

S U M M A R Y

Welcome and Introductions

Barbara French welcomed everyone and spoke about the changed political environment. UCSF is committed to this process and is committed to San Francisco, not just as the second largest employer, but also as a vital economic engine for the City. We want to greatly thank every member of the Dogpatch and Potrero communities who have put in a tremendous amount of work in these last few months along with City staff.

Agenda Overview and Recap of Meeting #5

Daniel Iacafano reviewed the agenda for this meeting and summarized the previous meeting.

Dogpatch Community Task Force Process Overview

Barbara gave an overview of the meeting format, which will focus on the presentation of projects prioritized by neighbors. These are not UCSF projects; UCSF is committed to participating on the projects with neighbors, City staff and Supervisor Cohen. None of the projects are easy; there are several hurdles to work through. UCSF is committed to this neighbor-led effort, and we have asked the Supervisor's Office and the City to work in partnership along with neighborhood organizations. Thanks to everyone for working to identify community priorities with valued input from the City.

Comments from Office of Supervisor Malia Cohen

Yoyo Chan spoke on behalf of Supervisor Cohen, who was unable to attend. She stated that the cushioning package is improved from the last meeting and reflects the community's needs and priorities. She thanked participants for working together in this process. She noted that there are other infrastructure concerns that will not be discussed this evening. The Supervisor wants everyone to remember the importance of this issue. She acknowledged and thanked everyone who participated in this conversation over the past few months.

UCSF's Proposed Cushioning Actions

To introduce the projects, Daniel Iacafano noted that UCSF will be a funding partner with other entities, including the City and the Dogpatch Northwest Potrero Green Benefit District (GBD). Additional developer agreements will be forged by neighbors to complete all of the projects on the broader list through fees on the various projects in the pipeline. For UCSF's investments, there is a funding strategy and framework that are achievable if we work together in partnership. Speakers from the neighborhood and city will address the various projects.

20th Street Police Station Restoration (the Hub) – Katherine Doumani

Katherine Doumani stated that the Hub is a priority for the community because it's one of the few remaining buildings that's a significant historic resource and could provide a space for the community to gather. She provided a description of the structure, which was previously the Potrero Police Station with an adjacent emergency hospital. They're asking for \$4.2 million for this project. The existing condition is very poor due to several fires and water penetration. In terms of a capital funding campaign, a leadership gift by UCSF makes the project more viable and will make others feel more confident about donating. These buildings are irreplaceable historic structures located within a historic district and would help tell the story of the community. There is City support and community consensus around this project. Since the 1990s, the City has tried to figure out what to do with the building. Here's a solution. It is difficult, but doable. This has been at the top of the neighbor list since before this process began because Dogpatch has no public resources or places to gather as a community. Katherine stated that she's not new to capital projects; she has built three preschools, with the school district and privately held nonprofits, serving about 160 families. They have over \$700,000 in in-kind service pledges for professional services for the project, which is a serious commitment. What would UCSF's gift accomplish? Phase one would secure, protect and weatherize the building from further decay with onsite monitoring, working with Orton and based on their experience at Pier 70 . This would be followed by predevelopment and project entitlement working with the City's Planning Commission and Real Estate Department for authorizations. Then demo and site preparation to remove structurally unsound elements in an historic and documented manner. Based on the estimates received, they would move into Phase 4, which includes seismic and foundation issues. They are asking for this commitment and think it would be well worth it.

Barbara explained that the Hub is owned by the City and has been vacant since about 1975. She invited John Gavin from the City's Real Estate Department to discuss its assessment and status of this project from the City's point of view. John stated that they have met with the Friends of the Hub and talked through the conceptual design, which is currently under evaluation. It's a challenging site plagued by break-ins and vandalism. What it would take just to stabilize it comes with a hefty price tag as a historic building. A lot of the interior has been vandalized and stripped. The Architecture Resource Group did a report on scoping needs for securing the perimeter with chainlink fencing. This would cost \$150,000. The roof would cost \$170,000 with another \$105,000 for windows. The interior requires remediation of contaminants at an estimated cost of \$350,000. Total site protection and mothballing would be about \$900,000, including contingency. They are continuing to analyze concepts, and it's exciting to see folks support this effort.

