapiens apart. Yet there are plenty of humans who lack language and reason—babies, the senile, the insane—and the thought of performing medical experiments on them is abhorrent. Why, if a severely retarded child is too precious to sacrifice, is a chimp of superior intelligence fair game?

Maybe there is no reasoned moral justification. Maybe animal experimentation is best understood in purely practical terms, not as a prerogative or an obligation but as a strategy for survival. Whatever the answer, scientists can no longer afford to pretend that their critics' moral concerns are frivolous. Profound questions are being raised, and ignoring them won't make them go away.

The Ark Is Overpopulated

1. There are 56 million cats and 54 million dogs in the United States and the population is growing. Every hour, on average, more than 2,000 dogs and 3,500 cats are born. Among humans, 415 babies are born every hour.

2. Last year animal shelters took in more than 22 million dogs and cats. At least 1.7 million were later claimed by their owners. At least 12 million were killed.

3. Since 1901, 57 Nobel prizes for physiology and medicine have been awarded for research done at least in part with animals. Pigs were used to develop the CAT scan; rabbits to understand the rejection of organ transplants. Researchers used monkeys and mice to develop the polio vaccine; rabbits and mice helped create sulfa drugs. Surgical advances in sutures and grafts have been made using dogs; dogs and rabbits aided the discovery of insulin and in understanding the mechanism of diabetes.

Sources: The American Humane Association, Michigan State U., The Rockefeller U.
TO: Members, Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

FR: Trinity A. Ordoña, Chair

RE: CANCELLED: May 12 General Membership Meeting
Next Meeting: Friday, June 9, 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m., S-118

Dear Colleagues,

Due to scheduling conflicts, the May 12 General Membership meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting will be Friday, June 9 (our regular time and place) and will feature Bill Kerr, Director of the UC Medical Center to speak on UCSF's recent affiliation with Mt. Zion. In the meantime, please remember to support our two upcoming events this month!

The Staff Education Sub-Committee is moving full steam ahead on a campus community forum, *Toxins in the Workplace* on Thursday, May 18 with Vice-Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and Asst. Vice Chancellor Roy Balzer. Please bring yourself, your co-workers and your questions to HSW 302, 12 noon - 1 p.m. For further information, contact Anne Poirier (x67033) or Suzanne Gottschalk (x61373).

The Community Outreach Sub-committee has also been very busy. A campus-wide drive to collect *New and Used Toys and Books for Children* will be held from May 15-26. Flyers will be sent through campus mail shortly and a letter to neighborhood merchants has been sent inviting donations as well. So, rummage through your own collection of children's books and toys or purchase new ones, and bring them in next week. Barrels will be placed in strategic locations (Moffitt cafeteria, the lobby in Moffitt, Med Sci, ACC, Nursing, etc.) on the Parnassus campus for two weeks. For information, contact Elenor Shimosaka (x62800).

**AGENDA:**
1. Review and correction of minutes of April 14 meeting
2. Chair's report
3. Liaisons report
4. Sub-committee reports:
   - Community Outreach, Staff Education, Information & Advocacy
5. Presentation: William B. Kerr -- UCSF and Mt. Zion

cc: B. Kerr, B. Atkinson, P. Carien Schultz, and J. Norton
/tao
THE CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INVITES YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN

TOXINS AND THE WORKPLACE
A QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH

BRUCE W. SPAULDING, VCHAN-BUSINESS & FISCAL SERVICES
J. LEROY BALZER, PHD, ASST VCHAN-ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & SAFETY

* Is there danger from fumes and strange smells in our ventilation systems?
* "Sick Building Syndrome" - Is my building making me ill?
* What are future plans for handling "Space Crunch"?
* Are video display terminals toxic in any way?
* If I’m exposed to hazardous materials, what’s the first thing I must do?

WHAT ARE YOUR QUESTIONS - CONCERNS - FEARS?

THIS HOUR IS DEVOTED TO ADDRESSING YOUR QUESTIONS. THERE WILL BE NO PRESENTATION. JUST AN OPEN AND FRANK DISCUSSION. FIND OUT THE ANSWERS . . . PLEASE COME TO:

HSW 302 - THURSDAY, MAY 18th - noon to one

For more information, call ext. 67033 (Anne Poirier)
The meeting was brought to order by Trinity Ordone at 12:05. She distributed copies of an animal rights article from "Newsweek" and copies of a flyer from ACT UP! announcing a demonstration at UCSF on Saturday, June 17. She called for any corrections or additions to the April minutes. None were requested and the minutes were approved as written.

Trinity announced that two recent SAC endeavors were very successful: the Toy Drive collected a substantial quantity and more than 130 people showed up for the Toxins seminar. She also announced that no SAC meeting will be held in July. The August meeting will meet to review a draft of the SAC annual report, to be written by the Executive Committee in July.

Barbara Atkinson and Leah Dible from Trinity's office discussed ways of responding to the ACT UP! flyer. Such issues as point of view, distortion of context, use of inflammatory language and lack of accurate information were pointed out. Members were encouraged to carefully analyze and think critically about such flyers as well as anything discussed in the news media.

Committee Reports

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Duffy Price discussed UCSF's upcoming 125th Anniversary Celebration, which will begin this Fall. The Community Outreach Committee is interested in having SAC cooperate with the MAG group in doing some tree planting at San Francisco schools in cooperation with Friends of the Urban Forest. Trinity will look into budget considerations but said it would be wonderful for SAC to be part of such a cooperative effort and asked for Committee approval of the project, which was given.

Trinity also discussed the Staff Appreciation Project, which is a plan to show special appreciation for staff members throughout the whole year-long 125th
celebration. The hope is to honor a number of staff members each month. Trinity asked for ideas and feedback on staff appreciation as well as on any ideas for a campus community talent show.

Chris Yee said that the Community Outreach Committee needs help in sorting, cleaning and distributing toys collected during the drive, if any one can offer assistance.

STAFF EDUCATION

Anne Poirier thanked those who attended and helped with the "Toxins in the Workplace" seminar. It was very successful and more seminars are planned. More focused topics may include ventilation on G and C levels, seminars on health concerns for pregnant women and radiation safety and toxins for lab workers. As well, the Committee plans to hold the same toxins seminar with Bill Kerr and Roy Balzer at CED sometime this summer.

INFORMATION AND ADVOCACY

Valli McDougle said that the Information and Advocacy Committee is drafting a letter to President David Gardner inviting him to speak at UCSF sometime in the Fall; the date would hopefully coincide with the 125th Anniversary kick-off activities in October. She also said that the network phone tree is now in working order.

The remainder of the meeting was turned over to Bill Kerr, Medical Center Director, who discussed the progress of the understanding between UCSF and Mount Zion Hospital. He reviewed the history of the Medical Center, the development of Long Hospital, the need for increased Medical Center space, previous collaborative efforts between UCSF and Mt. Zion, the declining census in many San Francisco hospitals, the proposed integration, the EIR stages, finances and possible future program development. He also answered questions.

Trinity adjourned the meeting at 1:10.

Attachments:
"The Battle Over Animal Rights"
ACT UP! flyer
Staff Appreciation Memo
I thought you would be interested in a brief summary of our "preferred alternative" proposal for integration with Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center to address our Medical Center's clinical needs. We are now beginning to develop an environmental review process which will lead to an Environmental Impact Report.

I would appreciate it if you could post this for the people in your department or laboratory to see.

Julius R. Krevans, M.D.
Chancellor

Enclosure
The UC San Francisco/Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center integration proposal

The following statement summarizes the status of the Mount Zion/UCSF Integration proposal as of June, 1989:

I. On May 31, 1988 Mount Zion and UC San Francisco signed a letter of intent that would govern the development of a proposal to integrate their two medical centers. The letter proposed that "UCSF assume overall programmatic and academic authority and fiscal responsibility for Mount Zion Hospital", and set forth general principles for a comprehensive integration proposal, including governance, medical staff, service and teaching programs, research, personnel and transfer of assets and liabilities.

The letter made it clear that the final plan would have to be proposed to the Regents of the University of California and the Mount Zion Health Systems Board. The Regents in turn declared that its approval would be contingent upon completing an environmental review process involving the preparation of a comprehensive environmental impact report (EIR).

The reason for this proposal was based upon mutual needs of the two institutions. Like many community hospitals in San Francisco, Mount Zion was experiencing severe economic pressures. In a statement regarding the letter of intent, Mount Zion President David Melnick had declared: "Given the economic forces in the San Francisco hospital community and the changing national educational requirements, it is questionable whether Mount Zion, or any other community teaching hospital, could satisfy its mission in the future as a stand-alone institution. The proposed plan would afford Mount Zion the continued ability to meet its mission by offering and expanding excellent primary and secondary medical services in a caring and personalized setting which also has a strong teaching component. It would also allow us to meet our continuing obligation to the Jewish community and our immediate neighbors."

For its part, UCSF's Medical Center was experiencing a severe space crunch which was beginning to make it impossible to continue to meet the demand for new patient care programs and to continue to recruit highly qualified faculty for the clinical departments of the School of Medicine. There were shortages of operating rooms, critical care beds, routine medical/surgical beds, space for expanded diagnostic services and outpatient care, and offices and research space for faculty physicians actively engaged in patient care.

This space shortage impedes the university's efforts to deliver the latest life-saving advances in medical care, diagnosis and treatment which it is the mission of UCSF's Medical Center to provide, in order to meet community needs and to assure effective training of the next generation of health practitioners as well the continuing education of those already in practice.
Under the agreement, Mount Zion would continue to provide inpatient medical/surgical services as well as emergency and outpatient care. UC San Francisco and Mount Zion would intend to continue and enhance the existing patient care, as well as the existing teaching and research programs at Mount Zion. Mount Zion's research programs have been in existence for more than 50 years, and for the past six years its $4 million biomedical research program has included collaborative efforts with UCSF.

As a result of the integration under the preferred alternative plan, the volume of patient care services provided at Mount Zion could increase to the point that, over the long run, Mount Zion could ultimately utilize its full complement of 439 licensed beds. The volume of outpatient visits provided at the hospital and in nearby physicians' offices could likewise increase accordingly. Development envisioned at Mount Zion would accommodate higher levels of patient activity, as well as provide office and research space for faculty physicians who would practice at Mount Zion. The balance between outpatient care and use of inpatient beds is one of the critical criteria in making a hospital economically viable.

The added volume of outpatient visits and greater use of existing inpatient beds could affect both traffic and parking demands and will be one of the primary environmental impacts the EIR will be addressing.

IV. In the planning for the types of patient care, diagnosis and treatment, attention is being paid to community needs and to the optimal use of the facilities at both institutions in terms of teaching, patient care and the research components which are integral to these programs. Clearly such planning must also consider the economic realities of today's health care delivery system.

At this writing, planning is under way to develop an enhanced comprehensive cancer program, an expanded psychiatric program, and a joint pediatric rehabilitation and chronic care program, all located at Mount Zion.

V. Preliminary studies so far are exploring the feasibility of the following:

- Modernization of existing space and equipment in the main hospital, including the operating rooms, recovery room, and nursing units, to improve function of existing departments.

- Modification of the existing outpatient services building is needed to make it possible to develop a comprehensive cancer center and add a 3rd floor for outpatient or surgical space.
July 31, 1989

TO: SAC Members
FR: Trinity Ordone
RE: Upcoming SAC Meeting

Dear Colleagues,

This is a reminder that the last two SAC General Membership meetings of the year will be:

Friday, August 11, S-30

Friday, September 9, S-118

Please note that the next meeting, August 11 is in a different room (S-30). In September, it will revert back to our regular meeting room, S-118. The meeting will review the draft Annual Report, 1989-90 SAC membership, and possible plans for public/community information meetings for the Mt. Zion EIR process. The draft report will be sent to you on Friday, so please take the time to read it and bring your comments to the meeting. Lastly, enclosed for your information is our letter of invitation to President Gardner. We hope to have him speak to the campus community sometime in the Fall.

Please call me (x68180) or Steve Reynolds (x62557) if you do not plan to attend.

/tao
cc: J. Norton, P. Carien Schultz, B. Atkinson, F. McEnroe
President David P. Gardner  
University of California  
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-3550  

Dear President Gardner:

On behalf of the Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee (SAC), and with the concurrence of Chancellor Julius R. Krevans, we invite you to speak to the staff, faculty and students of UC San Francisco as part of our 125th anniversary celebration. The opening event on Saturday, October 14, 1989, will mark the beginning of a year-long celebration for the UCSF campus and its associated communities. It is our hope that you will be able to join us sometime during the fall of 1989.

SAC was established on September 25, 1987 to improve employee and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF in light of the adverse public attention generated by the Laurel Heights site controversy. The committee has broad representation from across the campus. SAC’s purpose is (1) to support research, patient care, education and public service activities of UCSF, (2) to improve communication among staff, the community and the UCSF administration, and (3) to educate the staff, administration and community about issues of concern, such as the use of radioisotopes, toxins in the workplace, and the use of animals in research. The committee has made an effort to address many of the recent problems faced because of our need to expand. Your willingness to speak on our campus would make a considerable contribution to the goals of the committee to provide information and improve communication. Enclosed is a chronology of the achievements of the committee.

We feel that your vision of the future of UC San Francisco as we move into the 1990s would be a particularly appropriate topic. Issues that the staff and faculty consider important include your perspective on the University of California’s expansion to meet enrollment needs by the year 2000 and beyond, and your ideas on how UCSF can continue to meet its multiple missions of patient care, teaching, research and public service while facing the restrictions on our growth.
We look forward to your response to our invitation to speak before our campus community on the occasion of our 125th celebration.

Sincerely,

Trinity A. Ordona
Chair
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

TAO:vmc
Enclosures: Staff Advisory Committee Guidelines
Staff Advisory Committee Highlights, 1987-1989

cc: Julius R. Krevans, M.D., Chancellor
Lloyd H. Smith, Jr., M.D., Associate Dean and Chair, 125th Anniversary Committee
Members, SAC Committee

bcc: Barbara L. Atkinson
Carol D. Fox
Janet E. Norton
David J. Ramsay, D.M.
Paula Carien Schultz
Bruce W. Spaulding
Herbert W. Suelzle
Thena Trygstad
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

Friday, August 11, 1989
12:00 Noon - 1:00 p.m.
S - 30

Members In Attendance: Trinity Or bona - Chair, Kathy Balestreri, Karen Eldred, Rita Emelia, Suzanne Gottschalk, Michele Graf, Martha Hooven, May Huang, John O'Connor, Deborah Pauley, Anne Poirier, Dorothy Price, Eugene Salazar, Elenor Shimosaka, Byron Sigal, Margaret Warren, Christine Yee, Fred Mc Enroe - Staff

Liaisons: Barbara Atkinson, Community and Governmental Relations; Janet Norton, News Services; Paula Carien Schultz, Office of the Vice Chancellor--Staff and Student Human Resources


The meeting was brought to order by Trinity Or bona at 12:05.

Trinity began the meeting by introducing Barbara Atkinson, who briefly discussed some possible dates for public discussion of the Mt. Zion Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the Laurel Heights DEIR. She asked SAC members to help in networking to encourage campus staff and faculty members to attend the campus and Mt. Zion meetings. She said that Public Service Programs will provide flyers when the dates are finalized. Barbara also discussed the impending report of the Environmental Assessment Task Force on the Radian results of the Parnassus Heights Assessment.

Janet Norton then presented a general update on the activities of the 125th anniversary committee. Activities will include the following: Save-a-Life Saturday on September 23, KNBR Bridge to Bridge Run on September 24, and the official Kick Off on October 14th. October 14th activities will include a family health sciences expo, research demonstrations by faculty members, historical exhibits, entertainment and a variety of foods. Janet requested the assistance of SAC members in distributing posters to neighborhood merchants and also to help as tour guides on the 14th.

On the SAC budget, Trinity said that in 1988-89 the SAC budget was $3,000, but for 1989-90 the budget would be trimmed to $2,500 due to the administrative budget requirements.

As a final piece of business, Trinity announced that she was stepping down as chair of SAC and that Kathy Balestreri would become the chair for 1989-90. Trinity thanked the executive officers, the committee chairs, the liaisons and the entire committee for their support during her tenure in office.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

August 18, 1989

TO: MEMBERS, CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: KATHLEEN BALESTRERI, CHAIR

RE: September 6th General Membership Meeting

Dear Colleagues,

There has been a change in the date for the next SAC General Membership Meeting. The meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 6th at 12:00 Noon in S118. The focus of the agenda is the Mount Zion draft EIR.

UPDATE:

--The Information and Advocacy Subcommittee has begun to mobilize staff for the following draft EIR information meetings (MZ). Please mark your calendars -- details to follow:

  September 6th, 6:00 - 7:30 p.m., Public Information Meeting (MZ)
  September 7th, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m., SAC-sponsored UCSF Staff Information Meeting in Cole Hall
  September 28th, 6:00 - 7:30 p.m., Public Information Meeting at the Mount Zion Auditorium

--SAC has agreed to distribute posters for the 125th Anniversary to merchants in our campus' neighborhoods. The Community Outreach and Staff Education Subcommittees are working with Janet Norton and staff to formalize a plan for distribution during the first two weeks of October. We'll need help! Also, SAC agreed to serve as tour guides for the kick-off celebration on October 14th. If you have not yet volunteered, please call me at x2316 and I'll send you a sign-up sheet.

AGENDA - 9/6/89

1. Review and correction of minutes of August 11 meeting
2. Chair's Report (Discussion of SAC Membership Expectations)
3. Subcommittee Reports
4. Presentation of the Mount Zion draft EIR

cc: Janet Norton
Barbara Atkinson
Paula Schultz
All meetings will be held from 12:00 Noon - 1:30 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room (S-118).

September 4, 1989
October 4, 1989
November 1, 1989
December 6, 1989
January 3, 1990
February 7, 1990
March 7, 1990
April 4, 1990
May 2, 1990
June 6, 1990
July 11, 1990
August 8, 1990
September 5, 1990
## CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
### 1989 - 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kathy Balestreri</strong></td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Canfield</td>
<td>x3876</td>
<td>Box 0604</td>
<td>N-331B</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>x0544</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Cox</td>
<td>821-8317</td>
<td>SFGH, 5H22</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>General Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Emelia</td>
<td>221-4810/x3749</td>
<td>VA 116A</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED 145</td>
<td>AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Guggenheim</td>
<td>x3883</td>
<td>Box 0508</td>
<td>HSE-520</td>
<td>Immunogenetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>x4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>x1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>x1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td>Fac Alum, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kos</td>
<td>x8449</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED-425</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>S-612</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>x1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>x6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McDougle</td>
<td>x2342</td>
<td>Box 0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Minvielle</td>
<td>x8683</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-238</td>
<td>Millberry Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>x8974</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
<td>Lab Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Connor</td>
<td>x9014</td>
<td>Box 0640</td>
<td>C-734</td>
<td>Growth &amp; Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Ordona</td>
<td>x8180</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-834</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pauley</td>
<td>x8808</td>
<td>Box 0910</td>
<td>HSE Annex</td>
<td>Material Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Poirier</td>
<td>x7033</td>
<td>LPI-F-0984</td>
<td>LP-348</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>x4592</td>
<td>Box 0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
<td>SFGH, 3C29</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>GI Division, SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Roma</td>
<td>x8112</td>
<td>Box 0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Salazar</td>
<td>x4373</td>
<td>Box 0934</td>
<td>145 Irv 1W</td>
<td>Assoc Dean, Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Santos</td>
<td>x2681</td>
<td>Box 0430</td>
<td>S-630</td>
<td>Dean's Office, S/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Shimosaka</td>
<td>x2800</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHS-150</td>
<td>Staff Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Sigal</td>
<td>x1616</td>
<td>Box 0968</td>
<td>610 Parnassus</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>x8095</td>
<td>Box 0286</td>
<td>MU 4th fl W</td>
<td>VC-Adv &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>x7625</td>
<td>LPI-ACA-0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
<td>Psych/Acad Afrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>x1571</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>x1226</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-926</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yee</td>
<td>x5683</td>
<td>Box 0238</td>
<td>MU 3rd fl W</td>
<td>Police Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fred McEnroe</strong></td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaisons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Barbara Atkinson</strong></td>
<td>x3206</td>
<td>Box 0930</td>
<td>1308-3rd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Janet Norton</strong></td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0250</td>
<td>S-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paula Carien Schultz</strong></td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 21, 1989
August 21, 1989

TO: Julius R. Krevans, M.D.  
Chancellor's Office  
Box 0402  

FR: Trinity A. Ordoña  
Chair  
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

RE: 1988-89 Annual Report

On behalf of the Staff Advisory Committee, I am pleased to enclose our 1988-89 Annual Report for your review. It was prepared by our Executive Committee and contains a detailed summary of SAC activities and list of expenditures for the period of July 1, 1988 through August 30, 1989. As a group, we were all pleased to have been given this opportunity to contribute to UCSF.

Let me also take this moment to personally thank you for the opportunity to have served as Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee. It has been a privilege and honor to work with this committee and I am proud to be a part of the UCSF campus community.

cc: Vice Chancellor Thena Trygstad
I. HISTORY and BACKGROUND

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was formed on September 25, 1987 when Chancellor Julius R. Krevans called on interested campus community members to counter the University's prevailing negative image resulting from the unfavorable July 9, 1987 Appeals Court decision on Laurel Heights.

During its first year, SAC held a series of meetings and activities to address various campus and community concerns. Three informational noontime programs were held on the Laurel Heights court developments, the use and disposal of radioactivity, and questions concerning the use of animals in research. Several advocacy and public relations tasks were also accomplished. Most notably, SAC mobilized campus members to attend the SF Sierra Club meeting on May 11, 1988 when an anti-UCSF draft resolution was under consideration. At least 60 UCSF faculty, staff and students attended and after lengthy testimony, the opposition was countered with an effective articulation of the facts.

II. 1988-89 CURRENT STATUS

A. Transitional Period, July 1 - September 30, 1988:

On June 17 at a general membership meeting of SAC, Trinity Ordoñá was voted as Acting Chair and The Guidelines for the Staff Advisory Committee were adopted. A transitional leadership group composed of Valli McDougle, Byron Sigal and Susan Heath (each representing the three working subcommittees) joined Trinity to lead the group through the rest of the summer.

During that time, they successfully enlisted volunteers from a wider cross-section of the campus community to recommend to the Chancellor for appointment to SAC in 1988-89. The previous committee had a membership of 6 men and 20 women; the new volunteer list included 11 men and 27 women. In addition, a greater diversity in representation of our campus community was achieved with 11 people of color and 6 individuals from the off-campus sites (VAMC, SFGH, CED, and Laurel Heights) among the total 38 individuals. In addition, Parnassus Heights was more broadly represented with members from almost all the major campus buildings: Long Hospital, "
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Medical/Clinical Sciences, Nursing, Dentistry, Langley Porter, Millberry Union, Laguna Honda, Irving Street and Medical Center Way. Representatives from ABOG, UCSF Council, and MAG joined the committee as well.

In addition, SAC organized UCSF participation in a community project to create a child care center for the Plaza East Housing Development in the Western Addition on September 24-25, 1988. Skilled UCSF labor including three electricians, three plumbers, and a carpenter from our Physical Plant Department donated their skilled labor. Forty other UCSF volunteers helped to clean, scrape, and paint the new child care center.

B. October 1, 1988 through August 31, 1989:

On September 30, 1988 Trinity Ordoña was appointed by Chancellor Krevans as Chair and 38 others were appointed members. Volunteers came forward from the committee to lead the three subcommittees: Valli McDougle, Kathy Balestreri -- Information and Advocacy; Byron Sigal, Elenor Shimosaka -- Community Outreach; and Anne Poirier, Suzanne Gottschalk (replacing Susan Health who later resigned) -- Staff Education. Trinity also named Steve Reynolds as Vice-Chair. These eight individuals made up the SAC Executive Committee which met monthly on the first Friday of the month. General membership monthly meetings were regularly held on the second Friday during noontime. In addition, Fred McEnroe from Paula Carien Schultz' office took the minutes and handled SAC financial accounting. Barbara Atkinson (Community & Governmental Relations), Janet Norton (News & Public Information Services), and Paula Carien Schultz (Office of Vice Chancellor of Staff & Student Human Resources) continued as liaisons to SAC from their respective offices.

The general membership meetings were the mainstay for the organization, allowing members to give and receive reports on the activities of the working committees and, most importantly, discuss current issues with informed UCSF administration and outside sources. The information provided at these meetings enabled members to confidently respond to campus concerns and initiate activities during the year through the working committees. Relevant reports were regularly distributed and candidly discussed at meetings. In addition, the helpful and resourceful role of the liaisons often came into play. They kept the committee regularly informed of new developments, such as the EIR process for Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights, the 125th Anniversary Plans, Noe Valley community meetings about cancer clusters, etc.

For example, the December 12 meeting addressed the rumored new outbreak of Q fever and accusations that UCSF emissions were "toxic," and thus causing leukemia cancers in Noe Valley. This discussion led some
Information and Advocacy Committee members to attend their Noe Valley neighborhood community meeting on this issue (see specific report below). In addition, two general membership meetings on February 10 and March 10, 1989 were devoted solely to the concerns of toxics at the UCSF workplace. Dr. Balzer, and later Mr. Bruce Spaulding, candidly discussed these questions. The information they provided allowed the SAC Education Subcommittee to organize a very successful campuswide Q & A on this same topic. The Community Outreach Subcommittee, likewise, initiated and successfully organized two campus donation drives for food (November) and toys (May). Both campaigns brought recognition to UCSF and tapped the generosity of the campus community.