Barbara announced that UCSF is committing \$4.2 million to the Hub. We think the project has come along and believe there is community support. We also note in-kind commitments that Katherine has obtained in support. We are proposing to proceed with a project team to move this project along and are conferring with the Office of General Counsel to determine project timelines and milestones before funds are released. Funding must go to viable uses.

Esprit Park – Susan Fitch

Susan Fitch is a founding member of Toes and Paws for Green Space (TPGS). She said that Esprit Park is worthy of cushioning funds because it needs preservation as an oasis used by all ages in the community. It provides a space for recreation and relaxation for residents, visitors and preschools. It's the only city park in Dogpatch that provides space for a wide variety of stakeholders. It was originally a privately owned space built at a time when space, funding and water were not an issue and the number of park users was relatively low. That has all changed with the rapidly growing population of Dogpatch. Water, funding and maintenance are now a challenge as the load on the park increases. The condition of the park has degraded – trees are dying and some have been removed. They are asking for help with maintaining a park that needs renovation to better serve residents and UCSF.

Esprit Park – Irma Lewis

Irma Lewis noted that design features proposed by David Fletcher are included in this Esprit Park presentation and were endorsed by many neighbors. There are several reasons why Esprit is a neighbor priority. In addition to being the only city park, Esprit was highlighted in a number of Planning Department studies, along with the Green Benefit District Green Vision Plan. This points to the breadth of stakeholders involved since the beginning of the planning process including the DNA, GBD, Potrero Boosters, Friends of Esprit Park, etc. She noticed there was an opportunity for capturing the voice of other stakeholders, so they formed TPGS to fill the gap.

Why did this project rise to the top? They knew people cared, both institutions and organizations. People in the neighborhood stepped up, organized and issued a survey. A survey typically gets about a 7% response rate. TPGS's survey got a 30% response rate in four days. SF Planning had similar results, which validates a high level of interest in the park. Another reason was the 'fix it or lose it' factor. They are working towards consensus and support. SF Planning and Fletcher Studios worked to get community buy-in on a conceptual plan that reflects neighborhood priorities in cooperation with Recreation and Park Department (RPD), Drew Detsch of Detsch Associates Landscape Architecture (original park designer), Friends of Esprit, Dogpatch Neighborhood Association (DNA) Design and Development Committee (DDC), GBD and TPGS. The plan is broadly supported by neighbors. UCSF's investment will help preserve the core character of the park as an urban refuge. The plan will make the park stronger and more resilient with increased capacity, safety and lighting enhancements, safe play structures for children and a designated off-leash area for dogs. It also includes a reforestation plan with plants that are drought-resistant, low-maintenance and sustainable for a long-lasting and noteworthy park.

Esprit Park—Robin Abad, San Francisco Planning Department

Robin Abad explained that the Public Realm Plan process brought various city departments together: SFMTA, Department of Public Works (DPW), and Recreation and Park Department (RPD). They worked with Fletcher Studios on the schematic design, and DPW provided a cost estimate for the schematic plan. The next step is for a detailed design exercise with RPD and the community to get to 60-70% design through stakeholder meetings. At that point, they will have more information about existing conditions, including tree surveys and technical aspects

of what the park needs to further refine the budget. Currently, DPW estimates a \$5.9 million construction cost, based on the Fletcher Studios schematic design shared with the community.

Kevin Beauchamp reported on a meeting held with RPD to discuss the project, which was to make sure RPD had information about what we're contemplating. RPD expressed enthusiasm and support, knowing that UCSF has a leadership role in the planning process.

Barbara announced that the neighbor request for Esprit Park was \$5 million, and UCSF is committing \$5 million to this project.