1. General Membership Meetings: The following is a list of the highlights of the general membership meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Guest Speaker, Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 1988</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor Thena Trygstad: Purpose and Goals of the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18, 1988</td>
<td>Working Committee Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 1988</td>
<td>Alfred L. Jin, Environmental Health &amp; Safety: Facts and Issues on Q Fever; Andrew R. Moss, Ph.D., Epidemiology &amp; International Health, UCSF: The Noe Valley Cancer Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 1989</td>
<td>Lloyd H. Smith, M.D.: 125th Anniversary of UCSF; George L. Kenyon, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate: New Campuses for UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 1989</td>
<td>Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement and Planning, J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety: Questions and Concerns About Toxics at UCSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and March 10, 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 14, 1989  Attorney Anna Shimko (Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Robertson and Galk) and Barbara L. Atkinson, Community and Governmental Relations, UCSF:  *The Environmental Impact Report Process, Laurel Heights and Mount Zion*

May 12, 1989  General membership meeting cancelled;  *Toxins in the Workplace* seminar (May 18) and Toy & Book Drive (May 15-26)

June 9, 1989  William B. Kerr, Director, UCSF Medical Center:  *UCSF and Mount Zion Hospital*

August 11, 1989  Review and approval of the draft annual report; EIR process of campus/public information meetings for Mt. Zion/Laurel Heights to be discussed

2. **Working Committee Reports:** All of the SAC members were asked to join a working committee (Information & Advocacy, Community Outreach, Staff Education). These committees were the nuts and bolts of SAC and the majority of our external activities were organized through them. Each set up its own internal structure, leadership, meeting schedule and decision making process. Staff volunteers who were interested in one of our projects joined that committee at any time throughout the year. (See *Attachment i* for list of working committee members.) Below is a brief report from the co-chairs of each working committee on their activities for the year.

   a. **Information and Advocacy:** The goal of the Information & Advocacy subcommittee is to establish a campus information and mobilization network and to provide input, as requested, to campus communications regarding community/staff issues. During the course of the year, members of the subcommittee attended meetings of the established campus organizations to solicit participation in the mobilizations network. The network currently consists of over 60 members who may be solicited for letter-writing campaigns, attendance at community meetings, or participation in community-based projects. The network was used for attendance at the following public hearings:
Friends of Noe Valley Community Meeting, January 23, 1989: Meeting confined to Noe Valley residents to discuss cancer clusters; members of subcommittee spoke in defense of UCSF.

KQED-FM Radio-thon, February 10, 1989: Subcommittee recruited 8 staff volunteers from UCSF to participate in the radio-thon to raise funds for KQED-FM; during the radio-thon, UCSF was frequently mentioned on the air.

Radiation License Hearing for Laurel Heights, April 21, 1989: The subcommittee helped to recruit faculty and staff to be present and/or submit testimony throughout the day; coordinated with the UCSF Office of Public Service Programs. (Please note: approval of license was subsequently granted on August 17, 1989.)

To enhance staff communication on issues affecting the campus, the subcommittee was responsible for:

1. Development of a proposal for a UCSCF "Rumor Hotline" for continuous updates on issues of interest to staff (Attachment ii). The proposal was submitted to campus administration and is included in the 1989-90 budget.

2. Formulation of Campus Publications List of approximately 40 campus publications were compiled and forwarded to our News Services Office to enhance campus communication.

3. Invitation on behalf of SAC to: UC President David Pierpont Gardner to address the campus community in the Fall of 1989; Atty. Anna Shimko (Howard Rice & Associates) to discuss the Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights EIR processes (May); UCSF Medical Center Director William E. Kerr to address the UCSF/Mt. Zion background, history and integration process (June); and review Chancellor's letter to the campus community on the on Laurel Heights court decision (December).

In the coming year, the goal of the subcommittee is to further develop the information & mobilization network by recruiting additional participants from the campus community at large.

b. Community Outreach: Representing UCSF, our subcommittee's goals are to provide community service and spread good will to our neighbors, community and targeted groups. To help accomplish these goals, we encouraged broad campus representation on the committee and selected community projects with the following criteria: "do-able"
in a short period of time requiring people-power (no money would be donated or raised) and located in communities nearby UCSF or its off-campus sites and/or ethnic minority neighborhoods.

During the year, the committee met often to discuss projects, especially those that would link up with the upcoming 125th Anniversary Celebration plans. The committee sponsored its first project, Holiday Food Drive for the SF Food Bank (December 12-16). The campus collected over 5,000 pounds of food for the needy of San Francisco and was the fourth largest contributor in the city. This was our first effort and we plan to do this drive again next year. Since we found the campus community very giving, we sponsored a Toy & Book Drive in May and continued into June. Hundreds of toys and books were collected and are now being distributed to targeted day care centers and homeless shelters. (See Attachment iii-vii.) Next year, we also plan to carry out a renovation project and will solicit other projects/ideas from the campus community.

c. Staff Education: The Staff Education subcommittee began the year re-evaluating its mission to distinguish itself from other campus organizations or services also providing educational seminars. We decided that our task was to develop educational forums in immediate response to critical campus issues. This year, that topic was Toxins in the Workplace. This subject was selected after a process of holding two informal Q &A discussions with Dr. J. Leroy Balzer (Environmental Health & Safety) and Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding during our regularly scheduled general membership meetings in February and March. This preparation culminated in one of the best attended staff seminars on campus; over 130 people came to the standing-room only discussion. Of particular concern was the problems created by the noxious fumes from the ventilation system in the new spaces created in Millberry Union, Ambulatory Care and Medical Sciences. This proved to be an excellent forum for management-staff interaction and greatly increased staff understanding of the issues faced by a campus with severe space limitations in old buildings. The audience enthusiastically endorsed a follow-up seminar on the same topic. (See Attachment viii-x.) Next year, the subcommittee plans to organize another toxins seminar, including one at CED, as staff has indicated strong interest in this topic.

C. Budget:

All of these activities were accomplished through the time and effort of SAC members and other campus staff volunteers. It entailed many hours of meetings, designing graphics, making phone calls, writing and mailing letters, collecting food, toys and books and doing person-to-person outreach.
Only $3,000 of the $6,000 SAC budget has been spent, to date. As in the past, campus publicity was our single largest expenditure item, costing approximately $1,000 for each printing and mailing. (See Attachment xi for detailed report.)

III. FUTURE PLANS

In general, the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee has been active, involved and concerned about the current and future issues facing UCSF. These past two years have been crucial, formative ones. Basic organization and goals have been established and a good track record of service has been built. This annual report clearly demonstrates many creative examples of our loyalty and service, from tapping the generosity of the campus to provide needed community services and goods, to organizing educational forums on relevant campus issues, like toxins in the workplace, and mobilizing support from campus friends when needed.

We anticipate a continued need for SAC involvement in the coming years; already, the majority of members have indicated a desire to continue membership. Some plans have already been put into place for next year: SAC will help lead campus tours during the 125th Anniversary Celebration Kick-Off (scheduled for October 14, 1989) and mobilize for the upcoming community/campus informational meetings on Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights for the EIR process. Based on these past two years, we have confidence that we can effectively meet any new challenges ahead.

August 15, 1989

Trinity Ordoña
Chair

Kathy Balestreri
Information & Advocacy

Elenor Shimosaka
Community Outreach

Suzanne Gottschalk
Staff Education

Steve Reynolds
Vice Chair

Valli McDougle
Information & Advocacy

Byron Sigal
Community Outreach

Anne Poirier
Staff Education
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)

HIGHLIGHTS

July 9, 1987
Unfavorable California Court of Appeals ruling on UC at Laurel Heights

September 25, 1987
Chancellor Julius R. Krevans calls on campus community to join efforts countering the University's prevailing negative image resulting from this conflict; Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) formed with 26 members

January, 1988
SAC participates in a letter-writing campaign to San Francisco Supervisor Wendy Nelder (she was considering a proposal to the Board of Supervisors to file an amicus brief for the Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association lawsuit against UCSF). Supervisor Nelder received between 50 to 60 letters, an action that presumably prompted her to drop the plan altogether.

April 1, 1988
SAC-sponsored noontime forum entitled UCSF: Our Future, featuring Chancellor Julius R. Krevans, Dr. Henry J. Ralston, III, Academic Senate Chair, and Joy Becker for the Staff Advisory Committee; over 400 people attended to hear an update on the Laurel Heights issue.

April 20, 1988
SAC-sponsored educational program on Radioactivity: Its Use in Hospitals, In Research, and the Hazards of Its Use and Disposal, with J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety; about 40 attend.

May 11, 1988
SAC helps mobilize 60 UCSF faculty, staff and students to attend the San Francisco Sierra Club Executive Committee meeting. After lengthy testimony and discussion, a draft and resolution at the initiative of the Laurel Heights Improvement Association was substantially amended to something much less punitive, more related to the facts about pollution and safety, and less misrepresentative of UCSF's position in the city.

May 26, 1988
SAC-sponsored educational program, Animal Research: Why? A Forum to Address Campus Questions Concerning the Use of Animals in Research, featuring a panel of six speakers; 60 people attend.

August 3, 1988
SAC members participate in 125th Anniversary Committee planning process for the next 14 months.

September 24-25, 1988
SAC organizes UCSF participants in a community project to create a childcare center for the Plaza East Housing Development in the Western Addition, San Francisco; skilled labor including three electricians, three plumbers, and a carpenter from the Physical Plant Department donated their skilled labor; 40 other UCSF volunteers helped to clean, scrape, and paint the new Center.
October 1, 1988
Forty staff members appointed to the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee; three working committees formed in the areas of Community Outreach, Information and Advocacy, and Staff Education. Highlights of these three working committees are listed below.

October 17 and 24, 1988
SAC co-sponsors S.F. Board of Supervisors Candidates Forum with other faculty, staff and student organizations.

December 12-16, 1988
SAC organizes campus community participation in the San Francisco Corporate Challenge Food Drive; over 5000 lbs. of food were collected, making UCSF one of the top four largest contributors in the drive.

December 12, 1988 and January 23, 1989
SAC encourages UCSF faculty and staff residing in the Noe Valley area attend community meetings to discuss cancer cluster; allegations that toxic air emissions from UC's research facility were the possible cause of cancer are discussed and countered.

May 18, 1989
SAC-sponsored educational forum: *Toxins in the Workplace--A Question and Answer Session* with Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor, Business and Fiscal Services, and J. Leroy Balzer, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Environmental Health and Safety. Over 130 people attended this standing-room only forum to discuss campus members' concerns like, "Is my building making me ill?"

May 15-26, 1989
SAC-sponsored UCSF Toy Drive; approximately 25 barrels full of toys and books for the children of San Francisco were collected and are now being distributed to needy day care centers and nursery schools in the city.

August-October, 1989
Anticipated SAC assistance in mobilizing for the campus and community informational meetings on the Environmental Impact Report process for Laurel Heights and Mt. Zion.

October 14, 1989
SAC to lead tours during the kick-off event for the UCSF 125th Anniversary Celebration.
## CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
### 1988 - 89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Ordona</td>
<td>x8180</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-834 Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Baldwin</td>
<td>x0579</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Balestreri</td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103 Med Center</td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Becker</td>
<td>x2204</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409 Animal Care Fac</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Canfield</td>
<td>x3876</td>
<td>Box 0604</td>
<td>N-331B Dean's Ofc, S/N</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Ann Chou</td>
<td>x2298</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED 425 Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>x0544</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20 News Services</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Emelia</td>
<td>221-4810/x3749</td>
<td>VA 116A</td>
<td>same Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
<td>Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED 145 AIS</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x1373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403 Labor Relations</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>x4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>x1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>FAC Alum, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>x1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>S-612 Outdoors Unlimited</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>x1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>x6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td>Millberry Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McDougle</td>
<td>x2342</td>
<td>Box 0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
<td>Lab Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Minvielle</td>
<td>x8683</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-238</td>
<td>Growth &amp; Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>x8974</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
<td>Material Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Connor</td>
<td>x9014</td>
<td>Box 0640</td>
<td>C-734</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pauley</td>
<td>x8808</td>
<td>Box 0910</td>
<td>HSE Annex</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Poirier</td>
<td>x7033</td>
<td>LPI-F-0984</td>
<td>LP-348</td>
<td>GI Division, SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>x4592</td>
<td>Box 0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
<td>SFGH, 3C29</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>Assoc Dean, Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Roma</td>
<td>x8112</td>
<td>Box 0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
<td>Dean's Office, S/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Salazar</td>
<td>x4373</td>
<td>Box 0934</td>
<td>145 Irv 1W</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Santos</td>
<td>x2681</td>
<td>Box 0430</td>
<td>S-630</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Shimosaka</td>
<td>x2800</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHS-150</td>
<td>VC-Bus &amp; Fis Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Sigal</td>
<td>x1616</td>
<td>Box 0968</td>
<td>610 Parnassus</td>
<td>Psych/Acad Afrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>x8095</td>
<td>Box 0288</td>
<td>MU 2nd fl E</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>x7625</td>
<td>LPI-ACA-0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>x1571</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Police Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>x1226</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-926</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yee</td>
<td>x5683</td>
<td>Box 0238</td>
<td>MU 3rd fl W</td>
<td>VC-Psnnl &amp; Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff
- Fred McEnroe: x5186, Box 0402, S-24, VC-Psnnl & Stdt Svcs

### Liaisons
- Barbara Atkinson: x3206, Box 0930, 1308-3rd Ave, Com & Gov't Rel
- Janet Norton: x2557, Box 0250, S-20, News Services
- Paula Carien Schultz: x5186, Box 0402, S-24, VC-Psnnl & Stdt Svcs

May 24, 1989
CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Trinity Ordona, Chair; Steve Reynolds, Vice-Chair

Kathy Balestreri, Suzanne Gottschalk, Valli McDougle,
Anne Poirier, Byron Sigal, Elenor Shimosaka

WORKING COMMITTEES

Information & Advocacy:
Kathy Balestreri, Co-Chair
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair
Tim Baldwin
Bart Cohen
Linda Erklens
Martha Hooven
Carolyn Koster
Karen Newhouse
Dorothy Price
Chris Slaboszewicz
Susan Stevens
Margaret Warren

Community Outreach:
Elenor Shimosaka, Co-Chair
Byron Sigal, Co-Chair
Karen Eldred
Rita Emelia
Suzanne Gottschalk
Marsha Guggenheim
Miles Hamada
Sue Hamill
May Huang
Marie Lehrer
Albert Minvielle
John O'Connor
Trinity Ordona
Deborah Pauley
Anne Poirier
Steve Reynolds
Eugene Salazar
David Santos
Colleen Tradwick
Barbara Wilson
Christine Yee

Staff Education:
Suzanne Gottschalk, Co-Chair
Anne Poirier, Co-Chair
Ethel Adams
Joy Becker
Karen Eldred
Michele Graf
Susan Heath
May Huang
Loretta Maddux
Dorothy Price
Eunice Redondo
Steve Reynolds
Isabel Roma
Barbara Wilson

August 3, 1989
HOTLINE PROPOSAL

Due to the size of the UCSF campus, and dispersion of faculty, staff and students among its many sites, it is often difficult to obtain current, accurate information. This is particularly true during times of fast-breaking news, such as the Supreme Court’s decision on Laurel Heights, or during troubling activities or in crisis situations, such as an impending nurses’ strike, or responding to rumors about the spread of Q fever or cancer clusters in surrounding neighborhoods. In order to make sure that members of the UCSF organization have access to the latest, most accurate information, we are proposing a telephone hotline.

We believe that to be most effective, the telephone hotline should be kept as simple and as cost-effective as possible. And because News and Information Services is the main campus resource for accurate, up-to-date information, we propose that the telephone hotline become part of that office’s operations and responsibility.

It is also important to have some means of feedback so that campus officials have a means of learning about new events or recent rumors, and have an opportunity to clarify or respond appropriately.

The telephone hotline would work in the following way:

1) A separate telephone line with a message/answering machine would be located in News and Information Services.

2) A message about breaking news, or responding to campus rumors, would be recorded on the answering machine, and would be updated daily, and more often when necessary.

3) The message would end with a phone number which individuals could call in order to report breaking news or give information about spreading rumors, such as "If you have something you’d like to share with us, please call ______ or leave a message following the tone."

4) The message recorded on the answering machine could also be displayed on the TV monitors throughout the campus.

5) After a period of six months, this activity should be evaluated as to use and effectiveness.
25% of San Francisco's population lives near or below the poverty level. The majority of these people are children and senior citizens. UCSF has joined the Corporate Challenge Food Drive to collect food for the San Francisco Food Bank which serves soup kitchens, emergency and homeless shelters, senior centers and day care programs.

Your donations will help provide 75,000 meals a week to needy people throughout San Francisco!

Bring your donations to the UCSF Corporate Challenge Food Drive
December 12-16
FOOD DRIVE SHOPPING LIST
SUGGESTIONS

**ALL DONATED FOOD SHOULD BE CANNED OR DRY**

- CORNMEAL
- TUNA
- SARDINES
- STEW
- CHILI
- PASTA
- BEANS
- BRAN
- SOUPS
- RICE
- WHEAT
- CORNMEAL
- OATMEAL
- FRUIT JUICE
- CONDENSED MILK
- EVAPORATED MILK
- SPAGHETTI SAUCE
- PEANUT BUTTER
- DRY CEREAL
- PUDDING OR CUSTARD
- CANNED NUTS
- CANNED VEGETABLES
- CANNED OR DRY FRUITS
- MUFFIN OR PANCAKE MIX
- RICE CAKES
- BAKING MIXES

*Sponsored at UCSF by the Staff Advisory Committee and the Office of Public Service Programs

Look for the Food-Drop Barrel in your campus area
San Francisco Chronicle

Most Successful Food Drive Ever in S.F.

By Perry Lang
Chronicle Staff Writer

The employees of more than 100 San Francisco businesses opened their hearts and cupboards this holiday season and gave a record 64,000 pounds of food to the San Francisco Food Bank.

"It's the largest food drive ever held in San Francisco," said Judy Belohlavek, speaking for the organization. Belohlavek said overwhelming donations forced the bank to seek trucking help from the Teamsters union just to pick up all the food.

The Food Bank, which raised 18,000 pounds of food from 28 companies during its 1987 holiday food drive, raised 64,000 pounds from more than 100 companies.

Big donations came from Bechtel Corp. with 11,585 pounds, Del Monte with 6,676 pounds, McKesson with 5,000 pounds, University of California at San Francisco with 4,750 pounds, the Grubb & Ellis real estate firm with 3,700 pounds, Pacific Gas and Electric with 2,740 pounds, Wells Fargo Bank with 2,660 pounds and Chevron U.S.A. with 2,100 pounds.

Two local food producers, Nancy's Quiche and Allied Foods, gave substantial donations of their products to the drive.

In addition to food, some long-time corporate supporters, such as Transamerica, McKesson and the Haas foundations, donated more than $20,000 each.

All food collected by the food bank will be distributed to the needy through more than 100 human service agencies. These programs include homeless shelters, AIDS relief programs, soup kitchens, low-income senior centers, emergency food box programs and other agencies serving needy individuals.

The mission of the food bank is to act as a central food provider of donated food to local hunger relief agencies. The organization is one of two Bay Area groups that are part of the national food bank group called Second Harvest, which receives donations from grocery stores and food manufacturers.
UCSF TOY DRIVE

Sponsored by the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

MAY 15-26

We are collecting toys for some of the needy children of San Francisco. Toys will be donated to neighborhood community agencies providing summer programs for disadvantaged children.

Bring Toys for Infants through Pre-Teens

- BOOKS
- PUZZLES
- DOLLS
- BALLS
- EDUCATIONAL TOYS
- COMPLETE GAMES
- STUFFED ANIMALS
- MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS
- SPORTS EQUIPMENT
- ARTS & CRAFTS MATERIALS

Donations should be in good, usable condition

LOOK FOR TOY BARRELS IN YOUR LOCATION
How Many Toys Were There?

Neighborhood child care agencies soon will have a large collection of toys thanks to the successful Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee’s recent toy drive. At the time of this writing, some 26 barrels had been filled and still more were being collected. Nestled among one of the several mounds of toys (and offering a big collective “thanks” to everyone who donated) are the key members of the drive: (Clockwise beginning with Fred Flintstone) Child Care Center’s Bryon Sigal, CVRI’s Suzanne Gottschalk, Dentistry’s John O’Connor, Immunogenetics’ Marsha Guggenheim, Psychiatry’s Anne Poirier, Pharmacy’s Trinity Ordoña, News Services’ Karen Eldred and Stephen Reynolds, Personnel’s Eleonor Shimosaka and Pharmacy’s Barbara Wilson. Missing is Police Department’s Christine Yee.
Harris Award Shared by Two

For the second time in its 11-year history, the John B. Harris Award will be shared by two outstanding School of Medicine graduating students: David A. Campa of Van Nuys and Darrell L. Edwards of Oakland. The award is given annually to the UCSF graduate who best exemplifies the qualities of Harris, the black faculty member, physician and civil rights advocate, who died in 1973.

During his years as a medical student, Campa elected to work as a psychiatric clerk in the intense environment of the jail ward at SFGH, where he dealt with very ill patients, mostly from lower socio-economic groups.

With little spare time on his hands, he still managed to participate in several campus-wide and outside community activities geared to the medically underserved, including the School of Medicine admissions committee, the minority admissions panel, the registration fee advisory committee to the Chancellor, executive board of the Associated Students of UCSF, Chicanos in Health Education (CHE), and the California Chicano/Latino Medical Student Association, of which he currently serves as Northern California coordinator.

Campa received his BA in Human Biology in 1984 from Stanford, and graduated with honors in 1988 from the UC Berkeley School of Public Health with a MPH in Health Policy and Administration. He plans to do his residency... (continued on page 3.)

"Toxins and the Workplace," an Open Discussion May 18

"Is my building making me ill?"

That is one of several questions to be posed to University Advancement & Planning Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and EH&S Assistant Vice Chancellor J. Leroy Balzer during "Toxins and the Workplace," an open discussion to be held on Thursday, May 18, from noon to 1 p.m. in HSW 302.

"This hour has been set aside for an open and frank discussion," says Department of Pharmacy's Trinity Ordona, chair of the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee, which is sponsoring the event.

As there will be no formal presentation, members of the campus community are asked to bring along their questions, concerns and fears. Maybe you would like to know: "What's the difference between a toxin and an irritant?" "Are we getting headaches and feeling dizzy from toxins in our ventilation system?" "Are some buildings more prone to this than others?" "Do we have an asbestos problem on campus?" "Are video displays harming us?" "What are the future plans for handling the UCSF 'space crunch'?"

So, keep your May 18th noon hour open, bring your questions and find out some answers! In the meantime, if you have any questions regarding the discussion, call Anne T. POIRIER CLS Psychr Bx 0984 (m), Bx F-LPPI 342 664006/S/6220/Y/4767033.
The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee invites you to participate in

Toxins and the Workplace

A Question and Answer Session with

Bruce W. Spaulding, VChAn-Business & Fiscal Services
J. Leroy Balzer, PhD, Asst VChAn-Environmental Health & Safety

* Is there danger from fumes and strange smells in our ventilation systems?
* "Sick Building Syndrome" - Is my building making me ill?
* What are future plans for handling "Space Crunch"?
* Are video display terminals toxic in any way?
* If I'm exposed to hazardous materials, what's the first thing I must do?

What are your Questions - Concerns - Fears?

This hour is devoted to addressing your questions. There will be no presentation. Just an open and frank discussion. Find out the answers... Please come to:

HSW 302 - Thursday, May 18th - noon to one

For more information, call ext. 67033 (Anne Poirier)
Spaulding, Balzer discuss toxins in the workplace

By Kevin Knopf

"We're committed, if there is an environment that is in any way unhealthy, to making alternate work space available." This comment by Bruce Spaulding, vice chancellor for university advancement and planning, was in response to repeated employee concerns about air quality at a free-wheeling "open forum" on environmental health issues held May 18.

But he cautioned that when toxic substances in the air are measured following employee complaints, the levels detected are almost always well within safe limits. This makes relocation unnecessary in most cases, although the source of the fumes should aggressively be attacked, Spaulding explained.

Spaulding appeared with J. Leroy Balzer, assistant vice chancellor for occupational safety and health, before a capacity noon-time crowd in HSW 302. The event was sponsored by the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee on Toxins in the Workplace.

Many workers expressed concerns about inadequate ventilation, particularly in offices in the Millberry Union complex, which houses the parking garage. Several questioners reported ongoing problems with car and truck exhaust being sucked into their offices over long periods, despite repeated efforts by UCSF officials to solve the problems.

Other employees expressed fears about the possible health hazards associated with working at both a medical and research institution that routinely uses a wide range of chemicals in lab and clinical work.

Balzer and Spaulding assured the workers that the levels of toxic chemicals, which are routinely measured, are too low to be causing an occupational hazard.

Many worker complaints are apparently related to the "sick building syndrome." windows. Inadequate ventilation systems often allow the buildup of toxic gases or fumes, such as ozone and ammonia, routinely given off by office machines, or chemicals such as formaldehyde, used in the manufacture of furniture and carpeting.

Outdoor pollutants, such as carbon monoxide, are sometimes sucked into such buildings through poorly designed heating and cooling ductwork. Some experts believe that the combination of pollutants cause a synergistic effect, although individual pollutants are usually present in very low concentrations.

Classic sick-building symptoms—fatigue, headaches and respiratory complaints—are widespread among workers in newly remodeled areas of MU.

Balzer and Spaulding reiterated UCSF's dilemma on space: Because the campus growth is limited, an often-used approach to space demands has been to remodel for higher density use. But ventilation systems installed in the remodeled offices have not always been able to handle the job.

"We need a comprehensive program for all our older buildings, to improve the ventilation systems," Spaulding said, noting that prior ventilation decisions "were not ideal" and "would not be repeated" in future projects. But compensating for past errors could cost tens of millions of dollars, he added.