22nd Street Dogpatch Potrero Connector Stairs – J.R. Eppler

J.R. Eppler oriented the group to the project location, noting it would fill the gap in the stairway connector between Missouri and Connecticut streets. The proposed project would convert a treacherous path into an official path. This was a concept proposed by the City. He explained the need to leverage the resources available since land is not available for new open space and active recreation space, particularly in Dogpatch. This project also completes a connection between the Central Waterfront, Noe Valley and Diamond Heights. The David Fletcher-designed stairs below the proposed project will be funded by the 790 Pennsylvania project. These stairs will create a stronger connection between Dogpatch and Potrero. This inner neighborhood pedestrian route would be recognized by the City and would allow access to active recreation at the Potrero Recreation Center. This is important for meeting growth demands in the Central Waterfront. There is buy-in for this project from DPW and RPD. This project is discrete and achievable in the short term. The timing is good because it can all come online around the same time. There is also a grant sitting with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development that will be released now that UCSF is providing funding.

22nd Street Dogpatch Potrero Connector Steps – Jonathan Goldberg, San Francisco Public Works

Jonathan Goldberg noted that this is the type of work that does not always receive needed public bond funding. In the last bond cycle, less than 10 percent of the funds went towards such projects. But we know these projects do a lot to make communities more livable. There are about 195 stairways in SF, and about 160 are maintained by Public Works. They have an annual street structure budget of \$2.5 million. They need advocates, like those present, to speak about the need for such projects. They have a dedicated active group that has worked on a preliminary design and maintenance. This a no brainer for DPW to get behind and support UCSF's tangible investment in this project.

Barbara noted that the community asked for \$500,000, and UCSF is committing \$500,000.

Caltrain Gateway – Julie Christensen, Dogpatch Northwest Potrero Green Benefit District

Julie Christensen said this project was added to the neighbor list of priorities by the GBD. It's adjacent to the planned 22nd Street greening project extending from 22nd St. to Illinois, which is scheduled for major improvements. Woods Yard, located in front of the MUNI yard, is also on the GBD list for renovation. The 22nd Street Caltrain station has the fastest growing ridership of any station in California. Dogpatch has been trying to shift to more multi-modal methods of

transportation. However, residents and workers continue to rely on cars to get around. Having a train in the middle of a rapidly growing community is a plus, and more people should use it.

As J.R. noted, 22nd Street is an important corridor. It will connect the eastern waterfront and the Pier 70 project as it passes through the American Industrial Center, which has over 300 (PDR) businesses. Currently, there is poor lighting and signage, which will not improve without help. Caltrain is potentially looking at relocating the station, so is loathe to make improvements in the next 15-25 years. Way-finding and maps to other transit options are needed and will complement the 22nd Street project. Bikeshare and parking for scooters are needed for commuters and residents. She thanked Barbara and the university for taking on these tough projects that require a leap of faith and appreciate UCSF bringing the City to the table.

Caltrain Gateway – Robin Abad, Planning Department

Robin Abad described the project as serving more than just Dogpatch residents. The 22nd Street greening project between Pennsylvania and Third streets will have concomitant improvements, so we should expect to see the new bridge that Caltrain is replacing, and the lighting project that will likely be funded by the Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee (ENCAC) impact fees. We are going to see bus stop consolidation, as well as reworking of passenger loading for rideshare and consolidation of short and long-term bicycle storage and a bicycle pod, likely on Iowa Street. The Planning Department did initially look at this site as part of the Public Realm process since it was part of the GBD Vision Plan, but it was difficult to move forward without having the Peninsula Joint Powers Authority at the table. This group runs and governs Caltrain. There are several big unknowns, particularly as to whether this work will trigger ADA accessibility issues that would need to be assessed.

Barbara announced that the community requested \$250,000 for the Caltrain Gateway, and UCSF is committing \$250,000 to this project.