Currently, occupational health officials are surveying the ventilation needs of all campus buildings. Spaulding hopes that bond measures in future years could provide enough funds to solve ventilation problems. In the mean time, the worst problems will be tackled first, he said.

"The key thing is that there are people available to come out to your office and see if we can solve the immediate problem," Balzer said.

Spaulding and Balzer also made these responses to questions specific to a particular work environment:

- Plans to improve the air supply for G level in Millberry Union have been made and funding has been set aside.
- Air quality on C level of the Ambulatory Care Center is being examined for a possible overhaul of the ventilation system. "My judgement is that the C level environment is unacceptable," Spaulding said. Improvements may be linked to ventilation for the new Magnetic Resonance Imaging Center under construction on that floor.
- Construction activity in Millberry is being monitored for possible dust generation, especially near air intake areas.
- The microwave ovens used in the hospital have been checked for radiation leakage yearly and all but one have been found to be safe. The unsafe unit was removed.
- The radiation risk from video display terminals (VDTs) is not well documented. But problems are clearly linked to poorly designed chairs, eye strain, and a lack of exercise associated with working at VDTs. New policy recommendations about these factors are in the works.
- The procedure for documenting health problems due to poor air quality or other possible work-related exposures can come from the employee's doctor's reports or through employee health. There is a physician on call for employee treatment, and if necessary, for documenting work-related concerns.

Balzer said.

The lively meeting was so well attended that Steve Reynolds, a member of the sponsoring committee, suggested that future meetings maintain the open forum format. If workers have a particular concern about their work environment they should call Environmental Health and Safety at 476-1300.
Staff Advisory Committee  
1988-89 Costs

**Publicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fliers to UCSF Staff - AIS, Reprographics,</td>
<td>&quot;Toxins and the Workplace&quot; Forum - May 18, 1989</td>
<td>$977.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fliers to UCSF Staff - AIS, Reprographics, Addressing Svc.</td>
<td>&quot;Toy and Book Drive&quot; - May 15-June 9, 1989</td>
<td>$977.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMR Videotaping</td>
<td>&quot;Animal Research, Why?&quot; Forum - May 26, 1988</td>
<td>$238.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards for Networking</td>
<td>Quick Copy - June 1989</td>
<td>$16.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Advocacy Committee</td>
<td>Poster Boards - Millberry Union Bookstore</td>
<td>$16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Toy and Book Drive&quot; - May 15-June 9, 1989</td>
<td>Five 5x7 Prints for Neighborhood Papers</td>
<td>$33.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Toy and Book Drive&quot; - May 15-June 9, 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catering/Room Rental for General Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - July 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - September 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millberry Union Room Rental for Orientation Meeting with Thena Trygstad - October 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$162.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - October 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - November 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - December 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - January 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - February 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - March 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt Catering - April 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | | $2,933.79

* Activity from 1987-88 year charged to July 1988 ledger
STUDY SHOWS UC SAN FRANCISCO EMISSIONS HAVE MINIMAL HEALTH EFFECT ON COMMUNITY

An independent study released today by UC San Francisco shows that emissions from its Parnassus Heights research and teaching laboratories and hospitals have a minimal impact on neighborhoods surrounding the campus, according to Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor, Advancement and Planning.

No detectable effect on air quality was found in any neighborhood around the campus, even as close as half a block from the campus boundary. Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF were a fraction of what applicable government standards allow. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.

As a result of these low levels, the study concluded that emissions from Parnassus Heights research laboratories pose an extremely low risk to the public.

The study was initiated by the campus in January 1988 in an attempt to answer some of the concerns expressed by UCSF's neighbors and to assure the campus that research, teaching and patient care at Parnassus Heights are conducted in a safe manner.

Key findings of the study, performed by the Sacramento-based Radian Corporation, are:

- The highest radiation levels found on and around the Parnassus campus are 33 times less than government standards allow. No radiation above background levels could be detected in the air in any neighborhood around the campus. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.

- There was no statistical difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of chemicals in the air, indicating that chemicals are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect air quality.

- Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF are six times

(more)
below what applicable government standards allow. Chemicals found in soil on the Parnassus Heights campus and in the neighborhood are no different from what is found in any urban environment.

- The wind direction at UCSF Parnassus Heights is predominantly from the west southwest, about parallel to Parnassus Avenue. The wind blows toward the Noe and Eureka Valley areas a small percentage of the time. (This is important in view of the concern expressed by some residents of these neighborhoods over a possible "cancer cluster," or slightly elevated number of cancer cases in their area, which they feared might be due to UCSF emissions.)

- Overall, the estimates of emissions showed that about 107 pounds of chemicals may evaporate into the air each day from UCSF Parnassus. Not all of these are considered "toxic." This amount is slightly more than the emissions from a neighborhood dry cleaner.

- Of the total quantity of potentially toxic air emissions, the most significant in terms of health risk was ethylene oxide (2.2 pounds daily) from hospital and dental school sterilizers vented to the roof. Sterilizers are used routinely in most hospitals to disinfect instruments and supplies, and ethylene oxide is the most effective substance in disinfecting these items. UCSF has ordered the installation of new state-of-the-art scrubbers that will remove 98 percent of sterilizer emissions.

- Based on a health risk assessment with a hypothetical "worst case" scenario, assuming that the hypothetical individual affected lives all of his or her life (70 years) at the point of highest ground-level chemical concentrations without ever going indoors or leaving the spot, the possibility of developing cancer is estimated to be 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 chances in a million after installation of the state-of-the-art scrubbers on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

Measurements were taken directly at the vents on the roofs of a representative sample of research, teaching and hospital buildings at UCSF, and at six sites in backyards and on rooftops of neighbors in the vicinity of the campus.

Radian performed risk assessments to evaluate potential health risks associated with airborne emissions from the Parnassus campus. They assessed risks of developing acute health effects, chronic health effects and cancer. To estimate these hypothetical risks Radian used standard computer models developed and recommended by federal and state government agencies responsible for protecting public health and the environment.

These models use conservative assumptions and generally overstate health risks. For example, they assume that the hypothetical individual affected
lives all of his or her life (70 years) at the point of highest chemical emission concentration at ground level without ever going indoors or leaving the spot.

Because the highest level of UCSF emissions were detected at the rooftop vents themselves, the computer model used measurements made directly in these vents to estimate possible chemical concentrations on the campus and in the neighborhoods. From these estimates a hypothetical "cancer risk" was extrapolated.

The possibility of developing cancer in this hypothetical situation was estimated on the computer model as 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 chances in a million after installation of state-of-the-art scrubbers on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

Given the extremely conservative assumptions built into this type of "cancer risk" model, the State of California has concluded that a cancer risk of 10 in a million or more could be considered "significant." Installation of scrubbers thus reduces the total cancer risk due to Parnassus Heights air emissions to half the level considered significant by the State of California.

The scrubber for the hospital sterilizers, which emit the bulk of the ethylene oxide, is due to be installed by fall. Installation of the scrubber for the dental school sterilizer, which emits only 10% of the total ethylene oxide, is expected to be completed by next summer.

A hypothetical added risk of 5 in a million corresponds to an estimated one additional cancer case in 700 years in all of San Francisco.

For comparison, a person who lives near a gas station or dry cleaner has an estimated added risk of 10 to 50 chances in a million of developing cancer as a result of being exposed to emissions from these commercial facilities.

The environmental study and health risk assessment conducted by the Radian Corporation were commissioned as part of a model program for radiation safety and comprehensive environmental protection developed by UCSF for all its sites in response to concerns expressed by some residents of the Parnassus Heights and Laurel Heights (and later Noe Valley) neighborhoods, according to Spaulding.

The environmental study and health risk assessment at Parnassus Heights were key elements of the program, and are the first truly comprehensive environmental assessment with community input to be conducted on any campus in the country other than the National Institutes of Health. The study cost $1.6 million.

During the 20 months the study was planned and carried out, the UCSF
Department of Environmental Health & Safety under assistant vice chancellor Roy Balzer, PhD, and other UCSF officials met frequently with a community task force that included nine representatives of neighborhood community groups, plus the Sierra Club. Representatives of the San Francisco Department of Public Health and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District later joined the committee. Many campus neighbors allowed air sampling at sites in their backyards and rooftops.

A preview of the findings was presented to the task force last night (Thursday August 31).

In order to assure that the data gathered during the study received comprehensive evaluation by a number of individuals, UCSF and the University of California Office of the President commissioned an independent peer review by both outside consultants and internal UC staff. These reviewers included persons knowledgeable in areas of air sampling, computer modeling, meteorology, risk assessment methods and pollution control engineering. These outside reviewers and Radian met frequently to assure data validity and quality of results.

UCSF also has made a commitment to bring in another independent party to review the Radian study, the selection to be made by a committee composed of members of the community task force, the San Francisco Department of Public Health and UCSF, Spaulding said.

UCSF also will continue to reduce its use of potentially toxic material by substituting less toxic chemicals when possible and storing and using chemicals in smaller amounts, and has committed itself to a system of periodic monitoring of radiation safety and emissions to ensure that the air quality remains good around the Parnassus Heights campus.

"This study showed that only an extremely low risk could be attributed to emissions from the research laboratories at Parnassus Heights," Spaulding pointed out. "Furthermore, no radioactivity above background levels was detected in the air, and none at all in soils or sewers in any neighborhood surrounding the campus.

"This is important in view of the concerns expressed by some community members about the safety of moving our School of Pharmacy research programs to Laurel Heights," he said.

A summary of the environmental assessment methodology has been prepared. If not attached, call the UCSF News Office at (415) 476-2557 for a copy. The complete report may be obtained from the UCSF Department of Environmental Health & Safety at (415) 476-1300.

###
POTENTIAL EFFECTS AT UCSF PARNASSUS HEIGHTS
Data Collection in Phase II

UCSF HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
CHART II
NOTE: See Table 2-3 for Detailed Description of Receptor Sites.

Locations of Ambient Receptor Stations (Numbers) and Meteorological Stations (Letters) Near the Parnassus Campus.
### CHART III Legend
(Figure 2-1 in Radian Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station # and Identifier on Map</th>
<th>Location of Receptor Station</th>
<th>Description of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laguna Honda School</td>
<td>On 4-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1336 Willard (Willard at Parnassus)</td>
<td>On 4-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>144-150 Carl Street (Carl at Shrader)</td>
<td>On multiple unit. 3-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Belmont (Belmont at Edgewood)</td>
<td>On top of 1 story, exposed garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kesar Parking Lot (Frederick at Willard)</td>
<td>6 feet above ground in middle of parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>611 Frederick</td>
<td>On penthouse atop 4-story building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stanyan Street Fire Station (Stanyan at Willard)</td>
<td>On top of 30 foot tower above fire station roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Health Sciences West (Northwest Corner)</td>
<td>On northwest (leeward) corner of roof of 16-story building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Same as 3</td>
<td>Same as 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Stations 45 and 46 were added after the first day of sampling and were assigned the next available sequential station number.
Health Risk Assessment

Details of Cancer Risk Results

- Sources of risk (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Risk (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Teaching</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and Patient Care</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hospital Sterilizer</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Dental Sterilizer</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>0.00009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RISK AFTER INSTALLATION OF SCRUBBERS
University of California, San Francisco
Summary of Environmental Study and Health Risk Assessment
at Parnassus campus

The University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) operates a medical school, a dental school, a school of nursing, a school of pharmacy, the Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute and the UCSF Medical Center at its Parnassus Heights campus. Since January 1988 UCSF has been in the process of evaluating the potential health impact of the campus on the surrounding community and environment.

WHAT PROMPTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT?

About two years ago, UCSF learned that some community members were concerned about cancer cases reported in the Edgewood area (and later in Noe Valley). Also some residents of the Laurel Heights area had concerns about the plan to move School of Pharmacy research laboratories there. In response to neighborhood and community concerns, and to assure the campus community that research, teaching and patient care at Parnassus Heights are conducted in an environmentally responsible manner, UCSF decided to do an environmental assessment of the Parnassus campus.

WHAT IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT?

In an environmental assessment, as many factors as possible that could affect the environment in the area, such as air, water and soil, are considered. In this case, the assessment focused on emissions from the UCSF Parnassus facilities (see Chart I). It assessed how these emissions might affect air, soil, and water quality and, consequently, public health and the environment in the surrounding community.

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

Here are the most important findings:

- The highest radiation levels found on and around the Parnassus campus are 33 times less than government standards allow. No radiation above background levels could be detected in the air in any neighborhood around the campus. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.

- There was no statistical difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of chemicals in the air, indicating that chemicals are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect air quality.

- Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF are six times below what applicable government standards allow. Chemicals found in soil on the Parnassus Heights campus and in the neighborhood are no different from what is found in any urban environment.

(more)
• The wind direction at UCSF Parnassus Heights is predominantly from the west southwest, about parallel to Parnassus Avenue. The wind blows toward the Noe and Eureka Valley areas a small percentage of the time. (This is important in view of the concern expressed by some residents of these neighborhoods over a possible "cancer cluster," or slightly elevated number of cancer cases in their area, which they feared might be due to UCSF emissions.)

• Overall, the estimates of emissions showed that about 107 pounds of chemicals may evaporate into the air each day from UCSF Parnassus. Not all of these are considered "toxic." This amount is slightly more than the emissions from a neighborhood dry cleaner.

• Of the total quantity of potentially toxic air emissions, the most significant was ethylene oxide (2.2 pounds daily) from hospital and dental school sterilizers vented to the roof. Sterilizers are used routinely in most hospitals to disinfect instruments and supplies, and ethylene oxide is the most effective substance in disinfecting these items. UCSF has ordered the installation of new state-of-the-art scrubbers that will remove 98 percent of the emissions from sterilizer exhaust vents. These are expected to be installed in the hospital by fall and in the dental school (which is responsible for only 10% of emissions) by next summer.

• Based on a health risk assessment with a hypothetical "worst case" scenario, assuming that the hypothetical individual affected lives all of his or her life (70 years) at the point of highest ground-level chemical concentrations without ever going indoors or leaving the spot, the possibility of developing cancer is estimated to be 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 chances in a million after installation of the state-of-the-art scrubbers on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

The environmental assessment study results are discussed more fully under the "Results" heading of this summary.

HOW WAS THIS STUDY DONE?

Because UCSF uses many compounds for research, teaching, and patient care activities on the Parnassus campus, the task of measuring emissions to determine possible health impacts was very challenging. UCSF asked Radian Corporation, an independent environmental consulting firm, to do the assessment.

The environmental study and health risk assessment were the first to be conducted on any campus in the country outside the National Institutes of Health. Radian and UCSF considered input from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, community groups, and the scientific literature when designing and carrying out the $1.6 million study.

THE FIRST STEP WAS TO STUDY THE CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY AND UCSF.

Radian considered all input, and came up with a number of activities to evaluate these concerns. The results of these activities helped to focus the environmental assessment so that concerns with the greatest potential impact
received priority attention.

RADIAN DIVIDED THE MAIN PART OF THE STUDY INTO FOUR PHASES.

Phase I. Gather information so concerns can be studied scientifically.

Considerable information was needed to make sure that all of the potential impacts were identified and all concerns were considered. Two questionnaires sent to UCSF researchers were particularly useful in providing information about the types and amounts of compounds used in UCSF Parnassus facilities. This information was used to refine and focus the sampling plan carried out in Phase II.

Phase II. Measure emissions from UCSF activities.

This phase involved sampling emissions from laboratories, teaching facilities, and patient care activities (see Chart II). Specifically, this involved collecting samples from:

* Fume hood vents. Fume hoods are somewhat like kitchen stove hoods, where volatile chemicals are pulled up by fans and exhausted out of roof vents. Potentially hazardous compounds are used under fume hoods. Potentially infectious compounds are handled only under specially-filtered hoods.

* General building circulation vents. These vents exhaust air from rooms and hallways.

* Hospital and dental school sterilizers. Reusable medical instruments and supplies are sterilized by treating the equipment with a sterilizing gas in a chamber. After sterilization, the gas is vented to the atmosphere.

* Pathological incinerator. This facility is used to destroy and dispose of animal matter and clinical and surgical specimens.

* Soil. Area soil was collected and analyzed to see if emissions had been deposited there.

* Spring water. Because there were no ground-water wells in the community that could be sampled, water from two springs uphill of the campus, which were pointed out by community members, was sampled.

* Discharges to sewers. Sewer discharges from the campus were tested.

* Upwind and downwind air. Upwind air has not come into contact with emissions from UCSF Parnassus. Downwind air has had the chance to mix with these emissions. Sites where air quality was sampled are shown on Chart III. Many of these sites are in neighbors' backyards or on rooftops.

* Radiation levels. Radiation measurements were made of soil from the campus and the surrounding neighborhoods, the sewers, and airborne dust upwind and downwind of the campus. In particular, radioactive iodine -- the only radioactive material used at UCSF that could evaporate and be emitted in (more)
measurable quantities into the air - was looked for at rooftop vents and
upwind and downwind of the campus. Radiation generated by x-ray equipment
also was tested for.

The assessment also looked at:

• Meteorology. Wind measurements were made to indicate where UCSF emissions
were being distributed.

• Noise levels. Measured on and near campus.

Phase III. Determine if the measured emissions pose a health threat, using a
health risk assessment methodology.

Using survey data from Phase I activities and Phase II sampling, a health risk
assessment was carried out to see if UCSF Parnassus emissions could have any
effect on the community's health. To estimate these hypothetical risks Radian
used standard computer models developed and recommended by federal and state
government agencies responsible for protecting public health and the
environment.

To make sure that the health risk assessment took into account the maximum
possible effects that UCSF Parnassus emissions could have on the community,
the study assumed a hypothetical "worst case" scenario in calculating the
cancer risk to an individual. In this scenario the affected person is assumed
to live at the site of the highest ground-level concentrations from Parnassus
Heights emissions for his or her entire life (70 years), never leaving or
going indoors even for brief periods of time.

The hypothetical "worst case" risk calculated by this model is in addition to
a person's actual risk of developing cancer, estimated by the American Cancer
Society to be 300,000 chances in a million (more than one in four) for an
individual living in the United States.

In addition to estimating the cancer risk, the study also investigated the
possibility of non-cancer health effects. The non-cancer analysis looked at
acute (short-term) and chronic (long-term) health effects.

Phase IV. Monitor UCSF activities to make sure that environmental quality is
maintained.

An on-going monitoring program of stack emissions will be carried out by UCSF
to make sure that any harmful emission increases will be detected so that they
can be corrected. Ensuring long-term environmental quality has been the
ultimate objective of this environmental assessment.

RESULTS

Phase I. Survey. Based on information from the chemicals use questionnaires,

(more)
it was estimated that some 300 different compounds are regularly used in fume hoods at UCSF Parnassus. Other compounds are used outside of the hoods but could reach the air through general building exhaust.

Based on these surveys, it was estimated that the chemicals used in the highest volumes were two alcohols (ethanol and methanol), which accounted for one-third of all organic (containing carbon) compounds reported. Two common acids (hydrochloric acid and sulfuric acid) and sodium hydroxide (lye soda) accounted for about two-thirds of all inorganic (not containing carbon) compounds reported as used at UCSF Parnassus.

Phase II. Measurements. When Radian measured chemical emissions and radiation from UCSF Parnassus, it was found that barely detectable levels of radiation and only small amounts of chemicals were being released into the environment. Sampling results indicate that approximately 70% of the compound emissions came from fewer than 10% of the fume hood vents.

• Radiation. To see if radiation levels on or near the Parnassus campus could be linked to the use of x-ray equipment, radiation measurements were made at night (when the equipment is not heavily used) and during the day (when the equipment is most heavily used). No difference was found.

Radioactive iodine, the only radioactive substance emitted from UCSF's rooftop vents in measurable amounts, was found in barely detectable amounts in air sampled in the fume hood vents, but was not found in the surrounding community. No radioactivity, including radioactive iodine, was found in soil samples from the campus or the neighborhoods, in the sewers or in airborne dust. Radian estimated that the worst-case risk of developing cancer from radioactive iodine emissions would be 0.00009 chances in a million.

The highest radiation levels found at the Parnassus campus were 33 times lower than government regulations allow. Because radiation levels are low, and most radiation appears to be from non-campus related background sources, study results indicate that radiation from UCSF Parnassus activities would not have a demonstrable health impact on the surrounding community.

• Upwind and downwind air. There was no statistically significant difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of compounds in the air, indicating that compounds are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect ambient air quality.

• Meteorology. Wind direction in the Parnassus area was found to be predominantly from the west-southwest, which is about parallel to Parnassus Avenue.

• Fume hood vents and general building circulation vents. Air emissions from vents were sampled on three different days during the school term -- a typical summer session day, a day during the first week of classes, and a day in the middle of the semester -- plus several times as the data was being analyzed. Average yearly emissions from the vents were then estimated.

The yearly average emission rate of organic compounds from the campus is estimated at about 107 pounds per day. Of this, alcohols such as ethanol (ethyl alcohol) and methanol, which are used as solvents, were the most common. A variety of other compounds made up the balance of the 107 pounds of daily emissions.
Of about 1200 substances listed as being used in UCSF laboratories and hospitals at Parnassus Heights, 300 were identified as possibly leading to emissions, and only 44 were found to be emitted in large enough quantities to be included in the health risk assessment. These chemicals included benzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, ethylene oxide, dioxin and radioactive substances. (Dioxin was included because of its known toxicity, even though it was found in only minute amounts.)

• Hospital and dental school sterilizers. One compound, ethylene oxide, was estimated to be released from the hospital and dental school sterilizers at the rate of 2.2 pounds per day. Ethylene oxide is used routinely in hospitals to disinfect instruments and supplies that are re-used, and it is the most effective sterilizer for this purpose. Nevertheless, ethylene oxide is considered a potential health hazard, and UCSF has ordered installation of new air emission controls (state-of-the-art scrubbers) that will remove 98% of the emissions from sterilizer exhaust vents. The scrubber for the hospital sterilizers, which emit the bulk of the ethylene oxide, is due to be installed by fall. Installation of the scrubber for the dental school sterilizer, which emits only 10% of the total ethylene oxide, is expected to be completed by next summer.

• Pathological incinerator. The pathological incinerator was found to release small amounts of several compounds into the air, including minute and barely detectable amounts of dioxins. Dioxins are produced by many types of burning.

• Soil, spring water, and discharges to sewers. The soil and spring water samples did not uncover compounds from Parnassus Heights at levels higher than occur naturally in the Bay Area. Water in the two "springs" uphill of the campus that were tested may actually be water that is leaking from city water mains.

• Noise. The highest noise levels in the area are from car, truck and bus traffic on roadways, not from sources on campus. Traffic and/or construction on campus contribute to noise levels, but the campus itself does not appear to have a significant noise impact on the surrounding community.

Phase III. Assessment. The health risk assessment used information from Phase I and Phase II to estimate the hypothetical risk to a person living near UCSF Parnassus of developing cancer from exposure to campus emissions. It was found that potential emissions from all UCSF Parnassus activities result in minimal health impacts on the surrounding community, and that the health risk is at an acceptable level when compared to both federal and state standards of significant risk. Even by overstating the potential impacts in each step of the health risk assessment, it was found that there is a very small increase in the risk of developing cancer.

The maximum hypothetical cancer risk calculated to result from emissions on the Parnassus campus would be 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 in a million after new controls are in place on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

That is, a hypothetical individual who lives continuously at the site of maximum ground level chemical emission concentrations for 70 years without ever leaving or going indoors would have an estimated additional 5 chances in
one million of developing some form of cancer due to these emissions. The California Health & Welfare Agency, for the purposes of the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65), defines an "insignificant" cancer risk as one estimated to increase the risk of cancer by less than 10 chances in a million.

Application of the hypothetical cancer risk calculated by this computer model to the population which is actually exposed to emissions from Parnassus Heights results in a number called the "cancer burden," which is the estimated number of cancer cases in San Francisco during a 70-year period. Before the installation of scrubbers the cancer burden in San Francisco is estimated to be 0.7, or one new cancer case in 100 years. Installation of scrubbers reduces the cancer burden to 0.1, or one additional case of cancer in 700 years.

This evaluation of cancer risk includes the hypothetical cancer risk from UCSF's radioactive iodine emissions. Calculated independently, this estimated risk is 0.00009 chances in a million, assuming the "worst-case" scenario.

The study also looked at adverse non-carcinogenic health impacts, and concluded they are not likely to result from exposure to emissions from activities at UCSF Parnassus Heights.

INDEPENDENT CONFIRMATION

In order to assure that the data gathered during the study received comprehensive evaluation by a number of individuals, UCSF and the University of California Office of the President commissioned independent peer review by both outside consultants and internal UC staff. These reviewers included persons knowledgeable in areas of air sampling, computer modeling, meteorology, risk assessment methods and pollution control engineering. These outside reviewers and Radian met frequently to assure data validity and quality of results.

UCSF also has made a commitment to bring in another independent party to review the Radian study, the selection to be made with the participation of the community task force and the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Now that the effects of compound emissions from UCSF Parnassus have been studied, it is important to monitor future emissions to make sure they remain at very low levels. This activity, described as Phase IV, will be carried out by UCSF with guidance from Radian.

WHOM CAN I CALL WITH QUESTIONS?

Bruce W. Spaulding, vice chancellor, university advancement and planning, (415) 476-8059

Roy Balzer, PhD, UCSF assistant vice chancellor for Environmental Health and Safety: (415) 476-2759.

Elaine Bild, Director, Long Range Development & Environmental Planning, UC Office of the President: (415) 642-4316.
Toxic Gases

Pollution Controls At UCSF Hospital

By Elliot Diringer
Chronicle Staff Writer

Officials of the University of California at San Francisco said yesterday they will curb toxic releases from hospital sterilizers at the medical center even though they believe the gases pose no major health risk.