Traffic Light at 18th and Minnesota—Barbara French

Barbara explained that the City had asked for \$6.5 million for streetscape improvements. At the beginning of this process, UCSF had approval for \$10 million. If you add the previous items up, the total is just under \$10 million. During our discussions, neighbors had expressed safety concerns about the intersection at 18th and Minnesota streets. As part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the UCSF Minnesota Street graduate student and trainee housing, projected traffic increases would warrant a traffic light, as the project would contribute 15% of the traffic at this intersection. Therefore, we are committing \$600,000 to a traffic light.

Barbara summarized the project investments:

The Hub	\$4,200,000
Esprit Park	5,000,000
Caltrain Gateway	250,000
22 nd St. Stair Connector	500,000
Traffic Light	<u>600,000</u>
Total	\$10,550,000

Barbara explained that the funding could be delayed if there is a CEQA challenge on either or both of the two projects. She acknowledged the hard work of the community for building consensus on the neighbor priority list. UCSF is pleased to use funding the Chancellor has approved for this process. As we talked about at the onset of this process, we were looking to invest in projects that are significant, long-lasting and benefit the community and UCSF.

UCSF's Proposed Cushioning Actions: Other UCSF Contributions

Barbara identified other areas in which UCSF is making contributions. The City has asked the university to contribute towards the construction of the proposed 16th Street ferry landing. The Chancellor has agreed to participate in that discussion.

Adam Van de Water, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, said they have been working on the terminus design, which is fully funded by the City and Port of San Francisco. They are currently putting together the outstanding balance for construction and expect to begin CEQA permitting. They plan to start construction by 2019. The outstanding balance for construction is approximately \$36 million. He thanked those who have submitted letters of support for their application to the Bay Area Grant Program through the county transportation authority for \$10 million. If successful, the balance needed would be \$26 million. Federal cuts will also likely impact the Tiger Grant funds, so they will need to assemble more local, state and regional funds for this project. They are looking to traditional and private sources to close that gap upon completion of design and permitting.

Yoyo noted that the ferry landing and investment in transportation and infrastructure have been a top priority for Supervisor Cohen, who wants to make sure this commitment is met.

A member of the public commented that the ferry landing would also serve UCSF, and it should be brought to the Regents, as UCSF will be a direct beneficiary. It will also help neighboring bioscience and other entities that are clustered around the campus.

Barbara reiterated that the Chancellor is willing to be a part of that conversation. This project would also hold great benefit for the Warriors and others. We want to make sure everyone in the area is aware of the benefits and would participate in that coalition.

Barbara spoke about UCSF's other contributions. She noted that UCSF is also providing construction coordination for more than 50 projects over the next three and a half years, in and around the Third Street corridor. This is something that emanated out of the Mayor's Office when it became clear multiple public and private projects would be occurring in the area at the same time. We want to minimize impacts and inconveniences with respect to street closures and other construction activities. Adam invited UCSF and others to the table, and UCSF volunteered to serve as the lead for orderly construction coordination.

Adam explained that the Ballpark Mission Bay Transportation Coordination Committee, OCII and UCSF have been working to identify alternate routes for traffic. Barbara noted that the cost of the coordination will probably be a few million dollars, not an insignificant number.

Barbara discussed UCSF's good neighbor policy to minimize disruption for neighbors. We understand that, with the opening of our medical center, there has been an increase in employee smoking in the neighborhood, along with discarded cigarette butts and gloves. We do not condone this behavior. We have gotten a commitment from UCSF Health, our clinical enterprise, to patrol the streets to clean up and will make sure employees know what is expected of them.

UCSF is also supporting neighbors' desire to limit UCSF parking by not allowing students living in Minnesota Housing to obtain residential parking permits. UCSF will also support the RPP program in the neighborhood to hamper parking on the street by UCSF employees.

She noted that both UCSF developments in Dogpatch will include retail spaces that will provide amenities for the neighborhood and our campus community. In addition, the University of California Police Department (UCPD) patrols and responds to calls within a one-mile radius of our campuses, which includes the Dogpatch neighborhood.

In total, UCSF is committing \$10.55M. Since inception in 2008, the total Eastern Neighborhood fees generated is in the realm of \$11 million. Task force members discussed the accuracy of these figures, and participants said they would work on updating the information.

DISCUSSION

Tony Kelly asked if the streetscape investments are off the table as part of the \$10.55 million? *Barbara responded, yes, based on neighbor priorities.* Tony noted that those were things they expected every developer to do. *Barbara explained that UCSF has been recognized for over 150 years as a public benefit provider. We are not a developer who can absorb those project costs and recover them through market rents or profit from sales. We are building subsidized affordable student housing that will lessen the demand and competition for housing in the neighborhood from our students. Affordable housing is encouraged by the Mayor's Office. We will provide streetscape improvements adjacent to our projects. This investment proposal reflects the neighborhood priorities.* Tony expressed concerns about this process identifying impacts and coming up with proposals that respond to those impacts. He said this seems like it is more about neighborhood appeasement. He said this is an improvement from the last presentation, but does not negate the need to respond to impacts of transportation and circulation, employment and hazardous materials. He said neighbors will be less served by city infrastructure than they are today and will fall further behind in an already underserved neighborhood.

Bruce Huie stated that UCSF's commitment is not enough. He suggested that UCSF do more with the identified projects and look at what the City can do with respect to streetscape. He said the neighborhood has traffic and transportation issues. It would serve the university and neighbors if UCSF took a look at that. He said we have not talked about 777 Mariposa, so should leave the door open for another discussion about streetscape updates. He invited

everyone to continue the conversation. Neighbors had a list of priorities and while streetscapes fell off the list, he believes they need to revisit this subject.

Heidi Dunkelgod asked for an update on transportation. In her review of projects, she understood transportation would be handled by OEWD in connection with the Southern Bayfront. She asked OEWD, based on talks with other developers, how would transportation funds be allocated to the neighborhood? Adam responded that OEWD is the lead negotiator with private developers: Giants at the Seawall Lot 337, Mission Rock, Forest City Pier 70, Warriors, Power Plant, India Basin, the former PG&E Substation. OEWD negotiates individually with all of them under the umbrella of the Southern Bayfront Strategy to address open space, transportation, affordable housing, workforce development, sea level rise, etc. He explained that in those private development agreements, they have more flexibility around negotiating transportation funding than for offsite improvements such as recreation, open space and streetscape improvements. He would also welcome UCSF and the Chancellor to work with them on transportation improvements related to the 16th Street ferry landing, Third Street Rail and 16th Street bus service.

Heidi referred to a transportation ask list that was provided to OEWD. If OEWD is responsible for the transportation piece and for distributing the \$42 million from Pier 70, what line items will be made available to serve Dogpatch with respect to bus lines such as the 10, XX, re-routing of the 22, as well as a cross-town bus route that will connect Dogpatch to western points in the City?

Daniel asked if this would be addressed in follow-up implementation. Heidi expressed concerns that the caveat of CEQA litigation would hamper the availability of funds. She noted that the neighbors consulted an attorney. She stated that they need answers while the comment period is open and before the Regents certify the EIRs on May 19. Neighbors need to know what to expect from the City before these deadlines.

Adam responded that the negotiations continue with various development partners. He is confident that the XX and 10 will be a part of that discussion, but negotiations have yet to be finalized.

Keith Goldstein shared some numbers in response to Barbara's question about Eastern Neighborhood impact fees. From 2008-2017, Eastern Neighborhood impact fees for the Central Waterfront were around \$16 million, of which \$8 million has been allocated to be spent in the Central Waterfront. Projected revenues for 2018–2022 are \$4.8 million in the Central Waterfront, and \$11.8 million is allocated to be spent there. So projected allocations are at \$20 million, and projected revenues are \$21 million.