The decision to install pollution control devices, which may cost as much as $500,000, was prompted by the findings of a two-year examination of toxic and radioactive emissions from the school's Parnassus Avenue campus.

The $1.6 million study, believed to be the most exhaustive environmental checkup undergone by any medical center in the country, was started by the university two years ago as a way of soothing community fears about pollution from the school's research laboratories.

UCSF administrators said the report's findings, submitted yesterday to the San Francisco Department of Public Health, should reassure people that it is safe to live next door.

"I think it does effectively lay to rest a tremendous amount of concern," said Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding, who oversees environmental health and safety at the campus.

"Worst Case Scenario"

The study found that the "worst case" scenario — a person standing at the point of maximum exposure for 70 years — poses a cancer risk of 14 in 1 million, the equivalent of one additional cancer case in San Francisco every 100 years. Installing pollution controls on the sterilizers, the report said, would bring the risk down to 4.7 in 1 million.

Members of an advisory group that serves as liaison between the university and surrounding neighborhoods said they would withhold judgment on the highly technical report until hearing the assessment of an independent consultant.

"It sounds like there's no real problem in terms of danger to the community," said Kate Traynor, who represents the Haight-Ashbury Improvement Association on the liaison group. "But I don't know. I would be very curious to have the second party's report, too."

UCSF agreed to bring in a second consultant after the advisory group questioned the credibility of the Radian Corp., the firm that performed the environmental analysis. Although the university has committed $10,000 to hire the second consultant, a firm has not yet been selected.

The university undertook the environmental review in an attempt to shore up relations with neighbors worried about chemical exhausts and about state findings that UCSF researchers had repeatedly violated rules on handling of radioactive materials.

Those concerns had also brought about a rancorous dispute with residents of Laurel Heights, where the university plans to relocate some of its laboratories. Under court order, the university is preparing a new environmental study on the proposed move, which will incorporate data from the Parnassus Avenue campus review.

Cancer Risks Assessed

Radian's analysis found a theoretical cancer risk at various points in the surrounding neighborhood that ranged from a low of 1.2 in 1 million at Douglas Elementary School in Eureka Valley, to a high of 14.2 in 1 million, at the south end of Edgewood Avenue, just east of the campus.

By comparison, the Environmental Protection Agency typically aims for a risk no higher than one in a million when setting limits on pesticide residues in food, but just this week the agency announced new controls on benzene emissions that allow risks as high as one in 10,000.

A projected risk of one in a million means that over a 70-year period one additional case of cancer would be expected for every 1 million people experiencing the maximum expected exposure.

Vice Chancellor Spaulding said such theoretical calculations tend to exaggerate risk and he believes the actual risk posed by the university's emissions is lower than the numbers suggest.
CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

INFORMATION & ADVOCACY SUBCOMMITTEE
Carolyn Koster, Co-Chair (x65415)
Valli McDougle, Co-Chair (x2342)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>BOX #</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>x0542</td>
<td>0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>0976</td>
<td>CED 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>0422</td>
<td>S-612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McDougle</td>
<td>x2342</td>
<td>0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>x8974</td>
<td>0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>x4592</td>
<td>0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Romp</td>
<td>x8112</td>
<td>0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>x8095</td>
<td>0286</td>
<td>MU 4th fl. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>x7625</td>
<td>0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>x1571</td>
<td>0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>x1226</td>
<td>0238</td>
<td>S-926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notify of meetings, send minutes:

Barbara Atkinson       x3206 | 0930 | 1308 3rd Ave.
                       Office of Public Service Programs
Kathy Balestreri       x2316 | 0208 | L-103
                       Chair, Staff Advisory Committee
Janet Norton           x2557 | 0462 | S-20
                       News & Information Services
Paula Schultz          x5186 | 0402 | S-24
                       Asst. to Vice Chancellor for Student & Personnel Services

misc\commlst.ck
September 19, 1989

TO: Members, Information & Advocacy Subcommittee
    Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee

FROM: Carolyn Koster, Co-Chair

Enclosed are the telephone tree and a list of the names, addresses and telephone numbers of everyone who is participating in the tree. Participants include members of our Subcommittee, members of the Staff Advisory Committee and others who have indicated their willingness to help. Normally, Valli and I will activate the telephone tree by calling our assigned Subcommittee members. You will then be expected to call everyone assigned to you. An attempt has been made to group people according to location so that printed material can be easily be distributed to your group if necessary.

As you know, we have an immediate use for the telephone tree which is to get people to turn out for the meetings regarding the Mt. Zion EIR. A public information meeting will take place on MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1989 from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm at MT. ZION (specific location and parking information are enclosed). San Francisco residents should be encouraged to attend this meeting. Of wider interest is the Campus information meeting scheduled for WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1989 from noon to 1:30 pm in COLE HALL. Please communicate this information to the people assigned to you as soon as possible.

We will be meeting on TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1989 from noon to 1:00 pm in Room S-609. At that time we can discuss our experiences in using the telephone tree.

CK/arb

Enclosures

cc: B. Atkinson
    K. Balestreri
    J. Norton
    P. Schultz
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) Telephone Tree

- Hooven
  - Moisa
  - Moeglein
  - Huang
  - Poirier
  - Semonoff
  - O'Halloran
  - Messner
  - Mahoney
  - Gustafson

- Price
  - Rizzo
  - Hamada
  - Donoff
  - Yee, Angie
  - Janvrin
  - Hansen
  - Brown
  - Deppe
  - Battles

- McDougle

- Stevens
  - Casella
  - Antolin
  - Hall
  - Shimosaka
  - Wright
  - Low

- Newhouse
  - Baldwin
  - Leonoudakis
  - Maddux
  - Yee, Christina
  - Minivielle
  - Mezer

- Slaboszewicz
  - Emelia
  - Cox
  - Redondo
  - McCaffrey
  - Janssen
  - Harris
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) Telephone Tree

Warren
- Adams
- Gottschalk
- Magram
- Calauastro
- Foree
- Pauley
- Pelzner
- Shannon

- O'Conner
- Justman
- Porter
- Atkinson
- Salazar
- Sigal
- Afshari

- Santos - 6-268
- Ordona - 6-9180
- McEnroe - 6-5186
- Kingyauo - 6-2732
- Richardson - 2-737
- White - 2-353
- Sechan - 1179

Cohen
- Roma
- Koster
- Eldred
- Wilson
- Erkelens
- Heath
- Schultz
- Norton
- Reynolds
- Canfield
- Beauregard-Sund
- Nakashige
- Clemente-Lambert
- Amerson
- Horest
- Lockner
- Graf
- Spencer
- Taylor
- Freeman
- Griffin
- Kos
- Stinnett
- Range
- Schickler
- Chou
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Campus Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Afshari</td>
<td>x8907</td>
<td>Box 0994</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shella Amerson</td>
<td>x2742</td>
<td>Box 0813</td>
<td>CED-426</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Antolin</td>
<td>x3050</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHda-150</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Atkinson</td>
<td>x3206</td>
<td>Box 0930</td>
<td>1308 3rd Ave</td>
<td>Com &amp; Gov't Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td></td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Balestri</td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103</td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Rufus Battles</td>
<td>x9436</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>M-181</td>
<td>Patient Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae Beauregard-Sund</td>
<td>x1721</td>
<td>Box 0648</td>
<td>L-126</td>
<td>Anesthesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>x1715</td>
<td>Box 0228</td>
<td>HSW-1327</td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Calautro</td>
<td>x4510</td>
<td>Box 0452</td>
<td>N-331B</td>
<td>Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Canfield</td>
<td>x3876</td>
<td>Box 0604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean's Office, S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Casella</td>
<td>x5266</td>
<td>Box 0836</td>
<td>LH-163</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-Ann Chou</td>
<td>x2958</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbe Clemente-Lambert</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>General Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Cox</td>
<td>821-8317</td>
<td>SFGH, 5H22</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Material Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starlen Deppe</td>
<td>x5716</td>
<td>Box 0200</td>
<td>M-01</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennee Donoff</td>
<td>x5734</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518</td>
<td>Psychiatry, VAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Emelia</td>
<td>221-4810/x3749</td>
<td>VA 116A</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED-145</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Foree</td>
<td>x4292</td>
<td>Box 0522</td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Freeman</td>
<td>x7908</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED-425</td>
<td>Immunogenetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x1373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403</td>
<td>Hosp Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts-101</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasia Griffin</td>
<td>x5425</td>
<td>Box 0810</td>
<td>CED-300</td>
<td>Volunteer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Guggenheim</td>
<td>x3883</td>
<td>Box 0508</td>
<td>HSE-520</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha L. Gustafson</td>
<td>x5050</td>
<td>Box 0204</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hall</td>
<td>x4100</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHda-150</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>x4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona Hansen-Nealey</td>
<td>x3085</td>
<td>Box 0290</td>
<td>L-119A</td>
<td>Nursing-PICU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Harris</td>
<td>x2515</td>
<td>Box 0310</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Fac Alum, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Heath</td>
<td>x4240</td>
<td>Box 0622</td>
<td>C-156</td>
<td>Pharm Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Horest</td>
<td>x4502</td>
<td>Box 0810</td>
<td>CED-300</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>x1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyra Janssen</td>
<td>x5136</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>A-59B</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan D. Janvrin</td>
<td>x1198</td>
<td>Box 0210</td>
<td>L-171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>x1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy M. Kingyauo</td>
<td>x2732</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>CED-425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kos</td>
<td>x8449</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>S-612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>x1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>CED-560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Lockner</td>
<td>x1633</td>
<td>Box 0830</td>
<td>LHda-150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Low</td>
<td>x4287</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>x6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeanne Magram x5293 Box 0552 HSW-1502 Medicine
Sheila Mahoney x0938 Box 0120 A-59 Med Records
Kathy McCaffrey x1251 Box 0308 A-59 Dean's Office, S/M
Valli McDougle x2342 Box 0410 S-224 VC-Stf & Std Hum Res
Fred McEnroe x5186 Box 0402 S-24 Pediatrics
Matt Messner x2101 Box 0110
Lauren Mezer x7715 Box 0552 HSW-1502
Albert Minvielle x8683 Box 0234 MU-238 Millberry Union
Carol Moeglein x2258 Box 0210 L-171 S/N
Karen Moisa x1551 Box 0116 M-884 Orthosurgery
Jocelyn Nakashige x2228 Box 0728 U-471 Lab Medicine
Charles Nattkemper x4680 Box 0204 M-175 Restor. Dentistry
Karen Newhouse x8974 Box 0134 L-518B CRI
Janet Norton x2557 Box 0250 S-20 Pharmacy
John O'Connor x3295 Box 0758 D-3242 Material Management
Marge O'Halloran x1998 Box 0128 M-1282 Metabolic Research
Trinity Orda x8180 Box 0446 S-834 Psychiatry
Deborah Pauley x8808 Box 0910 HSE Annex Nuclear Medicine
Judy Pelzner x5667 Box 0540 HSW-1143 GI Division, SFGH
Anne Poirier x7033 Box 0988 145 Irving St. News Services
Paul Porter x8724 Box 0252 L-340 S-24 CED-100A
Dorothy Price x4592 Box 0810 CED-300 VC-Stf & Std Hum Res
Sandra Range x2933 Box 0824 CED-100A Biochemistry
Eunice Redondo x21-8822 Box 0462 S-20 Hormone Research Institute
Steve Reynolds x2357 Box 0429 S-613 Staff Personnel
Barbara Richardson x2737 Box 0214 M-344 Child Care Center
Zeida Rizzo x1931 Box 0840 S-257 VC-Adv & Planning
Isabel Roma x8112 Box 0934 145 Irv 1W Psych/Acad Affairs
Eugene Salazar x4373 Box 0430 S-630
David Santos x2681 Box 0824 CED-100A
Lane Schickler x6796 Box 0402 S-24
Paula Carien Schultz x5186 Box 0448
Neil Sehon x1179 Box 0208 M-181
Susan Semonoff x3013 Box 0534 HSW-1088
Pat Shannon x0991 Box 0832 LHS-150
Elenor Shimosaka x2800 Box 0968 610 Parnassus
Byron Sigal x1616 Box 0286 MU 4th fl W
Chris Slaboszewicz x8095 Box 0810 CED-300
Brazola Spencer x4665 Box 0824 CED-100A
Susan Stevens x7625 Box 0884 CED-506
Dorothy Stinnett x3890 Box 0446 S-916
Raj Subramaniam x8794 Box 0446 CED-100
Charles Taylor 525-4056(h) Box 0446
Martin Wang x9218 Box 0564 MR-409
Margaret Warren x1571 Box 0622 521 Parnassus
Carol A. White x2353 Box 0446 S-926
Barbara Wilson x1226 Box 0832 LHda-150
Susan Wright x3960 Box 1008
Angie Yee x4120 Box 0238 MU 3rd fl W
Christine Yee x5683 KTU

Byron Sigal x6796 Box 0402 S-24
Pat Shannon x0991 Box 0402 S-24

Budget & Reimbursement

Animal Care Facility
Clin Pharmacy
Dean's Office, S/P

KTU
Police Dept
Parking Facilities Convenient to Mount Zion

MONDAY - FRIDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A San Francisco Medical Center Garage</td>
<td>5:30 am - 1 am</td>
<td>$0.75 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant on Duty</td>
<td>$7.50 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In by 9 am</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out by 6 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early Bird Special:
- In by 9 am
- Out by 6 pm

B 24 hour OPEN LOT:
- 8 am - 5:30 pm
- Attendant on Duty
- $2 per hour
- $8 Maximum
- 5:30 pm - 8 am
- $2 all night

SATURDAY AND SUNDAY
(No Attendant on Duty)

C 24 hour Geary Boulevard
- 24 hours
- Free on weekends

D Sutter Auditorium (Draft EIR Public Meeting)
Enter the Emergency Entrance on Sutter between Divisadero and Scott. Once inside turn left and go through blue door. Wheelchair access from outside, to the left of Emergency Entrance.

Volunteer parking is available Monday through Friday, 8 am to 4 pm, at the main hospital entrance at 1600 Divisadero Street.

See reverse side for directions to Mount Zion.

Mount Zion
Hospital and Medical Center
1600 Divisadero between Post and Sutter
San Francisco • (415) 567-6600
Getting to Mount Zion: 1600 Divisadero Street, San Francisco

From east or south:
Take 101 to Franklin Street. Turn left on Geary Boulevard. Take Geary to Divisadero Street. Turn right on Divisadero. Mount Zion is on second block between Post and Sutter Streets.

From north:
Take 101 to Lombard Street. Turn right on Divisadero Street. Mount Zion is on Divisadero between Sutter and Post Streets.

Public parking available on Sutter Street between Divisadero and Broderick Streets.
TO: MEMBERS, CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FROM: KATHLEEN BALESTRERI, CHAIR  
RE: OCTOBER 4TH GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Dear Colleagues,

The next SAC General Membership Meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 4th from 12:00 Noon – 1:00 p.m. in Millberry Union, Room 252, on the East Wing -- please note the change in location.

AGENDA

1. Review and correction of minutes of September 6 meeting.
2. Chair's Report
3. Subcommittee Reports
   A. Information & Advocacy - Update on Mobilization of Staff for MZ/LH EIR Public Information Meetings
   B. Staff Education - Update on Distribution of 125th Anniversary Information to Neighborhood Merchants
   C. Community Outreach - Status of Community Projects' List
4. Discussion of Mount Zion Public Information Meetings (Barbara Atkinson)

PLEASE COME THE THE SAC-SPONSORED INFORMATION MEETING FOR A PRESENTATION ON THE MOUNT ZION DRAFT EIR ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27TH AT 12:00 NOON IN COLE HALL.

cc: Barbara Atkinson  
    Janet Norton  
    Paula Schultz
The meeting was brought to order by Kathy Balestreri at 12:05.

Introductions

Kathy introduced herself as the 1989-90 Chair for the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee and asked all members present to introduce themselves and state their university affiliations. She also asked the co-chairs of the three SAC sub-committees to designate themselves.

Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights DEIRs

Kathy introduced Barbara Atkinson and Tom Gwyn. Barbara discussed the impending publication of the draft environmental impact reports (DEIR) for Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights, the dates for the information meetings and the importance of SAC's participation. Tom reviewed the history and progress of the arrangement between Mt. Zion and UCSF and discussed in general the plans for the Mt. Zion site.

SAC Membership expectations

Kathy distributed a copy of the SAC 1989/90 membership expectations and names and extensions of the sub-committee co-chairs. She asked that members give her feedback on these expectations. Lists were also passed around for members to sign up for the sub-committees.

Sub-Committee Reports

Community Outreach. Byron Sigal said that the activities of the Community Outreach Committee are focused on the neighborhoods surrounding UCSF and the various remote locations. Such neighborhoods include the Inner Sunset (UCSF),
Laurel Village (Laurel Heights), the Haight (UCSF), the Mission (CED, SFGH and Physical Plant) and the Western Addition (Laurel Heights and Mt. Zion). Projects planned by the Committee may include a health fair, helping with a mini-park near CED, a stint on a KQED fund-raising night, some help in redecorating the kitchen and dining area of the Hamilton Methodist Church in the Haight, and another SF Food Bank drive.

Staff Education. Anne Poirier reviewed the activities of last year and said that at present a follow-up on the Toxins seminar is being considered. Otherwise the current efforts of this Committee are being focused on mobilization of staff members to distribute information to neighborhood merchants about the kick-off for the 125th Anniversary on October 14.

Information and Advocacy. No report was made. The sub-committee is responsible for mobilization of staff to attend the public hearings for both the Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights DEIRs (see attached).

125th Anniversary

Kathy introduced Janet Norton who reviewed the history and development of the publicity for the 125th Anniversary. She displayed the bus posters and showed the television spots which are currently playing on local stations. She said that Dwight Clark, a former SF 49er, will be one of the featured celebrities for the kick-off. As far as volunteers go, Leona Hansen-Nealey has had approximately 500 people sign up.

In closing, Kathy asked that any members who hesitated to sign up for a sub-committee to please call one of the co-chairs for information about committee responsibilities and activities.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.


Attachments:

- SAC 1989-90 Membership Expectations (for those members not in attendance)
- Mt. Zion/Laurel Heights DEIR Public Information Meeting schedule
### CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE
#### 1989 - 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Balestreri</td>
<td>x2316</td>
<td>Box 0208</td>
<td>L-103</td>
<td>Med Center Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Adams</td>
<td>x1300</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Cohen</td>
<td>x0544</td>
<td>Box 0942</td>
<td>50 Med Ctr Way</td>
<td>Env Hlth &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Cox</td>
<td>x4520</td>
<td>Box 0862</td>
<td>SFGH, SH22</td>
<td>General Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Eldred</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Erkelens</td>
<td>x4050</td>
<td>Box 0976</td>
<td>CED 145</td>
<td>AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gottschalk</td>
<td>x1373</td>
<td>Box 0544</td>
<td>HSE-1403</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Graf</td>
<td>x3905</td>
<td>Box 1202</td>
<td>LHts 101</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Guggenheim</td>
<td>x3883</td>
<td>Box 0508</td>
<td>HSE-520</td>
<td>Immunogenetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hamada</td>
<td>x4815</td>
<td>Box 0226</td>
<td>L-75</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Hooven</td>
<td>x5904</td>
<td>Box 0132</td>
<td>M-1479</td>
<td>Ob-Gyn &amp; Repro Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Huang</td>
<td>x1509</td>
<td>Box 0130</td>
<td>M-1331</td>
<td>CVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Justman</td>
<td>x1471</td>
<td>Box 0248</td>
<td>735 Parnassus</td>
<td>Fac Alum, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kos</td>
<td>x8449</td>
<td>Box 0812</td>
<td>CED-425</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Koster</td>
<td>x5415</td>
<td>Box 0422</td>
<td>S-612</td>
<td>Stomatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Leonoudakis</td>
<td>x1469</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-245</td>
<td>Outdoors Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>x6774</td>
<td>Box 0282</td>
<td>MU G-14</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Mah-Hing</td>
<td>x1137</td>
<td>Box 0606</td>
<td>N-411C</td>
<td>Fam Hlth Care Nurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valli McGoude</td>
<td>x2342</td>
<td>Box 0410</td>
<td>S-224</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Minvielle</td>
<td>x8683</td>
<td>Box 0234</td>
<td>MU-238</td>
<td>Millberry Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Newhouse</td>
<td>x8974</td>
<td>Box 0134</td>
<td>L-518B</td>
<td>Lab Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Connor</td>
<td>x3295</td>
<td>Box 0758</td>
<td>D-3242</td>
<td>Restor Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Ordona</td>
<td>x8180</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-834</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pauley</td>
<td>x8808</td>
<td>Box 0910</td>
<td>HSE Annex</td>
<td>Material Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Poirier</td>
<td>x7033</td>
<td>LPI-F-0984</td>
<td>LP-348</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Price</td>
<td>x4592</td>
<td>Box 0252</td>
<td>L-340</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
<td>SFGH, 3C29</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>GI Division, SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0462</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Roma</td>
<td>x8112</td>
<td>Box 0840</td>
<td>S-257</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Salazar</td>
<td>x4373</td>
<td>Box 0934</td>
<td>145 Irv 1W</td>
<td>Assoc Dean, Stdt Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Shimosaka</td>
<td>x2800</td>
<td>Box 0832</td>
<td>LHS-150</td>
<td>Staff Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Sigal</td>
<td>x1616</td>
<td>Box 0968</td>
<td>610 Parnassus</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>x8095</td>
<td>Box 0286</td>
<td>MU 4th fl W</td>
<td>VC-Adv &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stevens</td>
<td>x7625</td>
<td>LPI-ACA-0984</td>
<td>LP-362</td>
<td>Psych/Acad Afrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Warren</td>
<td>x1571</td>
<td>Box 0564</td>
<td>MR-409</td>
<td>Animal Care Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>x1226</td>
<td>Box 0446</td>
<td>S-926</td>
<td>Dean's Ofc, S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yee</td>
<td>x5683</td>
<td>Box 0238</td>
<td>MU 3rd fl W</td>
<td>Police Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred McEnroe</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Stf &amp; Std Hum Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Atkinson</td>
<td>x3206</td>
<td>Box 0930</td>
<td>1308-3rd Ave</td>
<td>Com &amp; Gov't Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Norton</td>
<td>x2557</td>
<td>Box 0250</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>News Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Carien Schultz</td>
<td>x5186</td>
<td>Box 0402</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>VC-Stf &amp; Std Hum Res</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 12, 1989
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT MEETING DATES FOR MOUNT ZION & LAUREL HEIGHTS

MOUNT ZION EIR -- DEIR published 9/22/89
Target Dates for Public Meetings & Hearing to be held at MZ Auditorium

(PIM = Public Information Meeting; CIM = Campus Information Meeting)

♀ September 25, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: PIM (ESA "walk-thru" DEIR)
♀ September 26, 1989, Tuesday; 11:30 am - 1:30 pm: Mt. Zion Staff (2 sessions)
♀ September 27, 1989, Wednesday; 12:00 noon - 1:30 pm: UCSF CIM at Cole Hall
♀ October 3, 1989, Tuesday; 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm: Mt. Zion Medical Board
♀ October 19, 1989, Thursday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: PIM (feedback & dialogue)
♀ November 8, 1989, Wednesday; 6:00 pm - 10:00 pm: Mt. Zion Public Hearing

LAUREL HEIGHTS EIR -- DEIR published 10/20/89
Target Dates for Public Meetings & Hearings to be held at LH auditorium

(PIM = Public Information Meeting; CIM = Campus Information Meeting)

♀ October 23, 1989, Monday; 12 noon - 1:30 pm: UCSF CIM
♀ October 23, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: LHts PIM (ESA "walk-thru" DEIR)
♀ November 13, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: LHts PIM (feedback & dialogue)
♀ December 4, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 10:00 pm: LHts Public Hearing

ba/eironly/9/6/89
For your information
September 15, 1989

UC San Francisco Marking 125th Anniversary with Year-Long Celebration

Originating in 1864 as "Toland Medical College," UC San Francisco has grown into one of the eminent health science centers in the world. With its roots older than the University of California itself, UC San Francisco is the only campus in the nine-campus UC system devoted solely to the health sciences.

To mark UC San Francisco's 125th anniversary, the campus is planning a year-long celebration of special events involving the entire community and open to the public. The public is invited to the following events. For more information, call 415/476-3954.

Calender

September 1989

Saturday, 23 "Save-a-Life Saturday." Thousands of people will be taught how to save a life by learning cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) preceding the SF Giants baseball game. Co-sponsored by UC San Francisco and the SF Giants. (Starting at 8:30 am, Candlestick Park, San Francisco)

Sunday, 24 "Bridge to Bridge Run." 13th annual event, includes 8-mile race, 5-K fun run, and 5-K Sunday stroll. UC San Francisco will provide medical support, as well as sponsor a team. Entertainment at the finish line will include the "Jazz Doctors," a group that includes several UCSF faculty members. Sponsored by KNBR Radio. (Near the Bay Bridge, San Francisco)

Tuesday, 26 Essayist and poet Jimmy Santiago Baca, a UC Regents Lecturer, will discuss "The Healing Images of Indigenous North and South American Literature and Poetry." (Noon, Toland Hall, 533 Parnassus, UC San Francisco).

October 1989

"UC San Francisco Month" as proclaimed by Mayor Art Agnos.

Sunday, 1 The Third Annual Chancellor's Recognition Dinner celebrating UCSF's partnership with the UCSF-Fresno Central San Joaquin Valley Medical Education Program. (By invitation.)

(more)
Saturday, 7
125th Anniversary 10K Run/5K Walk. (9 am, Speedway Meadow, Golden Gate Park. Call Alan Tower at 476-2671.)

Tuesday, 10
Stephen Jay Gould, PhD, best-selling author of "Ever Since Darwin" and "The Panda's Thumb," recipient of the National Book Critic's Circle Award and MacArthur Foundation Prize, and Harvard biologist who lectures around the world on subjects ranging from geology and evolution to the history of science, will be guest speaker at the Gordon Tomkins Lecture and Concert. Music by the Sierra String Quartet. (4 pm, Cole Hall, 513 Parnassus, UC San Francisco Campus)

Wednesday, 11
"UCSF: Today and Tomorrow," a Brown Bag Lecture by Lloyd H. Smith, Jr., MD, professor of medicine and associate dean, UC San Francisco School of Medicine, and chair of the UCSF 125th Anniversary Committee, who will look at UCSF's role as an academic center and health care institution. (Noon, HSW-300, 513 Parnassus, UC San Francisco Campus)

Saturday, 14
UC San Francisco 125th Birthday Party for the Bay Area. Festive celebration featuring health/science fair, family entertainment, celebrities, 1860's medicine show, celebrity chefs, behind-the-scenes tours of operating rooms and research labs where scientists work with DNA, fitness & outdoor adventure demonstrations, plus more. Free with free parking. (10 am - 4 pm, Third and Parnassus Avenues, UC San Francisco Campus)

Wednesday, 18
"UCSF: The Quest for Excellence," a Brown Bag Lecture by Guenter B. Risse, MD, PhD, professor and chair, UC San Francisco History of Health Sciences, who will look at 125 years of health education, patient care, research and public service. (Noon, HSW-300, 513 Parnassus, UC San Francisco Campus)

Wednesday, 25
"UCSF: Today and Tomorrow," a talk at the Commonwealth Club of California by Lloyd H. Smith, Jr., MD, professor of medicine and associate dean, UC San Francisco School of Medicine, and chair of the UCSF 125th Anniversary Committee. (Noon, Commonwealth Club, 595 Market St., San Francisco)

Tuesday, 31
"UCSF: Past and Future," a Rotary Club address by Lloyd H. Smith, Jr., MD, professor of medicine and associate dean, UC San Francisco School of Medicine, and chair of the UCSF 125th Anniversary Committee. (1 pm, Kensington Park Hotel, 450 Post St., San Francisco)

NOVEMBER 1989

New, Permanent, Hands-on Exhibit on "Molecular Modeling" created by UCSF faculty and Exploratorium staff. (Exploratorium, Marina Blvd. and Lyon, San Francisco)

(more)
125th Calendar of Events -- Page 3

Wednesday, 1
"200 years of Community Service." UC San Francisco and the University of San Francisco join to present a special lecture to the Fromm Institute for Life Long Learning. (2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco. By invitation.)

Wednesday, 8
Hastings Center 20th Anniversary Bioethics Conference, featuring a special lecture on "Health Care and the Good Society" by Daniel Callahan, PhD, director of the Hastings Center, New York, one of the country's premier bioethics research centers. Hosted by UC San Francisco with cosponsors California Medical Association and California Nurses Association. (1-5 pm, Cole Hall, 513 Parnassus, UC San Francisco Campus)

Thursday, 9
Gala Dinner Dance in Celebration of the 125th Anniversary of the UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences. (Hotel Nikko, San Francisco. By Invitation.)

Friday, 10
"Just About All Jazz" series starts with the Fred Hersch Trio. Series follows with vocalist Weslia Whitfield on January 26, the Horace Tapscott Trio on February 9, pianist Art Lande on March 31, vocalist Faith Winthrop on April 27, and the Turtle Island String Quartet on May 11. (8 pm, UCSF Laurel Heights, 3333 California Street. Call 476-2542 for ticket information).

JANUARY 1990
Two School of Dentistry Community Clinics celebrate their 10th Anniversary with open houses, mariachi bands and ethnic food. (San Francisco General Hospital, 1001 Potrero, and 100 Buchanan Street, San Francisco.)

SPRING 1990
April 26
Former US Surgeon General C. Everett Koop and other nationally prominent health leaders will be presented with UC San Francisco's highest honor, the UCSF Medal, at Founders Day Celebration. UCSF neurologist Stanley Prusiner will present the Faculty Research Lecture, a public event, that week. (Cole Hall, 513 Parnassus Avenue, UC San Francisco Campus. By invitation.)

March
Gladstone Foundation Laboratories for Cardiovascular Disease at the UCSF-affiliated San Francisco General Hospital celebrate their 10th Anniversary, with a science symposium, public-awareness event on cholesterol, reception and other events. (San Francisco General Hospital, 1001 Potrero, San Francisco).

March 14
The UCSF Orchestra joins the UCSF Community Chorus to perform works by J.S. Bach, Schubert and the premiere of a new piece by UCSF's Elaine Bearer. (8 pm, Herbst Theater, 401 Van Ness Avenue. For ticket information call 476-2542.)

(more)
Week of April 3

Nobel Laureate Francois Jacob presents the 10th Annual Chancellor's Distinguished Lecture for the Public Understanding of Science. Jacob is one of the world's leading scientists, a professor of cell genetics at the College de France and Pasteur Institute in Paris, and author of "The Logic of Life." (UC San Francisco Campus)

Date to be announced

Celebration of UC San Francisco/VA Medical Center Partnership. Full day of activities including a band concert. (Fort Miley VAMC, 4150 Clement, San Francisco)

SUMMER 1990

Date to be announced

Celebration of over a Century of Partnership between San Francisco General Hospital and UCSF. The community is invited. (1001 Potrero, San Francisco).

June 20-24

Sixth International Conference on AIDS. A meeting bringing together top AIDS scientists, physicians and health care professionals from around the world in an effort to better understand, treat and prevent the most devastating epidemic of our times. Hosted by UC San Francisco with co-sponsors World Health Organization, City and County of San Francisco, American Foundation for AIDS Research, International AIDS Society. (Moscone Convention Center and Marriott Hotel, San Francisco)

June

"AIDS: A Scientific Look for the Layman". Exhibit tied to the Sixth International AIDS Conference which will offer to the layman a scientific look on how the AIDS virus invades the body, behaves once inside a cell and attacks the immune system, and how modern biology is being used to understand and treat the disease. Co-sponsored by UCSF and the Exploratorium. (Exploratorium, Marina Blvd. and Lyon, San Francisco)

August - February 1991

Special Exhibit on "Ishi in San Francisco." A member of the Yahi tribe and the last wild Indian of North America, Ishi was found half-starved near Oroville, Calif., in 1911. Brought to the University of California Museum of Anthropology, which was then part of UC San Francisco, Ishi made his home in the museum and in the Mt. Sutro Forest behind the campus until his death in 1916. Co-sponsored by the Academy of Sciences and UCSF. (Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco)

WINTER 1990

Date to be announced

New UC San Francisco Library Opens. (Dedication and Open House will be spring 1991.)

###
I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was established on September 25, 1987 to improve employee and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF in light of the adverse public attention generated by the Laurel Heights site controversy.

As the Staff Advisory Committee discussions progressed ... it became clear that the issue went far beyond moving UCSF to Laurel Heights. The real issue was the University's basic right to conduct safe and important research. What started out as a discussion around a specific campus site soon became a discussion about the University as an institution, and its function and purpose. These discussions led us to consider the future of UCSF.

... In our dual role as staff and concerned citizens of the Bay Area, we can approach the issues raised by the Laurel Heights crisis by educating ourselves. ... The future of UCSF is our future too.

Staff Advisory Committee Forum
"UCSF: Our Future"
April 1, 1988

The purpose of the committee is to:

1. Support the research, patient care, education and public service of UCSF
2. Improve communication between staff, community and administration
3. Educate the staff, administration and community

II. STRUCTURE

The SAC is a working group responsible to recommend and advise the Chancellor on staff concerns related to the improvement of staff and community understanding of the role and contributions of UCSF. The SAC will also act on any recommendations approved by the Chancellor and will make an annual report of its activities at the conclusion of its current year.

To accomplish its purpose, the SAC formed three standing committees with these goals and objectives. They are:

STAFF EDUCATION

a. Sponsoring lecture series and campus/community information forums
INFORMATION & ADVOCACY

a. Organizing campus information and mobilization network (phone tree; letter writing campaigns)
b. Reviewing campus communications

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

a. Joining neighborhood organizations
b. Publicizing UCSF (public relations campaigns)
c. Participating in civic activities
d. Attending public forums

The Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee and all SAC members are appointed by the Chancellor for a tenure of one year beginning September 1; vacancies on the SAC will be filled by new appointments made by the Chancellor, and will last until the end of the tenure of the current term. The SAC is composed of at least 30 members. The goal is to have a cross section of representatives of the Schools, Medical Center and support services from all campus sites. The composition of the committee will seek to reflect the racial, cultural and sexual diversity of the campus. In addition, the committee will also have a liaison from each of the following three offices: Vice Chancellor, Personnel and Student Services; Community & Governmental Relations; News & Public Information Services.

The SAC has the authority to organize itself, form committees and to adopt its own structure and rules for the conduct of its business. The responsibilities of the Chair and Vice Chair are:

1. Chair -- Provide overall leadership to the committee; call meetings, prepare agenda and chair regular meetings; prepare and present intramural and extramural reports of the SAC as needed; prepare annual summary to the Chancellor on SAC activities.

2. Vice Chair -- Appointed by the chair for one year and serves as chairperson in the absence of the Chair; through a staff person assigned from the Vice Chancellor's Office, Vice-Chair has the following duties: keep current roster of SAC members; schedule meetings; make and distribute agenda and summary reports of each meeting; and keep record of all expenses incurred.

Accepted: August 3, 1988
TO: SAC MEMBERS
FROM: BARBARA ATKINSON
DATE: 9/1/89
RE: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) RESULTS

Attached please find a letter that is being sent today to all Deans, Directors and Department Heads. It outlines the results of the EA study begun at our Parnassus campus in January 1988.

It would be very helpful if you would see that this is widely distributed to all staff in your area. Thank you.
The University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) operates a medical school, a dental school, a school of nursing, a school of pharmacy, the Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute and the UCSF Medical Center at its Parnassus Heights campus. Since January 1988 UCSF has been in the process of evaluating the potential health impact of the campus on the surrounding community and environment.

WHAT PROMPTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT?

About two years ago, UCSF learned that some community members were concerned about cancer cases reported in the Edgewood area (and later in Noe Valley). Also some residents of the Laurel Heights area had concerns about the plan to move School of Pharmacy research laboratories there. In response to neighborhood and community concerns, and to assure the campus community that research, teaching and patient care at Parnassus Heights are conducted in an environmentally responsible manner, UCSF decided to do an environmental assessment of the Parnassus campus.

WHAT IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT?

In an environmental assessment, as many factors as possible that could affect the environment in the area, such as air, water and soil, are considered. In this case, the assessment focused on emissions from the UCSF Parnassus facilities (see Chart I). It assessed how these emissions might affect air, soil, and water quality and, consequently, public health and the environment in the surrounding community.

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

Here are the most important findings:

- The highest radiation levels found on and around the Parnassus campus are 33 times less than government standards allow. No radiation above background levels could be detected in the air in any neighborhood around the campus. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.

- There was no statistical difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of chemicals in the air, indicating that chemicals are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect air quality.

- Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF are six times below what applicable government standards allow. Chemicals found in soil on the Parnassus Heights campus and in the neighborhood are no different from what is found in any urban environment.
The wind direction at UCSF Parnassus Heights is predominantly from the west southwest, about parallel to Parnassus Avenue. The wind blows toward the Noe and Eureka Valley areas a small percentage of the time. (This is important in view of the concern expressed by some residents of these neighborhoods over a possible "cancer cluster," or slightly elevated number of cancer cases in their area, which they feared might be due to UCSF emissions.)

Overall, the estimates of emissions showed that about 107 pounds of chemicals may evaporate into the air each day from UCSF Parnassus. Not all of these are considered "toxic." This amount is slightly more than the emissions from a neighborhood dry cleaner.

Of the total quantity of potentially toxic air emissions, the most significant was ethylene oxide (2.2 pounds daily) from hospital and dental school sterilizers vented to the roof. Sterilizers are used routinely in most hospitals to disinfect instruments and supplies, and ethylene oxide is the most effective substance in disinfecting these items. UCSF has ordered the installation of new state-of-the-art scrubbers that will remove 98 percent of the emissions from sterilizer exhaust vents. These are expected to be installed in the hospital by fall and in the dental school (which is responsible for only 10% of emissions) by next summer.

Based on a health risk assessment with a hypothetical "worst case" scenario, assuming that the hypothetical individual affected lives all of his or her life (70 years) at the point of highest ground-level chemical concentrations without ever going indoors or leaving the spot, the possibility of developing cancer is estimated to be 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 chances in a million after installation of the state-of-the-art scrubbers on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

The environmental assessment study results are discussed more fully under the "Results" heading of this summary.

HOW WAS THIS STUDY DONE?

Because UCSF uses many compounds for research, teaching, and patient care activities on the Parnassus campus, the task of measuring emissions to determine possible health impacts was very challenging. UCSF asked Radian Corporation, an independent environmental consulting firm, to do the assessment.

The environmental study and health risk assessment were the first to be conducted on any campus in the country outside the National Institutes of Health. Radian and UCSF considered input from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, community groups, and the scientific literature when designing and carrying out the $1.6 million study.

THE FIRST STEP WAS TO STUDY THE CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY AND UCSF.

Radian considered all input, and came up with a number of activities to evaluate these concerns. The results of these activities helped to focus the environmental assessment so that concerns with the greatest potential impact
received priority attention.

**RADIAN DIVIDED THE MAIN PART OF THE STUDY INTO FOUR PHASES.**

**Phase I. Gather information so concerns can be studied scientifically.**

Considerable information was needed to make sure that all of the potential impacts were identified and all concerns were considered. Two questionnaires sent to UCSF researchers were particularly useful in providing information about the types and amounts of compounds used in UCSF Parnassus facilities. This information was used to refine and focus the sampling plan carried out in Phase II.

**Phase II. Measure emissions from UCSF activities.**

This phase involved sampling emissions from laboratories, teaching facilities, and patient care activities (see Chart II). Specifically, this involved collecting samples from:

- **Fume hood vents.** Fume hoods are somewhat like kitchen stove hoods, where volatile chemicals are pulled up by fans and exhausted out of roof vents. Potentially hazardous compounds are used under fume hoods. Potentially infectious compounds are handled only under specially-filtered hoods.

- **General building circulation vents.** These vents exhaust air from rooms and hallways.

- **Hospital and dental school sterilizers.** Reusable medical instruments and supplies are sterilized by treating the equipment with a sterilizing gas in a chamber. After sterilization, the gas is vented to the atmosphere.

- **Pathological incinerator.** This facility is used to destroy and dispose of animal matter and clinical and surgical specimens.

- **Soil.** Area soil was collected and analyzed to see if emissions had been deposited there.

- **Spring water.** Because there were no ground-water wells in the community that could be sampled, water from two springs uphill of the campus, which were pointed out by community members, was sampled.

- **Discharges to sewers.** Sewer discharges from the campus were tested.

- **Upwind and downwind air.** Upwind air has not come into contact with emissions from UCSF Parnassus. Downwind air has had the chance to mix with these emissions. Sites where air quality was sampled are shown on Chart III. Many of these sites are in neighbors' backyards or on rooftops.

- **Radiation levels.** Radiation measurements were made of soil from the campus and the surrounding neighborhoods, the sewers, and airborne dust upwind and downwind of the campus. In particular, radioactive iodine -- the only radioactive material used at UCSF that could evaporate and be emitted in
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measurable quantities into the air -- was looked for at rooftop vents and
upwind and downwind of the campus. Radiation generated by x-ray equipment
also was tested for.

The assessment also looked at:

• Meteorology. Wind measurements were made to indicate where UCSF emissions
were being distributed.

• Noise levels. Measured on and near campus.

Phase III. Determine if the measured emissions pose a health threat, using a
health risk assessment methodology.

Using survey data from Phase I activities and Phase II sampling, a health risk
assessment was carried out to see if UCSF Parnassus emissions could have any
effect on the community's health. To estimate these hypothetical risks Radian
used standard computer models developed and recommended by federal and state
government agencies responsible for protecting public health and the
environment.

To make sure that the health risk assessment took into account the maximum
possible effects that UCSF Parnassus emissions could have on the community,
the study assumed a hypothetical "worst case" scenario in calculating the
cancer risk to an individual. In this scenario the affected person is assumed
to live at the site of the highest ground-level concentrations from Parnassus
Heights emissions for his or her entire life (70 years), never leaving or
going indoors even for brief periods of time.

The hypothetical "worst case" risk calculated by this model is in addition to
a person's actual risk of developing cancer, estimated by the American Cancer
Society to be 300,000 chances in a million (more than one in four) for an
individual living in the United States.

In addition to estimating the cancer risk, the study also investigated the
possibility of non-cancer health effects. The non-cancer analysis looked at
acute (short-term) and chronic (long-term) health effects.

Phase IV. Monitor UCSF activities to make sure that environmental quality is
maintained.

An on-going monitoring program of stack emissions will be carried out by UCSF
to make sure that any harmful emission increases will be detected so that they
can be corrected. Ensuring long-term environmental quality has been the
ultimate objective of this environmental assessment.

RESULTS

Phase I. Survey. Based on information from the chemicals use questionnaires,
it was estimated that some 300 different compounds are regularly used in fume hoods at UCSF Parnassus. Other compounds are used outside of the hoods but could reach the air through general building exhaust.

Based on these surveys, it was estimated that the chemicals used in the highest volumes were two alcohols (ethanol and methanol), which accounted for one-third of all organic (containing carbon) compounds reported. Two common acids (hydrochloric acid and sulfuric acid) and sodium hydroxide (lye soda) accounted for about two-thirds of all inorganic (not containing carbon) compounds reported as used at UCSF Parnassus.

Phase II. Measurements. When Radian measured chemical emissions and radiation from UCSF Parnassus, it was found that barely detectable levels of radiation and only small amounts of chemicals were being released into the environment. Sampling results indicate that approximately 70% of the compound emissions came from fewer than 10% of the fume hood vents.

• Radiation. To see if radiation levels on or near the Parnassus campus could be linked to the use of x-ray equipment, radiation measurements were made at night (when the equipment is not heavily used) and during the day (when the equipment is most heavily used). No difference was found.

Radioactive iodine, the only radioactive substance emitted from UCSF's rooftop vents in measurable amounts, was found in barely detectable amounts in air sampled in the fume hood vents, but was not found in the surrounding community. No radioactivity, including radioactive iodine, was found in soil samples from the campus or the neighborhoods, in the sewers or in airborne dust. Radian estimated that the worst-case risk of developing cancer from radioactive iodine emissions would be 0.00009 chances in a million.

The highest radiation levels found at the Parnassus campus were 33 times lower than government regulations allow. Because radiation levels are low, and most radiation appears to be from non-campus related background sources, study results indicate that radiation from UCSF Parnassus activities would not have a demonstrable health impact on the surrounding community.

• Upwind and downwind air. There was no statistically significant difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of compounds in the air, indicating that compounds are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect ambient air quality.

• Meteorology. Wind direction in the Parnassus area was found to be predominantly from the west-southwest, which is about parallel to Parnassus Avenue.

• Fume hood vents and general building circulation vents. Air emissions from vents were sampled on three different days during the school term -- a typical summer session day, a day during the first week of classes, and a day in the middle of the semester -- plus several times as the data was being analyzed. Average yearly emissions from the vents were then estimated.

The yearly average emission rate of organic compounds from the campus is estimated at about 107 pounds per day. Of this, alcohols such as ethanol (ethyl alcohol) and methanol, which are used as solvents, were the most common. A variety of other compounds made up the balance of the 107 pounds of daily emissions.
Of about 1200 substances listed as being used in UCSF laboratories and hospitals at Parnassus Heights, 300 were identified as possibly leading to emissions, and only 44 were found to be emitted in large enough quantities to be included in the health risk assessment. These chemicals included benzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, ethylene oxide, dioxin and radioactive substances. (Dioxin was included because of its known toxicity, even though it was found in only minute amounts.)

• Hospital and dental school sterilizers. One compound, ethylene oxide, was estimated to be released from the hospital and dental school sterilizers at the rate of 2.2 pounds per day. Ethylene oxide is used routinely in hospitals to disinfect instruments and supplies that are re-used, and it is the most effective sterilizer for this purpose. Nevertheless, ethylene oxide is considered a potential health hazard, and UCSF has ordered installation of new air emission controls (state-of-the-art scrubbers) that will remove 98% of the emissions from sterilizer exhaust vents. The scrubber for the hospital sterilizers, which emit the bulk of the ethylene oxide, is due to be installed by fall. Installation of the scrubber for the dental school sterilizer, which emits only 10% of the total ethylene oxide, is expected to be completed by next summer.

• Pathological incinerator. The pathological incinerator was found to release small amounts of several compounds into the air, including minute and barely detectable amounts of dioxins. Dioxins are produced by many types of burning.

• Soil, spring water, and discharges to sewers. The soil and spring water samples did not uncover compounds from Parnassus Heights at levels higher than occur naturally in the Bay Area. Water in the two "springs" uphill of the campus that were tested may actually be water that is leaking from city water mains.

• Noise. The highest noise levels in the area are from car, truck and bus traffic on roadways, not from sources on campus. Traffic and/or construction on campus contribute to noise levels, but the campus itself does not appear to have a significant noise impact on the surrounding community.

Phase III. Assessment. The health risk assessment used information from Phase I and Phase II to estimate the hypothetical risk to a person living near UCSF Parnassus of developing cancer from exposure to campus emissions. It was found that potential emissions from all UCSF Parnassus activities result in minimal health impacts on the surrounding community, and that the health risk is at an acceptable level when compared to both federal and state standards of significant risk. Even by overstating the potential impacts in each step of the health risk assessment, it was found that there is a very small increase in the risk of developing cancer.

The maximum hypothetical cancer risk calculated to result from emissions on the Parnassus campus would be 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 in a million after new controls are in place on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

That is, a hypothetical individual who lives continuously at the site of maximum ground level chemical emission concentrations for 70 years without ever leaving or going indoors would have an estimated additional 5 chances in
one million of developing some form of cancer due to these emissions. The California Health & Welfare Agency, for the purposes of the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65), defines an "insignificant" cancer risk as one estimated to increase the risk of cancer by less than 10 chances in a million.

Application of the hypothetical cancer risk calculated by this computer model to the population which is actually exposed to emissions from Parnassus Heights results in a number called the "cancer burden," which is the estimated number of cancer cases in San Francisco during a 70-year period. Before the installation of scrubbers the cancer burden in San Francisco is estimated to be 0.7, or one new cancer case in 100 years. Installation of scrubbers reduces the cancer burden to 0.1, or one additional case of cancer in 700 years.

This evaluation of cancer risk includes the hypothetical cancer risk from UCSF's radioactive iodine emissions. Calculated independently, this estimated risk is 0.00009 chances in a million, assuming the "worst-case" scenario.

The study also looked at adverse non-carcinogenic health impacts, and concluded they are not likely to result from exposure to emissions from activities at UCSF Parnassus Heights.

INDEPENDENT CONFIRMATION

In order to assure that the data gathered during the study received comprehensive evaluation by a number of individuals, UCSF and the University of California Office of the President commissioned independent peer review by both outside consultants and internal UC staff. These reviewers included persons knowledgeable in areas of air sampling, computer modeling, meteorology, risk assessment methods and pollution control engineering. These outside reviewers and Radian met frequently to assure data validity and quality of results.

UCSF also has made a commitment to bring in another independent party to review the Radian study, the selection to be made with the participation of the community task force and the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Now that the effects of compound emissions from UCSF Parnassus have been studied, it is important to monitor future emissions to make sure they remain at very low levels. This activity, described as Phase IV, will be carried out by UCSF with guidance from Radian.

WHOM CAN I CALL WITH QUESTIONS?

Bruce W. Spaulding, vice chancellor, university advancement and planning, (415) 476-8059

Roy Balzer, PhD, UCSF assistant vice chancellor for Environmental Health and Safety: (415) 476-2759.

Elaine Bild, Director, Long Range Development & Environmental Planning, UC Office of the President: (415) 642-4316.

###
UCSF HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
CHART I

POTENTIAL EFFECTS AT UCSF PARNASSUS HEIGHTS
NOTE: See Table 2-3 for Detailed Description of Receptor Sites.

Locations of Ambient Receptor Stations (Numbers) and Meteorological Stations (Letters) Near the Parnassus Campus.
### CHART III Legend
(Figure 2-1 in Radian Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station # and Identifier on Map</th>
<th>Location of Receptor Station</th>
<th>Description of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laguna Honda School</td>
<td>On 4-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1336 Willard (Willard at Parnassus)</td>
<td>On 4-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>144-150 Carl Street (Carl at Shrader)</td>
<td>On multiple unit. 3-story roof top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Belmont (Belmont at Edgewood)</td>
<td>On top of 1 story, exposed garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kesar Parking Lot (Frederick at Willard)</td>
<td>6 feet above ground in middle of parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>611 Frederick</td>
<td>On penthouse atop 4-story building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stanyan Street Fire Station (Stanyan at Willard)</td>
<td>On top of 30 foot tower above fire station roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Health Sciences West (Northwest Corner)</td>
<td>On northwest (leeward) corner of roof of 16-story building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Same as 3</td>
<td>Same as 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Stations 45 and 46 were added after the first day of sampling and were assigned the next available sequential station number.
September 1, 1989

DEANS
DIRECTORS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Many of you are aware that we embarked on an environmental assessment at our Parnassus campus in January 1988. The study was initiated by the campus in an attempt to answer some of the concerns expressed by UCSF's neighbors and to assure the campus that research, teaching, and patient care at Parnassus Heights are conducted in a safe manner.