Keith explained that the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan says that these revenues were projected to meet only 30% of the area need. He also clarified that Central Waterfront is synonymous with Dogpatch. So Central Waterfront is slightly behind in projected revenues and

expenditures. Of the five neighborhoods, Showplace Potrero is furthest behind, and eastern SOMA is ahead due to the Folsom Street improvements.

Janet Carpinelli expressed concerns about potential impacts of CEQA litigation. She also noted that the environment is continuously changing. When Central Waterfront and Eastern Neighborhoods were being created, developers were complaining about costs and fees being too high. As a result, fees were negotiated down with the City. Consequently, she believes they are always falling behind in their efforts to meet needs. They have to look at the long-term impacts of projects. She believes \$10.55 million is not enough, and a private developer would have paid \$42 million.

J.R. Eppler thanked the university for having listened to neighbor priorities for cushioning. He stated that cushioning is one of the legs of a three-legged stool, along with design and CEQA. Design conversations should include the full building envelope and adjacent streetscapes. He said the university's standing is one thing on campus, but outside of that setting, there is an obligation to adhere to the same standards as private development. He thinks the environmental impacts stem from the student housing, 2130 Third Street, projects underway at Mission Bay and the university at large. Because of that, UCSF has an obligation to look at ferry service and SFMTA's expansion to get neighbors and UCSF staff around town. He believes the neighbors know what their needs are and that it would be great to have a streamlined process when considering 777 Mariposa. He also asked for a response to their request for a commitment for no further UCSF acquisition of property in Dogpatch. Daniel noted that we will discuss policy considerations during this meeting.

Regarding design, Heidi noted that the community expects that the building design for the Dogpatch developments would continue to be worked on. She stated that SKS, Prado has fulfilled that commitment for the 2130 Third Street project, but there is grave concern about the student housing, and they are running out of time. Demolition will start at the end of May, and they need to know how UCSF will resolve design issues.

Kieran Lal thanked everyone for working through this process, especially Supervisor Cohen's office. He said that work still needs to be done on the Good Neighbor Policy, particularly as it relates to the behavior of UCSF employees. Regarding the student housing, he said they would like a commitment for staging to be done on Indiana. He appreciates UCSF's support for residential parking permits. He believes the street light at 18th and Minnesota is important given the volume of employee traffic related to the medical center. Also, please encourage car share use for students and make it a low-impact building. *Lori Yamauchi explained that car ownership among our students and trainees is pretty low because it is more of a hassle than a benefit in San Francisco. Much like what we have done at 145 Irving Street, student residents are not permitted to have residential parking permits. UCSF would only provide student parking for disabled students, and would provide car share and ride share. There are total of 127 parking spaces for disabled, car share, service facilities, and general employee parking.*

There was a brief discussion clarifying UCSF's \$600,000 contribution for the street light as it relates to the previously proposed \$6.5 million in streetscape improvements. This item had been included in the previous streetscape proposal. The \$600,000 estimate was provided by SFMTA for a signal at 18th & Minnesota streets. The next step for the City is to figure out resources available for implementing the rest of the streetscape improvements. The Planning Department understands that 18th & 19th streets have risen as priorities. Adam said that Planning, RPD and SFMTA got together to assess the outstanding need for providing a fully functional, walkable community. Cross walks, bulb-outs and pedestrian lighting and bike routes are also important.