A preview of the results of this study was presented last night (Thursday, August 31) to the members of a community task force which has been participating with EH&S in the study as it progressed.

The attached press release summarizes the findings to date. I believe you will find them reassuring.

We did not commission a similar study on workplace safety because our EH&S Department already monitors our compliance with local, state and federal health standards.

If you wish to see a more detailed summary, or the whole report, please contact Roy Balzer, X6-2759.

Bruce W. Spaulding  
Vice Chancellor  
University Advancement and Planning
STUDY SHOWS UC SAN FRANCISCO EMISSIONS HAVE MINIMAL HEALTH EFFECT ON COMMUNITY

An independent study released today by UC San Francisco shows that emissions from its Parnassus Heights research and teaching laboratories and hospitals have a minimal impact on neighborhoods surrounding the campus, according to Bruce W. Spaulding, Vice Chancellor, Advancement and Planning.

No detectable effect on air quality was found in any neighborhood around the campus, even as close as half a block from the campus boundary. Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF were a fraction of what applicable government standards allow. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.

As a result of these low levels, the study concluded that emissions from Parnassus Heights research laboratories pose an extremely low risk to the public.

The study was initiated by the campus in January 1988 in an attempt to answer some of the concerns expressed by UCSF's neighbors and to assure the campus that research, teaching and patient care at Parnassus Heights are conducted in a safe manner.

Key findings of the study, performed by the Sacramento-based Radian Corporation, are:

- The highest radiation levels found on and around the Parnassus campus are 33 times less than government standards allow. No radiation above background levels could be detected in the air in any neighborhood around the campus. No radioactivity was found in soils, sewers or airborne dust.
- There was no statistical difference between upwind and downwind concentrations of chemicals in the air, indicating that chemicals are not released from the campus into the air in large enough amounts to measurably affect air quality.
- Levels of chemicals in the sewer water coming from UCSF are six times...
below what applicable government standards allow. Chemicals found in
soil on the Parnassus Heights campus and in the neighborhood are no
different from what is found in any urban environment.

- The wind direction at UCSF Parnassus Heights is predominantly from the
west southwest, about parallel to Parnassus Avenue. The wind blows
toward the Noe and Eureka Valley areas a small percentage of the time.
(This is important in view of the concern expressed by some residents of
these neighborhoods over a possible "cancer cluster," or slightly
elevated number of cancer cases in their area, which they feared might be
due to UCSF emissions.)

- Overall, the estimates of emissions showed that about 107 pounds of
chemicals may evaporate into the air each day from UCSF Parnassus. Not
all of these are considered "toxic." This amount is slightly more than
the emissions from a neighborhood dry cleaner.

- Of the total quantity of potentially toxic air emissions, the most
significant in terms of health risk was ethylene oxide (2.2 pounds daily)
from hospital and dental school sterilizers vented to the roof.
Sterilizers are used routinely in most hospitals to disinfect instruments
and supplies, and ethylene oxide is the most effective substance in
disinfecting these items. UCSF has ordered the installation of new
state-of-the-art scrubbers that will remove 98 percent of the emissions
from the sterilizer exhaust vents.

Measurements were taken directly at the vents on the roofs of a
representative sample of research, teaching and hospital buildings at UCSF,
and at six sites in backyards and on rooftops of neighbors in the vicinity of
the campus.

Radian subsequently performed risk assessments to evaluate potential
health risks associated with airborne emissions from the Parnassus campus.
They assessed risks of developing acute health effects, chronic health effects
and cancer. To estimate these hypothetical risks Radian used standard
computer models developed and recommended by federal and state government
agencies responsible for protecting public health and the environment.

These models use conservative assumptions and generally overstate health
risks. For example, they assume that the hypothetical individual affected
lives all of his or her life (70 years) at the point of highest chemical
emission concentration at ground level without ever going indoors or leaving
the spot.

Because the highest level of UCSF emissions were detected at the rooftop
vents themselves, the computer model used measurements made directly in these
vents to estimate possible chemical concentrations on the campus and in the

(more)
neighborhoods. From these estimates a hypothetical "cancer risk" was extrapolated.

The possibility of developing cancer in this hypothetical situation was estimated on the computer model as 14 chances in a million, reduced to 5 chances in a million after installation of state-of-the-art scrubbers on the hospital and dental school sterilizers.

Given the extremely conservative assumptions built into this type of "cancer risk" model, the State of California has concluded that a cancer risk of 10 in a million or more could be considered "significant." Installation of scrubbers thus reduces the total cancer risk due to Parnassus Heights air emissions to half the level considered significant by the State of California.

The scrubber for the hospital sterilizers, which emit the bulk of the ethylene oxide, is due to be installed by fall. Installation of the scrubber for the dental school sterilizer, which emits only 10% of the total ethylene oxide, is expected to be completed by next summer.

A hypothetical added risk of 5 in a million corresponds to an estimated one additional cancer case in 700 years in all of San Francisco.

For comparison, a person who lives near a gas station or dry cleaner has an estimated added risk of 10 to 50 chances in a million of developing cancer as a result of being exposed to emissions from these commercial facilities.

The environmental study and health risk assessment conducted by the Radian Corporation were commissioned as part of a model program for radiation safety and comprehensive environmental protection developed by UCSF for all its sites in response to concerns expressed by some residents of the Parnassus Heights and Laurel Heights (and later Noe Valley) neighborhoods, according to Spaulding.

The environmental study and health risk assessment at Parnassus Heights were key elements of the program, and are the first truly comprehensive environmental assessment with community input to be conducted on any campus in the country other than the National Institutes of Health. The study cost $1.6 million.

During the 20 months the study was planned and carried out, the UCSF Department of Environmental Health & Safety under assistant vice chancellor Roy Balzer, PhD, and other UCSF officials met frequently with a community task force that included nine representatives of neighborhood community groups,
plus the Sierra Club. Representatives of the San Francisco Department of Public Health and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District later joined the committee. Many campus neighbors allowed air sampling at sites in their backyards and rooftops.

A preview of the findings was presented to the task force last night (Thursday August 31).

In order to assure that the data gathered during the study received comprehensive evaluation by a number of individuals, UCSF and the University of California Office of the President commissioned an independent peer review by both outside consultants and internal UC staff. These reviewers included persons knowledgeable in areas of air sampling, computer modeling, meteorology, risk assessment methods and pollution control engineering. These outside reviewers and Radian met frequently to assure data validity and quality of results.

UCSF also has made a commitment to bring in another independent party to review the Radian study, the selection to be made by a committee composed of members of the community task force, the San Francisco Department of Public Health and UCSF, Spaulding said.

UCSF also will continue to reduce its use of potentially toxic material by substituting less toxic chemicals when possible and storing and using chemicals in smaller amounts, and has committed itself to a system of periodic monitoring of radiation safety and emissions to ensure that the air quality remains good around the Parnassus Heights campus.

"This study showed that only an extremely low risk could be attributed to emissions from the research laboratories at Parnassus Heights," Spaulding pointed out. "Furthermore, no radioactivity above background levels was detected in the air, and none at all in soils or sewers in any neighborhood surrounding the campus.

"This is important in view of the concerns expressed by some community members about the safety of moving our School of Pharmacy research programs to Laurel Heights," he said.

A summary of the environmental assessment methodology has been prepared. If not attached, call the UCSF News Office at (415) 476-2557 for a copy. The complete report may be obtained from the UCSF Department of Environmental Health & Safety at (415) 476-1300.
ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT MEETING DATES FOR MOUNT ZION & LAUREL HEIGHTS

MOUNT ZION EIR -- DEIR published 9/22/89
Target Dates for Public Meetings & Hearing to be held at MZ Auditorium

(PIM = Public Information Meeting; CIM = Campus Information Meeting)

- September 25, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: PIM (ESA "walk-thru" DEIR)
- September 26, 1989, Tuesday; 11:30 am - 1:30 pm: Mt. Zion Staff (2 sessions)
- September 27, 1989, Wednesday; 12:00 noon - 1:30 pm: UCSF CIM at Cole Hall
- October 3, 1989, Tuesday; 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm: Mt. Zion Medical Board
- October 19, 1989, Thursday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: PIM (feedback & dialogue)
- November 8, 1989, Wednesday; 6:00 pm - 10:00 pm: Mt. Zion Public Hearing

LAUREL HEIGHTS EIR -- DEIR published 10/20/89
Target Dates for Public Meetings & Hearings to be held at LH auditorium

(PIM = Public Information Meeting; CIM = Campus Information Meeting)

- October 23, 1989, Monday; 12 noon - 1:30 pm: UCSF CIM
- October 23, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: LHts PIM (ESA "walk-thru" DEIR)
- November 13, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm: LHts PIM (feedback & dialogue)
- December 4, 1989, Monday; 6:00 pm - 10:00 pm: LHts Public Hearing

ba/eironly/9/6/89
UCSF expansion debated

300 at meeting on plans for Laurel Heights campus

By Craig Marine
OF THE EXAMINER STAFF

More than 300 people crowded into an auditorium at UC-San Francisco's Laurel Heights campus to argue the pros and cons of further expansion of the facility.

At Monday night's official public hearing, testimony on the new draft environmental impact report prepared by the university grew testy at times — particularly when some speakers in favor of growth attempted to downplay neighborhood opposition.

Distinguished doctors and happy patients spoke glowingly of the accomplishments of UCSF and the continuing need for space for research and laboratories.

Others spoke of their fears of toxic waste, air pollution, noise, traffic problems and the disposal of diseased animal carcasses.

"I am a beneficiary of (UCSF) research," said Dan Turner, who has been described as the longest-surviving AIDS patient in the Bay Area.

"I have been contributing my blood for research for eight years, and each time I do so in an office no bigger than a walk-in closet," he said. "I believe the doctors who have helped me so much deserve more than just a closet for an office."

John Rothmann, who described himself simply as "a neighbor," drew loud applause from the crowd when he praised the work done by the facility, yet urged that they choose another site for their expansion plans.

"I believe this belongs more in an industrial park setting than in a residential neighborhood," Rothmann said. "UCSF is indeed a jewel, but every jewel deserves an appropriate setting, and this is not the setting.

Rothmann cited the parking problems that might plague the neighborhood should the building, at 3333 California St., begin operating at full capacity.

For Deetje Boler, the main concern was the experimentation likely to take place using animals, and the disposal of dead, possibly contaminated animals.

"They will build what they euphemistically call an 'animal care facility,'" she said. "It might be more appropriate to call it an animal victimization facility."

Boler said that the disposal of carcasses and the routes and destinations for the carcass disposal should have been included in the environmental impact report and urged that the matter be given closer scrutiny.

For every speaker who complained of possible calamities, another tried to ease fears. Dr. Peter Gregory of the Stanford Medical School, a member of that facility's safety panel, spoke of the need for additional space for research.

"Adequate space helps insure that research is conducted safely," he said.

The comments from Monday nights meeting, and any further written comments, will be accepted by the university until Dec. 29. After that, a final environmental impact report will be published, which will included responses to all the environmental issues raised by the testimony and written comments.

The final report will then be presented to the UC Board of Regents. If they approve the document, lawsuits challenging the action can be filed within 30 days.
TO: SAC MEMBERS
FROM: BARBARA ATKINSON
DATE: OCTOBER 5, 1989
RE: INFORMATION ON MOUNT ZION

As requested, please find enclosed several information sheets on the UCSF/Mount Zion integration.

News Services is also in the process of producing an informational piece on the impacts of the integration. This will be ready by the next PIM, October 19.

Please let me know if these pieces meet your needs; if not, I will attempt to consolidate them. You should know, however, that anything produced for the external community is reviewed and scrutinized by a number of people. A consolidated piece would take a bit of time as it went through this process.

Thank you all for your continued efforts and support on behalf of the campus; you are an important part of our external outreach.
Joint Statement by UC San Francisco and Mount Zion

Summary of the UC San Francisco/Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center Integration Proposal—September 25, 1989

The following statement summarizes the revised and updated status of the Mount Zion/UCSF Integration proposal as of September, 1989:

I. On May 31, 1988 Mount Zion and UC San Francisco signed a letter of intent that would govern the development of a proposal to integrate their two medical centers. The letter proposed that "UCSF assume overall programmatic and academic authority and fiscal responsibility for Mount Zion Hospital", and set forth general principles for a comprehensive integration proposal, including governance, medical staff, service and teaching programs, research, personnel and transfer of assets and liabilities.

The letter made it clear that the final plan would have to be proposed to The Regents of the University of California and the Mount Zion Health Systems Board. The Regents in turn declared that its approval would be contingent upon completing an environmental review process involving the preparation of a comprehensive environmental impact report (EIR).

The reason for this proposal was based upon mutual needs of the two institutions and projected benefits for the entire community.

Like many community hospitals in San Francisco, Mount Zion is experiencing severe economic pressures. In a statement regarding the letter of intent, Mount Zion Chairman David Melnick declared: "Given the economic forces in the San Francisco hospital community and the changing national educational requirements, it is questionable whether Mount Zion, or any other community teaching hospital, could satisfy its mission in the future as a stand-alone institution. The proposed plan would afford Mount Zion the continued ability to meet its mission by offering and expanding excellent primary and secondary medical services in a caring and personalized setting which also has a strong teaching component. It would also allow us to meet our continuing obligation to the Jewish community and our immediate neighbors." In order to continue to be responsive to the needs of the community, it is essential for Mount Zion to find a partner to be able to carry on teaching, research and patient care and to serve the public.

For its part, UCSF is experiencing a severe space crunch which is beginning to make it impossible to continue to meet the demand for new patient care programs and to continue to recruit highly qualified
faculty to teach students, conduct research and provide patient care. There are shortages of operating rooms, critical care beds, routine medical/surgical beds, space for expanded diagnostic services and outpatient care, and teaching and research space for faculty physicians actively engaged in patient care.

This space shortage impedes the university's efforts to deliver the latest life-saving advances in medical care, diagnosis and treatment which it is the mission of UCSF's Medical Center to provide, in order to meet community needs and to assure effective training of the next generation of health practitioners as well the continuing education of those already in practice.

II. In March 1989, UCSF presented to The Regents of The University of California an evaluation of its clinical program needs, a preliminary analysis of its inability to meet those needs on the Parnassus Heights campus, and a description of the alternatives considered by UCSF in its planning efforts to date. The Regents reviewed the outline of the principal features of the proposed integration agreement which the Board of Mount Zion Health Systems (the parent corporation of Mount Zion) had approved. The Regents then directed UCSF to undertake a detailed environmental analysis of the Mount Zion integration proposal and other alternatives to resolve UCSF's clinical space shortage and educational needs.

UCSF has prepared a draft environmental impact report (EIR) to enable The Regents to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed Mount Zion integration. The Regents will then determine, in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), whether to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed Mount Zion integration agreement which is presently under negotiation.

The draft EIR

-- discusses the objectives for the proposed integration (the project);
-- describes the project in terms necessary for environmental review, including estimates of patient care and research activity, staffing, and building plans;
-- describes existing conditions at Mount Zion (the setting);
-- analyzes environmental changes at Mount Zion related to the project;
-- identifies any measures that UCSF would take to lessen anticipated environmental impacts (mitigation measures); and
-- presents a section on alternatives that describes the environmental effects if no project were pursued (no project alternative), if there were different levels of use proposed for Mount Zion (on-site alternatives), or if UCSF were to meet its objectives at a different hospital location (off-site alternatives at Children's Hospital of San Francisco, Pacific Presbyterian Medical Center, San Francisco General Hospital, and Laurel Heights).

The draft EIR for the Mount Zion project is available for public comment for a 60-day period beginning on September 22, 1989. There will be a public hearing on November 8 during this public comment period. The final EIR submitted to The Regents will incorporate responses to the
public comments received. Certification of the EIR by The Regents would precede any action by The Regents on the integration agreement.

III. Description of Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center as the proposed project is predicated on commitments that UCSF proposes to make to the Board of Mount Zion Health Systems under the integration agreement that Mount Zion would continue to be what it has been in the past -- a community-based, general acute care hospital with strong teaching, community service and research components.

The legal agreement to carry out the proposed integration is still under negotiation, but the principal features of the agreement have been determined. On the effective date (hopefully early in 1990), title to most of the property of Mount Zion would be conveyed to the University which would agree to continue to operate Mount Zion as a general acute care hospital. From the inception of the proposed agreement, the University would be responsible for improvements in Mount Zion's physical plant and equipment.

Mount Zion Health Systems, the parent corporation of Mount Zion, would continue to retain control of the following properties not included in the integration agreement: the land for the Ronald McDonald House (1640-1646 Scott Street), the Management Information Systems building (1606 Scott Street), the Crisis Clinic (2330 Post Street), the land for the San Francisco Medical Center office building at the northwest corner of Divisadero and Post Streets and the adjacent garage, and the parking lot on the east side of Scott Street between Sutter and Post.

Under the integration, Mount Zion would continue to provide inpatient medical/surgical services as well as emergency and outpatient care. UC San Francisco and Mount Zion Health Systems would also intend to continue and enhance the existing teaching and research programs at Mount Zion. Mount Zion's research programs have been in existence for more than 50 years, and for the past six years its $4 million biomedical research program has included collaborative efforts with UCSF.

As UCSF faculty physicians and Mount Zion medical staff strengthen the clinical programs available at Mount Zion, the volume of patient care services could increase to the point that, over the long run, Mount Zion could ultimately utilize its full complement of 408 acute care and 31 skilled nursing licensed beds. The volume of outpatient visits would increase accordingly. The projections of patient activity in the draft EIR assume that Mount Zion would be able to reach an occupancy rate of 80%. Because this occupancy rate is substantially higher than the occupancy rates experienced by San Francisco hospitals in recent years, the draft EIR presents a conservative or "worst case" analysis of the environmental impacts.

IV. The draft EIR identifies and analyzes two periods of program development and capital improvements for the Mount Zion integration: a short-range program which is projected to occur between 1990 and 1996 and a long-range program which is projected to occur between 1997 and 2010.

The short-range program would permit UCSF to make the capital
investments necessary to initiate several new patient care programs at Mount Zion, such as an enhanced cancer program and a pediatric rehabilitation program. By the end of the short-range program, Mount Zion could operate 293 acute care beds and 31 skilled nursing beds, all located in the main hospital buildings.

The short-range program would also allow UCSF to develop outpatient and research space for faculty physicians who would practice at Mount Zion. Patient care areas, both for outpatient and hospital care, and research facilities must be convenient to one another so that faculty physicians may move back and forth among their roles as medical practitioners, teachers, and researchers. Because the physical integration of these facilities is standard at academic medical centers around the country, UCSF must offer outpatient care and research space at Mount Zion to recruit highly qualified faculty physicians to clinical programs there. By the end of the long-range program, research space for faculty physicians would occupy 16% of Mount Zion's total space, compared to 3% today.

The short-range program would include:

--- Renovation of patient services within the main hospital buildings;

--- Reconstruction of the outpatient services building, including two additional floors, to house an outpatient cancer treatment center and related physicians' offices, and to accommodate an operating room suite designed for today's sophisticated surgical procedures;

--- Phased replacement of the current Sutter Street Pavilion with two contiguous buildings for outpatient care and research. Independent of the integration proposal, Mount Zion had made decisions to relocate the inpatient units currently in the Pavilion to other locations. In the short term, vacated space would then be used for office, outpatient care, teaching and additional research space. In the first phase of construction, a building to house outpatient care and research would replace the one-story existing building. A second, contiguous building would replace the Pavilion building no earlier than two years following the completion of the first. Neither building has yet been designed, but the draft EIR assumes that they would have six stories and two levels of underground garages to address needs for additional parking;

--- Demolition of the buildings on the eastern end of the main hospital block (Sutter, Hellman, Harold Brunn Institute, and Adult Day Health buildings). While these facilities have been well-maintained, they have serious technical and functional problems. Mount Zion could not undertake substantial remodeling of these facilities without seismic upgrading and without entailing new electrical distribution and fire alarm systems; improvements to fire exits, improved access for the handicapped, and new heating, ventilation, and cooling systems. Even with costly renovations which could potentially exceed the expense of new buildings, these buildings would not satisfy Mount Zion's long-term need for a well-integrated, modern hospital facility adjacent to the existing main hospital;
Installation of emission control equipment for the Mount Zion hospital sterilizer which would reduce toxic air emissions from the sterilizer by about 98%. UCSF is in the process of installing such state-of-the-art equipment at the Parnassus Heights medical center and School of Dentistry. As part of the demolition program, Mount Zion's incinerator would be removed. It is not currently in use, and UCSF would not operate it in the future.

Upon completion of the short-range program, the facilities included in the Mount Zion integration project would occupy a total of 601,715 building gross square feet (bgsf), compared to the current total of 540,065 bgsf. Excluding 55,600 bgsf in underground parking, the total gross square footage would increase only 1% over existing facilities. An increase of 274 parking spaces would be provided in underground and surface parking.

The long-range program looks out twenty years from the expected date of the integration agreement, a time frame which extends well beyond the usual ten-year time period for institutional master plans for hospitals. Most of Mount Zion's hospital facilities are now more than forty years old and over the next twenty years, UCSF foresees the need to modernize and expand the existing hospital.

Mount Zion is already encountering problems in making aging building systems support current patient care needs. Demands for ventilation systems and electrical systems have changed with advances in patient care technology. Current seismic standards are also considerably more rigorous than when Mount Zion's main hospital buildings were built. In addition to needed hospital engineering changes over the next twenty years, there may well be changes in the configuration of radiology suites, operating rooms, critical care areas, and nursing units that cannot be accommodated by renovating existing facilities. UCSF, or any entity responsible for Mount Zion's future operation, would be only prudent to assume that a substantial hospital modernization program at Mount Zion would be necessary by the beginning of the next century.

The long-range program in the draft EIR sketches broadly the increase in space that may be necessary to allow Mount Zion to relocate highly specialized patient care services to new space. The size of the modernized hospital facility would also permit Mount Zion to operate all of its licensed beds, including 115 acute care beds which could not be used at the end of the short-term program due to space constraints. This would allow UCSF to meet its projected long-term need for hospital beds for its clinical programs at Mount Zion without increasing the number of licensed beds in San Francisco. In addition, the modernized hospital facility would house outpatient care and research space commensurate with the size of the larger inpatient program.

Construction would probably occur in two phases. The first phase, which might be completed by 2004, would involve the construction of a new building of about 250,000 bgsf at the southwest corner of Sutter and Scott Streets. The second phase, with a completion date of about 2010, would involve construction of a new 200,000 bgsf building at the
northwest corner of Post and Scott Streets. Both buildings would have two levels of underground parking. For the purposes of analysis in the draft EIR, both buildings are assumed to have seven stories above ground with two levels of underground parking. Given current standards for hospital construction, the draft EIR assumes that each story would have a floor-to-ceiling height of fifteen feet.

By the completion of the long-range program, Mount Zion facilities would occupy 1,029,215 gross square feet. Excluding 163,600 gross square feet in underground parking facilities, total Mount Zion square footage would increase by 60% over 1989. The total increase in parking spaces from 1989 to 2010 would be 691.

This twenty year projection of possible needs will be subject to revision as changing needs in medicine and science and the delivery of health care dictate. If there were substantial changes to the project or the area around the project, supplemental environmental documentation would be prepared as needed.

V. In the planning for activities at Mount Zion under the proposed integration agreement, attention is being paid to community needs and to the optimal use of the facilities at both institutions in terms of teaching, patient care and the research components which are integral to these programs. Such planning must also consider the economic realities of today's health care delivery system.

The proposed integration would have the following benefits for the community:

• Preserve Mount Zion as a premier community-based acute-care teaching hospital.
• Create a comprehensive cancer program.
• Improve and expand services available to psychiatric patients.
• Preserve and expand comprehensive programs developed at Mount Zion for the elderly.
• Strengthen the region's pediatric services.
• Provide continued access to high quality health care for the economically disadvantaged.
• Maintain current Mount Zion research with new opportunities for collaboration.
• Improve physical facilities at the Mount Zion site.
• Stimulate economic growth.
• Make efficient use of health care resources.
• Maintain UCSF as one of the leading academic medical centers in the United States.
• Improve the educational opportunities for the next generation of health care professionals.
We want you to know why the Mount Zion Board of Directors is pursuing integration discussions with the Medical Center at UC-San Francisco.

The facts are simple and can be summarized in three words: environment, costs, and reimbursement.

Environment:

Hospitals in San Francisco—and throughout the United States—have been forced into a survival struggle unforeseen even ten years ago. Downsize, merge, and close have become common descriptors throughout the industry. Hospitals without sufficient funds for upgrading equipment and facilities and mounting new clinical programs to meet community need have little chance for survival in this environment. Mount Zion has no such funds.

Costs:

Despite deep expense reductions at Mount Zion, the outlook for the future is grim. Rising costs of labor and materials push our need for operating capital beyond our ability to generate revenue. This disparity between costs and revenue has resulted in multi-million dollar losses from operations, and attendant drain on our reserve funds, for each of the past four years.

Reimbursement:

Approximately 75 percent of our patients are supported by federal and state government through the Medicare and Medi-Cal programs—at rates that fall far short of the cost of delivering care. For example, one of Mount Zion's outpatient treatment programs receives only 28 cents in reimbursement for every dollar of service it provides to Medi-Cal patients.

This unattractive blend of a competitive environment, rising costs and shrinking reimbursement forces this conclusion: Mount Zion is not—and cannot become—financially able to maintain its mission as an acute care hospital committed to patient care, teaching, research, and community service without a long-term partner.
We can survive—and thrive—only with a partner that will work collaboratively with our medical and hospital staff to build programs to serve a growing population of patients at Mount Zion.

Mount Zion is at a crucial intersection. Continuing down the present path will ultimately lead to greater losses and eventual closure. In its present state, Mount Zion lacks the resources for continuing existing programs, let alone mounting new ones to respond to new needs in the community. A formal and permanent relationship with a stronger partner that shares enthusiasm for Mount Zion's mission is essential to survival.

The following questions are frequently asked about our proposed integration with UCSF. Their answers explain why our board of directors seeks to establish a formal relationship with the Medical Center at UCSF and why we believe the integration merits your support.

Q. How would the community be affected if Mount Zion were to close?

A. Mount Zion affects the community in many ways; it is a major provider of health care and outreach, as well as a significant employer and an economic anchor in its Western Addition neighborhood. For example, ten percent of the hospital's employees live within a half-mile of Mount Zion.

Closure of Mount Zion would have the following impacts on the community:

1. Approximately 1500 individuals (including part-time and per-diem employees) would lose their jobs.

2. Patients who account for 7,900 hospitalizations a year would be forced to choose another source of care.

3. Patients who turn to Mount Zion for emergency care (approximately 22,000 visits per year) would be diverted elsewhere, increasing the burden on the already over-loaded emergency system in San Francisco.

4. San Francisco's Jewish community would suffer: Hundreds of Soviet emigres would lose access to healthcare in an environment empathetic to their special religious and cultural needs.

5. Numerous programs provided for the elderly through Mount Zion's San Francisco Institute on Aging would be jeopardized: It's uncertain whether such programs as day care for Alzheimer's patients and frail elderly persons could continue independent of an acute care hospital.
6. Mount Zion Care Account, the low-cost program that provides coordinated health services and elimination of paperwork to 2500 elderly persons, would be discontinued.

7. Patients who account for about 27,000 outpatient visits per year (many who are economically disadvantaged) would lose access to high-quality, convenient health services--particularly diagnostic and treatment services for AIDS patients and pre-natal care for teenage and drug-addicted mothers.

8. The 24-hour emergency psychiatric "crisis" clinic, one of only two in San Francisco, would likely be closed.

9. Nationally recognized research projects related to infectious diseases, diabetes and geriatrics (among others) would be discontinued.

Q. What criteria did Mount Zion use when considering a potential "partner?"

A. The primary criterion was that any institution with whom Mount Zion could integrate have values compatible with Mount Zion's mission. In addition, the following were essential:

1. That Mount Zion continue as an acute care (i.e. providing primary medical and surgical services) teaching hospital.

2. That the relationship be long-term.

3. That Mount Zion's existing educational training programs be strengthened.

4. That areas of excellence determined in Mount Zion's 1987 Strategic Plan--such as the cancer program--be enhanced.

5. That the board of directors and staff physicians continue to play a meaningful role in influencing the scope of programs.

6. That Mount Zion Health Systems, Inc. (the parent corporation of Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center) retain control of trust and special funds, and continue to devote a portion of them to the hospital.

7. That Mount Zion maintain its Jewish identity--specifically, that the name of the hospital be retained, that a rabbi continue to provide pastoral care and that kosher food be available.
Q. Why did Mount Zion select UCSF as a potential partner?

A. Mount Zion has more in common with UCSF than with any other local hospital. The philosophy and the history of the two institutions are quite parallel. Both have shown a commitment over the years to the highest quality of medical care, to education, to research, to community service, and to taking care of the poor. We believe that UCSF is the strongest partner possible.

Additionally, Mount Zion has had an established relationship with the University for nearly 50 years as a training site for medical students, interns and residents. And, more than half of the doctors on our medical staff are already members of the University's clinical faculty.

Present joint ventures include perinatal services, home care, and geriatric research.

Our parallel objectives, our long history of affiliation, and the success of our existing joint programs were the basis for Mount Zion's initiation of integration discussions with the University.

Q. What changes at the Mount Zion site are envisioned as a result of the integration proposal?

A. The short-range program (between the date of agreement and 1996) would permit UCSF to make the capital investments necessary to initiate several new patient care programs at Mount Zion and to develop outpatient and research space for faculty physicians who would practice here. Programs envisioned include an enhanced comprehensive cancer program, expanded inpatient psychiatric beds, and a new program in pediatric rehabilitation for children who need special care after surgery or after discharge from intensive care units.

Under the long-range program (1996-2010), UCSF foresees the need for phased construction of a hospital facility that would permit Mount Zion to modernize highly specialized diagnostic and treatment services and to place all licensed beds in service. Because most of Mount Zion's hospital facilities are over 40 years old, Mount Zion is already encountering problems in making aging building systems support current patient care needs. To accommodate increasingly sophisticated ventilation systems, new hospitals are being built with floor-to-ceiling heights several feet higher than those currently available at Mount Zion. Current seismic standards are also considerably more rigorous than when Mount Zion's main hospital buildings were built.
In addition to needed hospital engineering changes, over the next 20 years there may well be changes in the configuration of radiology suites, operating rooms, critical care areas and nursing units that cannot be accommodated by renovating existing facilities. It would only be prudent for UCSF, or any other partner that Mount Zion might have chosen, to assume that a substantial hospital modernization program at Mount Zion would be necessary by the beginning of the next century.

The Executive Summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report, dated September 22, 1989, contains more detail about the foreseeable changes. Copies are available from Public Affairs at Mount Zion.

Q. Why is an environmental impact report (EIR) necessary?

A. The integration agreement must be approved by both the Mount Zion Board of Directors and The Regents of the University of California. Since the University of California is a state agency, actions by The Regents are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA was developed to inform the public and decision makers of the environmental consequences of proposed projects. Because activity at the Mount Zion site could intensify, it could have an impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The draft EIR, prepared by UCSF to conform with CEQA requirements, presents the environmental impacts, the level of significance of those impacts, mitigation measures, the level of significance after implementation of the mitigation measures, and alternatives to the project. These impacts are summarized in the Executive Summary of the draft EIR, dated September 22, 1989.

Q. If the integration proposal is approved, would Mount Zion be exempt from local ordinances?

A. Like all state agencies and organizations, such as CalTrans, the University of California is exempt from local planning jurisdiction. Under the proposed integration, Mount Zion would likewise be exempt because UCSF would assume control of the hospital. The University is subject to extensive state and federal regulation and some local ordinances. UCSF would continue to meet with local officials and neighborhood representatives to respond to their concerns about activities at Mount Zion.

Q. If UCSF ultimately assumes control of Mount Zion, how can Mount Zion maintain its Jewish identity?

A. Both Mount Zion and UCSF recognize that the University, as a public institution, must remain neutral regarding religious issues. This is why Mount Zion Health Systems, Inc., and its board of directors would exist separately from the integration to raise and designate funds for programs serving Jewish patients, doctors, staff and the community at Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center.
Q. What will happen to Mount Zion's employees if the integration with UCSF moves forward?

A. All Mount Zion employees would eventually become UCSF employees. The transfer would be expected to occur in mid-1992. Mount Zion staff would retain their rate of pay, vacation and sick leave banks. Their length of service would be transferred for purposes of vesting in the University's retirement program and for applicability to labor contracts and various UC personnel policies. The intention of the proposed integration is to retain all Mount Zion employees and, over time, increase the total workforce here.

Unions that currently hold contracts with Mount Zion would continue to represent Mount Zion employees until the date they transfer to UC. At that time, they would be placed in appropriate UC job classifications and, where applicable, become members of UC bargaining units.

Q. Some people believe that San Francisco has too many hospitals for the existing need. If that is true, and Mount Zion's future is unstable, why is it important for Mount Zion to continue operating?

A. Mount Zion is different from most other community hospitals. It has 75 interns and residents in graduate training from schools across the U.S., including UCSF. It is one of the few training sites for postgraduate fellowships in geriatric medicine in the country. The loss of Mount Zion's nationally recognized teaching program would diminish training opportunities for physicians.

In a community survey conducted recently, it was revealed that Mount Zion is perceived and valued as a major provider of health care in San Francisco--pre-eminent in the areas of cancer, cardiology, geriatrics, obstetrics and women's health.

Further evidence of Mount Zion's stature in the community was provided earlier this year when The Baxter Foundation and the American Hospital Association named Mount Zion one of four finalists in the 1989 national competition for its prestigious Foster G. McGaw Prize, which recognizes hospitals' excellence in community service.

Q. What can members of the community do to show their support of the proposed integration with UCSF?

A. You can show your support during the required public comment period following publication of the draft environmental impact report. Before The Regents of the University of
California and the Mount Zion Board of Directors can forge an agreement for the proposed integration, comments from the public and responses to public concerns must be included in a final environmental impact report.

You can play a significant role in ensuring Mount Zion's continued service to the community by participating in a public information meeting at Mount Zion Thursday, October 19 at 6 pm in Sutter Auditorium or, more importantly, voicing your support at the formal public hearing on Wednesday, November 8, at 6 pm in Sutter Auditorium.

Additionally, support letters are strongly encouraged and should be addressed to:

David Layne  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
UCSF  
San Francisco, CA 94143-0286

Thank you for your support.
Joint Statement from Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center and UC San Francisco—September 25, 1989

Mount Zion-UC San Francisco Proposed Integration Draft Environmental Impact Report Ready; Public Meetings Scheduled

The potential environmental impacts of the proposed integration between Mount Zion and UC San Francisco are analyzed in a draft environmental impact report (DEIR), which was released to the public on Friday, September 22, 1989.

A public meeting will be held on Monday, September 25 at 6 pm to summarize the DEIR and to explain the EIR process. A public information meeting will be held on Thursday, October 19 at 6 pm to give those interested an opportunity to ask questions about the EIR.

A formal public hearing on the EIR is scheduled for Wednesday, November 8, from 6 to 10 pm. The final EIR will respond to comments delivered at the public hearing, as well as those submitted in writing.

All the meetings will be held in the Sutter Auditorium at Mount Zion, 1st floor, Sutter Building, 1600 Divisadero.
DEAR SAC MEMBERS:

Please take a moment to review the attached letter from Dr. Karl Hittleman about Secretary of the Department of Health & Human Services Dr. Louis W. Sullivan's outspoken commitment on the use of animals in research.

I would urge those of you who are interested to write to Secretary Sullivan and send a copy of your letter to Dr. Hittleman's office. Please feel free to circulate the attached to the staff in your offices.

Sincerely,

Kathleen A. Balestreri
Chair
June 11, 1990

TO PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS WITH C.A.R. APPROVALS:

On Thursday, June 8, 1990, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis W. Sullivan, issued one of the strongest defenses of the use of animals in research that has yet been issued by an official in the Bush administration. Describing himself as "angry" at the so-called animal rights movement, Secretary Sullivan accused activists of being "on the wrong side of morality." Speaking only three days before a march on Washington scheduled by the movement, he noted that, "Without one monumental medical advance achieved through animal research, at least a few of those marching would likely not be able to walk at all. A cure for polio would not have been found."

Secretary Sullivan is the highest-level health official in the nation to support publicly and unequivocally the continued, responsible use of animals in biomedical research. Judging by the experience of others who have spoken out, his forceful, outspoken advocacy will unquestionably result in a flood of threats, insults, and other abuse from the animal rights movement. Therefore, it is very important that the research community write to the Secretary and commend him for his action. In a very real sense, he has put himself in an exposed position for the biomedical research community, and our support of him will be very important.

You can write to Secretary Sullivan as follows:

Secretary Louis Sullivan  
Department of Health and Human Services  
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20201

Please write to him as soon as possible, and, if you would, send a copy of your letter to this office. Thank you.

Karl J. Hittelman, Ph.D.

cc: Chancellor Julius R. Krevans  
Senior Vice Chancellor David J. Ramsay
Joint Statement from Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center
and UC San Francisco—September 25, 1989

MOUNT ZION-UC SAN FRANCISCO INTEGRATION WILL ACHIEVE MANY BENEFITS
FOR THE CITY AND THE REGION

The vision of integrating Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center with the
Medical Center at UC-San Francisco paints a picture of a thriving, community-
based, acute care hospital with enhanced patient care, teaching and research
programs that will significantly add to the health and well-being of San
Francisco and Northern California, as well as to the Western Addition.

The proposed integration would have the following benefits for the community:

1. Preserve Mount Zion as a premier community-based acute care
   teaching hospital.

   Mount Zion is not financially able to maintain its 102-year mission
   as an acute care hospital, committed to patient care, teaching,
   research and community service, without a long-term partner.

   The Mount Zion board of directors has an obligation to hold the
   hospital in trust for the benefit of the community and, in doing so,
   the directors also are obliged to make certain that the hospital
   remains a distinctive provider of healthcare services in San
   Francisco.

   When the board conducted a detailed review of Mount Zion's strengths
   and limitations, it concluded that a formal and permanent
   relationship with UCSF would allow Mount Zion to meet its mission by
   offering and expanding excellent primary and secondary medical
   services in a caring and personalized setting which also has a
   strong teaching component.

   It would also allow Mount Zion to meet its continuing obligation to
   the Jewish community and its immediate neighbors.

2. Create a comprehensive cancer program.

   The combined resources of the two institutions' outstanding cancer
   programs would serve Northern California in ways that neither could
   accomplish alone. It would combine clinical teaching and research
   programs of the UCSF Cancer Research Institute, Haas Radiation
   Oncology Center and Brain Tumor Research Institute with the
   radiation and medical oncology treatment facilities at Mount Zion's
   Claire Zellerbach Saroni Tumor Institute. It would also offer
   opportunities for close collaboration with some of UCSF's basic
   scientists (including those who discovered the role of the
Integration will achieve many benefits for city oncogene. For instance, a program at Mount Zion emphasizing the diagnosis and treatment of solid tumors such as lung cancer or breast cancer could complement UCSF's strengths in leukemias, lymphomas and pediatric cancer treatment. As such, the two institutions will have much greater power in the fight against all types of cancer.

3. Improve and expand services available for psychiatric patients.

The integrated program would increase the number of inpatient psychiatric beds at Mount Zion from 16 to 33, thereby expanding available facilities in San Francisco for severely ill psychiatric patients. Patients who receive emergency treatment in the Mount Zion Crisis Clinic and need to be hospitalized would not have to be transported to other, overcrowded San Francisco facilities.

4. Preserve and expand comprehensive programs developed at Mount Zion for the elderly.

Nearly 20 percent of San Franciscans are over the age of 60 -- twice the national average. The elderly, with their complex array of health problems, is the fastest growing segment of the population and account for 30 percent of the nation's annual health care bill. Since the 1950s, Mount Zion has been a national leader in developing programs for the elderly, from establishing the first hospital-based home care program on the West Coast to opening an innovative day care center for Alzheimer's patients. Mount Zion and UCSF already have established the Center for Aging Services Research.

UCSF has established a new division of geriatrics and gerontology in collaboration with Mount Zion, which has its Center for Biomedical Research located on the Mount Zion site. The center is studying such problems as Alzheimer's disease, cancer, coronary artery disease and other disorders that affect the elderly. These joint programs supplement the 17 outreach and education programs provided by Mount Zion's San Francisco Institute on Aging.

5. Strengthen the region's pediatric services.

The pediatric department at UCSF has led the nation in many developments, including the treatment for respiratory distress syndrome, one of the major killers of premature infants, the treatment of pediatric cancers and leukemia (including bone marrow transplant), growth hormone and endocrine disorders, fetal problems, and pediatric AIDS. UCSF physicians have pioneered in pediatric heart surgery and neurosurgery. With integration, Mount Zion and UCSF plan to develop an even stronger pediatric program, including continued development of a joint program to care for very sick newborns as well as a new rehabilitation program for children who need special care after surgery or after discharge from intensive care units.
6. **Provide continued access to high quality health care for the economically disadvantaged.**

For more than 100 years, Mount Zion has been recognized as a leading provider of care for San Francisco's indigent. It supports 24 different outpatient clinics, including the prenatal program for expectant mothers and the teenage mothers program. It was one of four finalists for the prestigious Foster G. McGaw Prize in 1989, a national competition recognizing hospitals for excellence in community service.

UCSF also has an impressive record of contributing to the care of the poor and economically disadvantaged. The Medical Center at the UCSF Parnassus Heights campus hospitalizes more patients without insurance or on Medi-Cal than any other San Francisco hospital except SFCH (and UCSF faculty and house staff provide the patient care and teaching at that institution and the VAMC as well). 26% of UCSF's Med Center inpatients are on Medicare; 17% on Medi-Cal.

The UCSF campus as a whole also provides an enormous number of outreach programs. Among those listed in the "UCSF in the Community" directory are: Adolescent School Programs; Early Outreach Program for minority students; Well-Child Care in SF Bayview District; Hispanic, Asian and Senior Health Fairs; and the Mobile Low-Cost Mammography Screening Program.

By strengthening Mount Zion's financial viability, the integration would allow Mount Zion to continue to offer access to high quality health care to the economically disadvantaged.

7. **Maintain current Mount Zion research with new opportunities for collaboration.**

Unlike most community hospitals, Mount Zion maintains a significant level of research; approximately $4 million a year is awarded Mount Zion researchers in grants supporting biomedical and social sciences research.

Basic biological and clinical research at Mount Zion includes such diverse areas of study as child development, infectious diseases, and diabetes. Investigations of effective methods for delivering health services to the elderly have attracted substantial support from federal funds and private foundations. These studies may have significant impact on thousands of future Medicare clients. The diabetes and endocrine research laboratory has earned an international reputation for its investigations on how hormones affect cell function and contribute to disease. Mount Zion is currently involved in numerous studies investigating the efficacy of various drugs in the treatment of AIDS.

UCSF and Mount Zion share the mission of continuing excellence in health-related research. An integration would only strengthen and unify research efforts. The UCSF School of Medicine comes to the union as the institution receiving the most NIH funding for research in the country for the 16th year in a row.
8. **Improve physical facilities at the Mount Zion site.**

Mount Zion does not have funds to renovate or replace its aging physical plant. The integration would infuse capital that would allow Mount Zion to upgrade and modernize its facilities, replace buildings that are at the end of their useful lives, and acquire new equipment which would enhance existing services.

9. **Stimulate economic growth.**

By restoring Mount Zion to its former occupancy levels and expanding patient care, teaching and research activities, the integration could provide additional employment and training opportunities at Mount Zion. It would also create jobs and a demand for retail services in the neighborhood.

10. **Make efficient use of health care resources.**

Common management and financial control of Mount Zion Hospital and UCSF offer several desirable operational advantages. By combining the resources of the two medical centers, UCSF would have the flexibility to base decisions about the location of clinical services upon patient care and academic program needs, rather than upon only financial or management considerations. By pooling reserve funds, UCSF could fund the highest priority capital needs at both facilities. Common University control would also create potential for consolidation of administrative and support services. In addition, because staff in both settings would be University employees, current and future shortages of certain health professionals could be addressed in flexible recruitment, retention and staffing plans.

11. **Maintain UCSF as one of the leading academic medical centers in the United States.**

The proposed integration would provide UCSF with the physical facilities necessary to recruit and retain highly qualified faculty physicians for patient care, teaching, and research; offer patients the most advanced techniques available for diagnosis and treatment; and provide the clinical experiences necessary to offer the highest quality of training to health professionals who are the next generation of practitioners needed to meet community health needs.

UCSF has a need for additional space, both to recruit new faculty who are pioneering new techniques and to retain faculty who have created clinical programs that now need room to function with the new requirements for equipment and staff. To capitalize on the new understandings and possibilities created by current research, additional faculty must be recruited in fields that have not previously existed. In 1980, for example, no one could have foreseen the explosion in both patient care and research in response to the AIDS epidemic.
12. Improve the educational opportunities for the next generation of health care professionals.

Development of a comprehensive teaching program at Mount Zion would enhance the training that UCSF offers to health professional students.

The Medical Center at UCSF has become a highly specialized referral center, and UCSF's education experiences at San Francisco General Hospital and the Veteran's Administration Medical Center tend to concentrate on the types of care required by their special missions and patient populations. The proposed UCSF/Mount Zion integration would give UCSF students and house staff a more comprehensive training program and the opportunity to care for patients with the common diseases and illnesses they will treat when they establish their practices in the community.

###
Walter Hoadley: Senior research fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. New president of the alumni association at the University of California, Berkeley. A director of Transcisco Industries Inc. Chosen as the new board member of PLM International Inc. as part of a settlement to end the feud between PLM and Transcisco, both San Francisco companies.

Former chief economist at Bank of America. Former chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank in Philadelphia. Member of numerous local, national and international committees.

Raised in San Francisco during the Great Depression. One of 15 students from his graduating class of 300 at Mission High to attend college. Thankful for it.

On shooting from the hip

"We don't do anything in America by thoughtful consideration and careful planning," Hoadley says. "We shoot from the hip. But the one thing that is the common trigger is always the crisis. People who can't agree on anything will find something in common when the results of ignoring (an issue) get so bad that doing something is better than not doing something.

"You have to do a little crisis forecasting to get anyone's attention," Hoadley continues, sitting in the fifth floor office reserved for former executives at the Bank of America building in San Francisco.

"Always America has responded to crisis. Americans won't spend time on an issue until they get hurt. And the media won't pay attention to a crisis until they can see it and then it becomes good news."

On what happens anyway

"But because of this reactive/crisis orientation, I don't think that we're doing a very good job of presenting the collision course constructively in ample time to avoid the collision."

"Any effort to correct (a problem) is always defeated on the grounds of (one exception or another) until it gets so bad the public rises up and then you do what you should have done before and maybe avoided it. Maybe that's why I'm a crisis forecaster — because when there's no other alternative, something happens."

More...
a relatively short period of time, which means most will ignore it until it all suddenly hits them and then they want 'to do something about it.' And they won't know what that is.

"At any rate, it all comes down to the fact that of the issues that affect America, particularly in the West, particularly in California and particularly in the Bay Area, this one will make or break, in my judgement, the future ability of the economy to develop and provide growth and reasonable progress benefiting the community and people generally. That being the issue, whatever time and energy I have, I'll get to know people and be a facilitator if I can.

"(We must) provide some basis for people seeing, frankly, the consequences of failure."

Diversity is a major issue for the whole UC system and one that by which we are measured externally. Perhaps the staff educator committee can look at this issue.
Dear Neighbor,

RE: University of California San Francisco Environmental Impact Report on Proposed Integration with Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center

This is to let you know about the timetable for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that UCSF is preparing on its proposed integration with Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center and the process and meeting schedule for public comment.

The Regents of the University of California have reviewed an outline of the proposed integration and have directed that an EIR be prepared based on the potential for the integration to generate significant environmental effects. The Mount Zion board was unanimous in its support of the proposed integration at its March, 1989 meeting. Certification of the EIR by the Regents would precede any final decision between Mount Zion and the University on the agreement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) will be available as of Friday, September 22, 1989 at 10:00 am. The release of the DEIR on that date begins the 60-day public review period, running through November 21. During this period you may attend two public information meetings to learn more about the project and a public hearing to make us aware of any concerns you may have. Comments on the DEIR, either submitted in writing during the public review period, or delivered orally at the November 8 public hearing, will become part of, and be responded to in, the Final EIR that is submitted to the Regents for certification.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1989: DEIR AVAILABLE - UCSF PROPOSED INTEGRATION WITH MOUNT ZION HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER
A copy of the DEIR may be picked up at the Information Desk at Moffitt Hospital, 505 Parnassus. (You may park briefly in the circular driveway.) In addition copies will be available for review at the following libraries:
- Main Library Civic Center, Larkin and McAllister
- Presidio Branch at 3150 Sacramento Street
- Richmond Branch at 351 Ninth Avenue or
- Western Addition Branch at 1550 Scott Street

SEPTEMBER 25, 1989: PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING-MT. ZION AUDITORIUM
A review of the DEIR (copies of the DEIR will be available)
1600 Divisadero, 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm

OCTOBER 19, 1989: PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING - MT. ZION AUDITORIUM
Discussion with the community on the DEIR
1600 Divisadero, 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm

NOVEMBER 8, 1989: FORMAL PUBLIC HEARING - MT. ZION AUDITORIUM
1600 Divisadero, 6:00 pm - 10:00 pm

Letters of support and/or concern during the 60-day public comment period may be sent to:
David Layne, UCSF, Millberry Union 4th Floor West, San Francisco, CA 94143-0286.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely Yours,

Bruce W. Spaulding
Vice Chancellor
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 4, 1989
MU, East Wing, Room 252

Members In Attendance: Kathy Balestreri - Chair, Bart Cohen, Nancy Cox, Karen Eldred, Linda Erkelens, Michele Graf, Marsha Guggenheim, Martha Hooven, May Huang, Helga Justman, Ron Kos, Carolyn Koster, Steve Leonoudakis, Loretta Maddux, Karen Mah-Hing, Valli McDougle, Karen Newhouse, Trinity Ordona, Anne Poirier, Dorothy Price, Steve Reynolds, Isabel Roma, Elenor Shimosaka, Chris Slaboszewicz, Christine Yee, Fred McEnroe - Staff

Liaisons: Barbara Atkinson, Community and Governmental Relations

Members Absent: Ethel Adams, Suzanne Gottschalk, Miles Hamada, Al Minvielle, John O'Connor, Deborah Pauley, Eunice Redondo, Eugene Salazar, Byron Sigal, Susan Stevens, Margaret Warren, Barbara Wilson

The meeting was brought to order by Kathy Balestreri at 12:05.

Kathy called for additions or corrections to the September 6 minutes. No additions or corrections were requested and the minutes were approved as presented.

Discussion of Mt. Zion Information Meetings

Kathy introduced Barbara Atkinson who discussed the Public Information Meeting of September 25 at Mt. Zion and the Campus Information Meeting of September 27 at Cole Hall. She said that both meetings were successful from UCSF's point of view. Several members of the community who have traditionally opposed UCSF were at the first meeting; however, since this was basically a "walk-thru" of the DEIR, the real test will come on October 19 after all participants have had a chance to carefully read through the DEIR. Likely problem areas are research and the planned increase of space at the Mt. Zion site.

Barbara said that much work is being done to prepare for the October 19 meeting and she hopes that SAC will continue to take an active role in recruiting people to attend the meeting. Several requests were made by SAC members for a short, one-page summary statement on the Mt. Zion DEIR that could be used in discussions with other staff members. Barbara said that she would check her files and send a packet of information to all SAC members. Valli McDougle said that the phone network worked well and they will try to make it even more efficient for the next go-around.

Sub-Committee Reports

Information and Advocacy. Carolyn Koster described the experiences of SAC members working with the telephone tree. Many people contacted were not aware of the Mt. Zion meeting at all and were not feeling connected to the issue. There seemed to be a definite problem in getting the information out through official channels. Also, it was very difficult to reach people and the process was quite time consuming. For the next go-around, the committee hopes
to use E-mail and voice mail as well, and would also like to have SAC members make commitments to get people to the meeting.

The I & A Committee stressed that the network is a supplement to already existing lines of communication for the Campus. Members of the Committee were concerned that there was no formal campus communication from the Chancellor about the public hearing schedule. Barbara Atkinson suggested that SAC raise these concerns in a letter to the Chancellor requesting him to encourage the deans, directors and department chairs to take a more active role in presenting the issues and in encouraging the interest and concern of their staff members. Kathy asked the I & A committee to draft such a letter.

Trinity Ordona suggested that a key requirement for successful managers in the 1990s will be political acuity and an understanding of the political aspects of such processes as the development of environmental impact reports. A suggestion was made that SAC involve ABOG, MAG and the UCSF Council in discussions about development of educational sessions for this and future campus related issues. The Staff Education Committee will follow-up.

Michele Graf suggested that the Intercom could be used to get information out to campus managers and supervisors if it is provided within the publication deadlines.

Staff Education. Anne Poirier discussed the distribution of the 125th poster to neighborhood merchants and recounted several interesting experiences had by SAC members in the process. Overall it was a positive experience interacting with the merchants.

Community Outreach. Chris Yee said that all the toys from the drive were finally distributed. In total we collected over 25 barrels of toys, which went to centers all over the city. The next community outreach project is the San Francisco Food Bank Drive, which will probably take place during the first two weeks of December.

In closing, Kathy said that the previously distributed "membership expectations" and the goals and objectives of SAC will be one of the topics of discussion at a future meeting.

REMINDER:
Oct 19 - Mt. Zion DEIR Pub. Info. Mtg. at Mt. Zion, 6 - 7:30 p.m.
Nov 8 - Public Hearing at Mt. Zion, 6 - 10 p.m.
Oct 23 - Laurel Hts. Campus Info. Mtg. at UCSF, 12 Noon - 1:30 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: November 1st, 12 Noon - 1:00 p.m., Room S-118

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Fred McEnroe, October 5, 1989.
October 12, 1989

TO: Thena Trygstad  
Vice Chancellor, Personnel and Student Services

FROM: Carolyn Koster  
Department Manager; Stomatology

Valli T. McDougle  
Executive Assistant to the Dean  
Office of the Dean, School of Medicine

As co-chairs of the Information and Advocacy Subcommittee, Staff Advisory Committee (SAC), we are following up on the status of the proposal for a campus "hotline" which was developed by our subcommittee and submitted for your and Assistant Chancellor Reichman's review in February 1989.

We received a copy of your memo to Assistant Chancellor Reichman endorsing the proposal and agreeing that her office was the appropriate organizational unit for such an activity. Except for your memo, we have not received any additional formal communication on the status of the proposal.

We all still feel very strongly that the hotline is an idea that should be tried and that News and Public Information Services is the appropriate place for it. We would appreciate your support of this goal.

CK/arb

cc: Information and Advocacy Subcommittee  
Kathleen A. Balestreri, Chair, Staff Advisory Committee
October 24, 1989

To: Paula Schultz S-24
Fred McEnroe S-24
Karen Eldred S-20
Steve Reynolds S-20
Janet Norton S-20
Valli McDougle S-224
Isabel Roma S-257
Carolyn Koster S-612
David Santos S-630
Trinity Ordona S-834
Barbara Wilson S-926

From: Marsha Guggenheim SAC Staff Education Subcommittee

Re: Earthquake Awareness and Preparedness
Friday, October 27, Noon to One HSW 302

Your help is needed! The attached fliers need to be distributed today. Please post them on bulletin boards, pass them out to your coworkers, and encourage people to attend. We hope you'll be able to attend. Bring questions to start the ball rolling.

If you have any questions, please call me at x63883 or Anne Poirier at x67033. Thank you.
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)
Information & Advocacy Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 3, 1989

Present: C. Koster, Co-Chair; B. Cohen, K. Eldred, L. Erkelens, M. Hooven, K. Newhouse, I. Romo, C. Slaboszewicz

Absent: V. McDougle, Co-Chair; D. Price, S. Stevens, M. Warren, B. Wilson

Comments on Using the Telephone Tree

L. Erkelens reported that the non-SAC contacts on her list knew very little about Mt. Zion. She used the opportunity to inform them of the issues and get them interested. Some non-Medical Center employees seemed to feel that the outcome of the Mt. Zion EIR impacts on the Medical Center only. This raised the question as to whether organizational channels are being used to communicate the importance of the Mt. Zion EIR process, i.e. Chancellor to Senior Officers to Department Chairs. Everyone agreed that SAC and the Information and Advocacy Subcommittee could act only as an adjunct to regular means of communication.

Other comments related to telephone tag problems. Since groups were assigned by physical location, some people found it easier to just walk around and talk to the people assigned to them. Information on which contacts are accessible by either e-mail or voice mail will be collected on the next round of calls.

There was discussion about whether notices of EIR meetings could be included in CMS news. A question was raised as to what had become of the campus telephone hot line proposal. It was agreed that a follow-up letter regarding the status of that proposal would be sent from the subcommittee.

Another question was raised as to the status of the SAC invitation to President Gardner to come to campus to speak in conjunction with the 125th. No one at the meeting knew the answer and it was suggested that the question be raised at the general SAC meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDougle</td>
<td>2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooven</td>
<td>5904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleguas</td>
<td>2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustafson</td>
<td>5050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang</td>
<td>1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>0938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messner</td>
<td>2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moeglein</td>
<td>2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisa</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Halloran</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poirier</td>
<td>7033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semonoff</td>
<td>3013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>4592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balestreri</td>
<td>2316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battles</td>
<td>9436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deppe</td>
<td>5716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donoff</td>
<td>5734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamada</td>
<td>4815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen-Nealey</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janvrin</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizzo</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee</td>
<td>4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nattkemper</td>
<td>4680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)
### TELEPHONE TREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>7625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antolin</td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casella</td>
<td>5266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimosaka</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>3960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhouse</td>
<td>8974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonoudakis</td>
<td>1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddux</td>
<td>6774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezey</td>
<td>7715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minvielle</td>
<td>8683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaboszewicz</td>
<td>8095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>821-8317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emelia</td>
<td>3749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>2515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janssen</td>
<td>5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaffrey</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo</td>
<td>821-8822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koster</td>
<td>5415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>0539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaustro</td>
<td>4510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foree</td>
<td>4292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottschalk</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim</td>
<td>3883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magram</td>
<td>5293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauley</td>
<td>8808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelzner</td>
<td>5667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>0991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>0544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afshari</td>
<td>8907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>3206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justman</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehrer</td>
<td>3939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Conner</td>
<td>3295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>8724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>4373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigal</td>
<td>1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trawick</td>
<td>3939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romo</td>
<td>8112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>4859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinyaou</td>
<td>2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEnroe</td>
<td>5186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordona</td>
<td>8180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>2737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechan</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldred</td>
<td>2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>3876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakashige</td>
<td>2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td>2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerson</td>
<td>2742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazola</td>
<td>5456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente-Lambert</td>
<td>3905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>3905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst</td>
<td>4502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockner</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>4665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>6796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkelens</td>
<td>4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou</td>
<td>2958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>7908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>5425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>8449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickler</td>
<td>6796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinnett</td>
<td>3890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: MEMBERS OF THE CHANCELLOR'S STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: KATHLEEN BALESTRERI, CHAIR

RE: November 1st General Membership Meeting

The next SAC general meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 1st from 12:00 Noon - 1:00 p.m. in Room S-118 (no room change this time, I promise!!!)

AGENDA

1. Review and correction of minutes of October 4th Meeting.

2. Chair's Report

3. Subcommittee Reports
   
   A. Staff Education - Results of Earthquake Awareness and Preparedness Session held on October 27th.
   
   B. Community Outreach - Update on Food Drive
   
   C. Information & Advocacy - Update on mobilization of staff for MZ/LH EIR Public Information Meetings; President Gardner's visit to the Campus

4. Liaison Reports

5. Discussion of Agenda for SAC General Meeting with Vice Chancellor Trygstad on December 6th

cc: Barbara Atkinson
    Janet Norton
    Paula Schultz
Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)
Information and Advocacy Subcommittee
Agenda

November 7, 1989

1. Review and correction of minutes of October 3, 1989 meeting.
2. Mt. Zion EIR meeting Wed., November 8, 6:00 p.m. Laurel Hts.
3. Updated telephone tree.
4. Open Agenda.
SAC FOOD DRIVE
CHRISTMAS 1988

TO: CAN FOOD DRIVE VOLUNTEER
FROM: ELENOR SHIMOSAKA AND CHRISTINE YEE
RE: COORDINATION FOR 2ND ANNUAL FOOD DRIVE
DATE: NOVEMBER 1, 1989

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION IN OUR CHRISTMAS FOOD DRIVE TO HELP THE SAN FRANCISCO FOOD BANK PROVIDE FOOD FOR NON-PROFIT AGENCIES TO FEED THE NEEDY. WE KNOW WE STILL HAVE VERY LITTLE TIME TO COORDINATE SUCH A BIG EFFORT--BUT IN THE SPIRIT OF THE GIVING, WE WANT TO SHARE TOGETHER AGAIN!

OUR COMMITTEE IS IN NEED OF YOUR FULLEST COOPERATION TO MAKE THIS ACTIVITY A SUCCESS. THE SAN FRANCISCO FOOD BANK ENLISTED THE HELP OF THE TEAMSTERS TO DELIVER BARRELS FOR THE FOOD DRIVE...40 IS WHAT WE WERE ASSIGNED LAST YEAR AND WE FILLED 26 BARREL (MAKING US NUMBER 3 IN THE CITY/AND JUST 3 BARRELS BEHIND NUMBER 2!) UNLESS WE GIVE THEM SPECIFIC INFORMATION, THEY WILL LEAVE ALL THE CANS ON OUR FRONT DOOR! THE DROP-OFF WILL OCCUR ON IN THE EARLY DECEMBER. WE NEED TO PREPARE FOR A BIG KICK-OFF! GIVE US A DATE TODAY PLEASE!!!

WE MUST SUBMIT A DETAILED MAP OF LOCATIONS AND PLACEMENT OF THE CANS TO THE FOOD BANK BY NOVEMBER 17TH.

WE NEED YOU TO FILL OUT THIS INFORMATION SHEET AND SUBMIT A MAP AND BARREL MONITOR AS TO WHERE YOU WANT THE CAN(S) LOCATED AND WHO WE CAN CONTACT ON A REGULAR BASIS. WE ARE
ALSO ASKING YOU TO MONITOR AND EMPTY THE CANS THROUGHOUT THE DRIVE. IF THEY ARE FILLED TO THE BRIM ON THE FIRST DAY, WE NEED TO IDENTIFY A CENTRAL LOCATION TO STORE THE FOOD. VOLUNTEERS?! A FILLED BARRELWEIGHTS APPROXIMATELY 225 POUNDS AND IT WILL BE DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO CARRY IT TO THE FRONT DOOR.

WE NEED VOLUNTEERS FOR THIS COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROJECT. A SIGN-UP LIST WILL BE CIRCULATED TODAY. ADD FRIENDS AND OTHER DEPARTMENT MEMBERS!

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CALL ELLY AT X2800 OR CHRIS AT X5683 (PAGER-739-9232)

THANKS FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
SAC 2ND ANNUAL FOOD DRIVE

COMMUNITY OUTREACH WISH LIST

****************

MARKETING FOLKS AND FLYER MAKER

POSTER FOR BARREL MAKERS

BARREL PREP WORKERS

MONEY FOR FLYER

DEPARTMENT GO-GETTERS

BOOSTERS

BARREL VOLUNTEER

BUILDING REPRESENTATIVE

ROOMS / SPACE / STORAGE

MEETING SPACE

FOOD

CANNED GOODS

PEOPLE POWER

HELP!!!

Thanks
CORPORATE CHALLENGE
FOOD DRIVE FACTS

What Is the Corporate Challenge Food Drive?

The Corporate Challenge Food Drive is an effort by Bay Area companies and organizations to collect canned or dried foods to donate to local food banks.

In San Francisco, we are hoping to enlist over 100 companies and organizations to operate their own food drives on our behalf. We will provide support to the various companies as needed, including delivering and picking up food barrels. We ask that companies schedule their drives between December 12 and December 16 in order to be part of the KSFO/KYA radio promotion.

Where Does the Food Go?

The food collected will be given to needy San Francisco residents through our 100 agencies, including soup kitchens, emergency shelters, and child care programs among others. In addition, some of the food will be used to supplement our Brown Bag Program, which provides food to 330 senior citizens weekly.

Why Now?

The holidays are a time of giving, but there is also a practical reason for food drives at this time. The Food Bank receives food donations throughout the year from large corporations, wholesalers, and retailers. During the winter months the demand for canned and dried food increases because fresh produce is less accessible and because more people with seasonal jobs are out of work. High quality canned food is vital to those people served by the Food Bank at this time.

What Kind of Food is Best?

We need food from all four of the basic food groups. Suggested items are:

Canned meat (such as ham, tuna, sardines, stew, and chili), canned nuts, canned or dried beans, peanut butter, condensed or evaporated milk, canned pudding or custard, canned or dried fruit, canned fruit juice, canned vegetables, soups, spaghetti sauce, pasta, dry cereal (such as bran, wheat, rice or oatmeal), rice rice cakes, baking mix, Bisquick, muffin or pancake mix, cornmeal.
DETAILS

Planning for The Food Drive

1. Pick the date and duration of your food drive. Call Judy at the Food Bank (957-1076) by November 15 to arrange for barrel delivery.

2. If you are a large corporation, divide your organization by floor, building, department, etc. You may want to have different departments compete against one another to bring in more food.

3. Notify your employees about the food drive, including dates, what kind of food to bring, where to bring it, and any special company policies. Distribute Food Drive Facts to your employees.

4. Put up signs and publicize a suggested food list. You might also want to offer incentives, such as 49er football tickets or comp time, to employees who bring in the most food.

During the Food Drive

1. Set a goal for your drive. Keep a chart indicating how many pounds have been donated by each employee. You can estimate poundage by reading the can labels.

2. You might want to hold a holiday office party during the food drive, and ask employees to bring their food donations then.

3. Once your barrel is full, call the Food Bank to arrange a pick-up. We are happy to pick up and drop off barrels. However, if you are able to do this yourself, we would greatly appreciate the help during this busy time.

4. Use this time to inform your employees of the problem of hunger in San Francisco and elsewhere, and of our programs at the Food Bank. Please call us if you need help.

Other Ideas

1. Use a slogan that ties your company to the food drive.
2. Send out a press release to notify the media of your participation in the food drive.
3. Take a tour of the Food Bank, or arrange for a speaker.
4. Ask your company to "match" the donated food; for example, you could donate a dollar amount for every 100 pounds of food collected.
HUNGER AND THE ROLE OF THE FOOD BANK

Despite the obvious prosperity of the Bay Area, over 450,000 people in the Bay Area seek emergency aid from food banks each month. In 1986, The Mayor's Task Force on Food and Hunger found that 25% of the population of San Francisco alone (approximately 162,800 people) lives near or below poverty level. Most of these people are children and senior citizens.

The San Francisco Food Bank is dedicated to alleviating hunger by salvaging large quantities of edible but unsalable food that would otherwise be discarded by the food industry. We receive dented and mislabelled canned food from local food manufacturers and grocery chains as well as donated gifts from individuals in the community. The food is redistributed to over 100 agencies providing emergency on-site and food box programs serving San Francisco's needy. The Food Bank is a member of Second Harvest, the national food bank network which standardizes local food banking practices to conform to food industry health and safety requirements.

If you are interested in donating food, money or time to the Food Bank, please call us at 957-1076. The rewards are as satisfying as the need is great.
The attached flyer announces the S.F. Supervisorial Candidate Forums from 12 - 1 PM October 4 in Toland Hall and October 11 in the Millberry Union Conference Center.

During the last general SAC meeting Meredith Michaels outlined that this is an especially exciting and crucial race, as five Board seats are up and only two incumbents are running. This means that we have the opportunity to elect three new members, which could significantly change the character of the Board. It is important for the campus community to learn the candidates' views so we can make informed decisions on election day.

Please circulate this flyer around your department, and encourage a large attendance by faculty, staff and trainees: try to commit at least 5 people to accompany you. A substantial turnout at these functions will communicate to the candidates that UCSF has a voice to be heard.

Also, please come prepared to participate - prepare questions and don't be afraid to ask them!

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me. Thanks for your support.
The Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee Sponsors

AN INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH

PRESIDENT DAVID P. GARDNER

Monday, December 17th
12 Noon — 1 PM in Cole Hall

For further information call Anne Poirier ext. 7033
TO: All SAC Members

FR: Karen Newhouse, Chair

RE: 502-NEWS

Just a gentle reminder to encourage each of you to dial 2-NEWS (2-6397) daily. Please encourage fellow employees, family and friends to call in also. In the first 1.5 weeks only 92 calls were made to the hotline.
EAST BAY FIRE RELIEF DONATIONS

UCSF Family - Helping Our Community

The recent fire in the East Bay has resulted in many members of the UCSF Family and others losing their homes.

THE CHANCELLORS STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC) is organizing a collection of unused household items.

Date: November 1, 1991 - November 29, 1991

Items suggested for Donation

Δ Household Items
Δ Bedding
Δ Clothing, packaged undergarments, socks, "bearly" worn clothing
Δ "Bearly" used children toys and books

Where to Donate?

Bring your donations to any of these Authorized Locations:

1) Police Department
   Parnassus Campus
   Millberry Union West "G" Level

2) Police Department
   Mission Center Building
   1st Floor

3) Personnel Department
   Laguna Honda School
   1st Floor

4) Mt. Zion, UCSF
   Security Office - 1st Floor
   Next to Emergency Dept.
   Sutter St Entrance

Following distribution of items to the UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students, items will be donated to others at UCB, and the remainder to the Salvation Army.

SAC Contact Person: Christine Yee, 476-5683

Hotline News:

The UCSF Hotline Telephone: 502-NEWS will provide information regarding employee assistance and other relevant employee information and updates.

The Chancellors' Staff Advisory Committee thanks you for your donations and supporting members of the UCSF Family in their time of need.

Sincerely,

Staff Advisory Committee
May 6, 1992

Memo To: Committee Members
From: Nancy L. Heller for Duffy Price

We apologize for having to cancel our May 6th meeting due to the Cinco de Mayo celebration, but we have rescheduled the next SAC meeting as follows:

Day: Wednesday
Date: June 3, 1992
Time: 12 noon to 1:30pm
Location: Millberry West - 3rd Floor
Conference Room #301

Our guest speaker will be Ms. Judith Woodard, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Public Affairs.

Please try to attend this important meeting. If you are unable to attend, kindly call me on ext. 6-3206.

:nh

cc: Orlando Elizondo
Janet Norton
Brenda Patterson
Paula Carien Schultz
Judith Woodard
SAC - VOLUNTEERS NEEDED!

Bond Issue - Proposition 153

Commitment to Higher Education in the State of California

SAC Volunteers Needed to Help Educate
Our Campus Community and the Public

Please Call Orlando Elizondo
476-8431

Date   Time   Location   How Many
May 18 12n - 1pm Med Sci Lobby 2 people
May 20 12n - 1pm Med Sci Lobby 2 people
May 22 12n - 1pm Med Sci Lobby 2 people
May 27 12n - 1pm Med Sci Lobby 2 people
May 29 12n - 1pm Med Sci Lobby 2 people

May 30 Saturday 10 am - 12 n 4 each site

1) Castro Street 4 people
2) Pacific Heights - Fillmore 4 people
3) Marina Safeway 4 people
4) North Beach - Washington Square 4 people

Thank you to SAC for coming through again!
Staff Advisory Committee Meeting
April 7, 1993
Room S-118

Members in Attendance: Ethel Adams, Richard Aleguas, Bart Cohen, Karen Eldred, Lucie Faulknor (staff) May Huang, Katy Irwin, Mary Jo Kelly, Eric Koenig, Meg Kennedy, Karen Mah-Hing, Valli McDougle, Fred McEnroe, Anne Poirier, Duffy Price, Byron Sigal (Chair), Paul A. Vagadori, Ruth Weiler, Barbara Wilson, Christine Yee

Absent: Kathy Balestreri, Orlando Elizondo, Linda Erkelens, Shirley Hodges, Meg Kennedy, Loretta Maddux, Janet Norton, Beth O’Boyle, Brenda Patterson, Lorie Rice, Gemma Rieser, Isabel Romo, Gene Salazar, Elenor Shimosaka, Susan Stevens, Margaret Warren

I. Agenda

No agenda, Byron was late, Katy Irwin made the meeting roll.

II. Committee Reports

A) Empact

If anyone wants to sell or purchase raffle tickets, let Paul Vagadori know at 6-1953.

Ticket sales are way down for the Black and White Gala on Friday, April 16th. The ticket price was reduced from $20 to $12 for staff. It is no longer a benefit because they don't think they’ll be able to cover their costs.

Staff Appreciation day is April 21st. Recharge for goods are available.

A family picnic was suggested for the University.

Empact needs volunteers!

C) Budget Update

Eric Koenig, liaison for Thena Trygstad, VC-Staff & Student Human Resources. Eric said the Chancellor will be meeting soon about the new VERIP (aka, "Son of VERIP") with recommendations to the Regents.

Regarding TRIP - there is a new incentive to extend to June 1994. Minimum 10% reduction of time is required, it will make them exempt from the 5% pay cut, but the are still eligible for CAP.
D) KQED Night

Katy Irwin said everyone had a fun night at KQED. There was a full house. 37 UCSF representatives raised $28,805 for the station. UCSF was flashed on the screen several times.

E) Misc.

Karen Eldred talked about the List Services that ABOG started - they want more subscribers to keep more information flowing.

Lucie Faulknor is the Corporate Team Leader for this year's AIDS Walk. The event will take place on the 4th Sunday of July (July 25th).

Ethel Adams reports that the Gospel Choir needs members.

Byron announced that Fred McEnroe is moving to New Mexico, he will receive a gift certificate from Byron.

Katy Irwin was recognized for her wonderful flyer announcing the Chancellor's Budget Update meeting in Cole Hall. The meeting was very successful. They are looking to hook-up the other sites next time, so they will be able to phone in questions. Byron has a copy of the tape if anyone wants it.

III. Featured Speaker: Joe Mattox, PhD, Director, Staff, Faculty, & Student Assistance Program.

Joe Mattox's talk centered around the fact that the campus is changing. People are finding out that jobs are not forever. How do people cope with this change? How can SAC help?

Understanding how people cope with change is similar to the Kubla-Ross theory of the stages experienced through death and dying. Most people experience shock or surprise when a relationship is changed. Next step is disbelief/denial; when that wears off people get mad, and at times, get even. After getting mad, depression, grieving the lost object, sets in; and finally, reconciliation with the process the workplace is going through and therefore they adapt.

When someone dies or after a change there is a survivor. What are the survivors going through?
1) Sense of ambiguity. There is an information vacuum at all levels - someone fills in the information if nothing is going on - rumors begin when information is not given. Disconcerting lack of clarity about goals and directions. Can we do what we did before with less people and less money? Quality issues come up. Give the usual 150% or 120%? Do we need to revisit goals and mission in light of changes?
2) Weakening of trust level. In the beginning, forget about employees trusting you. Organizations need to regain employees trust. Eventually it will come back.

3) Self-preservation. At first people are divisive, not sharing information and thus work too hard. Definition survival in times of change. Self-preservation does not allow people to work as a team.

Organizations begin to look at departments at this point and not at individuals. It is more macro-management than micro-management.

Morale - The key to communication is to listen to your employees, communicate often and consistently. Have staff meetings with updates - they will be meeting informally anyway. You will have more control over rumors when you meet, even if you have to say, "I don't know" to some questions.

Recognize your stress level. Signs include: change in behavior, sleeping problems, a short fuse, the kids say you look bad. If you begin to experience "mental chatter," i.e., I should've exercised, I shouldn't have had that donut, etc, etc... that is an indication of being stressed-out. Remember: stress is a normal part of managing change.

To improve self-esteem, give more options. There is a way of working harder and a way of working smarter. Encourage people to work smarter. Be flexible - the tree that bends with the storm survives, the tree that doesn't breaks.

The message from the top is that we have to do business differently. We can't work like we used to.

Next SAC Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 5th, Noon to 1:30 pm in S-118.