Janet expressed concerns about traffic if parking will be provided for the doctors at 2130 Third St. *Lori noted that the current plan is to provide staff and physician parking at Mission Bay on Block 34, which is one block away. The purpose of the parking beneath the student housing project is to accommodate staff for the project, as well as staff at 654 Minnesota, offsetting some of the demand for curbside parking. We are also contemplating consolidating and relocating the UCPD from the Mission Center site, which triggers the displacement of existing parking for staff at 654 Minnesota.* Janet expressed concerns about UCSF putting more programming into the neighborhood and asked if this was analyzed in the project EIR. *Yes, this was included in the EIR analysis.*

Irma asked about implementation as we prepare working teams. With regards to the Hub, it was previously noted that funds would be released in a phased manner with discrete milestones. She said that given the huge effort to gain consensus on streamlining neighborhood priorities and the high level of neighbor engagement around the schematic for Esprit Park, we need to be equally diligent about preventing drift for Esprit. It would be good to similarly have phased release of funds with maximum efficiencies. She hopes that Esprit continues to move forward with the existing concept. There has been a rich level of engagement that should serve as a platform for advancing this project.

Yoyo noted that all of the projects presented today have the support of the City. Various city departments have been involved in the planning process and the city family has a unified vision. There is unified interest in realizing these projects.

Bruce asked whether there would be a term sheet drafted to lay out agreement terms as we move towards action items and timeframe.

Key Action Steps

Barbara noted that each project has its own complexities for moving towards implementation. Each requires heavy lifting that could not be accomplished by tonight's meeting. She proposed that we move forward with project teams comprised of representatives from the existing neighborhood groups and GBD, along with city staff representatives, Supervisor Cohen's office and UCSF staff. The teams, with seven to eleven participants, would look at each project and identify parties to the MOU, timelines and milestones, with quarterly monitoring and accountability to the UCSF Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide updates on

expenditures and progress. For example, the Hub would need to work on establishing its status as a nonprofit and obtain a fiscal sponsor that can take on this fiduciary responsibility. With Esprit Park, we have discussed completing the construction drawings to get closer to filling the gap in funding with RPD. The GBD would be asked to participate in an MOU for this project as a fiscal agent. All in all, this means that we will need to work together towards implementation. We will look to the DNA and GBD to recommend representatives to participate, along with Toes and Paws for Esprit Park. Barbara stated that she has also spoken with Supervisor Cohen's office and John Rahaim from the Planning Department regarding their continued participation. The \$10.55M has been set aside by our budget officer and is being held in an escrow-like account.

Heidi noted that the Hub is interested in getting the building secured by winter, so they would like to have subgroups that can work autonomously. *Barbara noted that each project team will have to tackle those issues. Project teams will be a working group intended to move the projects forward.* John Rahaim said he envisions three project teams, one for the Hub, Esprit, and a third for the other public works projects under the purview of DPW. He stated that the legal mechanism and metrics for funds to flow to the projects need defining, so it might take more than three months. J.R. asked that these groups include a placeholder for a Potrero organization.

Barbara addressed the request for a community liaison on remediation and construction, stating that Michele Davis will serve in this capacity in the context of her work.

Barbara discussed the request for expanding local hiring and permanent jobs. UCSF remains committed to our community construction outreach program since we created it voluntarily in March 2011. We have been doing local hiring since the mid 90's when Mission Bay was constructed. Hiring San Francisco residents has been a priority for hiring from the onset. It is a voluntary commitment because, as a state institution, we are prohibited from allocating jobs based on where someone lives. In terms of permanent jobs, much of what we do requires a specialized workforce with clinical experience. UCSF sees a lot of opportunity on the administrative side. For the last 12 years, we have run our EXCEL training program. We have 40 slots a year in which people who have been on public assistance are trained and earn \$15/hour in paid internships. Seventy percent of participants succeed in obtaining jobs after completion, transforming their lives so that they are no longer on public assistance. A high percentage go on to career positions and advancement. We are committed to continuing this program, which is expensive, but yields long-term benefits to individuals, their families and the city.

Barbara discussed the request for effective participation in transportation demand management (TDM). UCSF has a very rigorous TDM program, probably one of the most effective in the city with respect to reducing the number of single occupancy vehicles. We work closely with the City and the Department of Public Health to inform them about what we do so they can reduce their rate of single occupancy commuters at San Francisco General Hospital.

As part of the UC system, we continue to work with the Office of General Counsel to reduce our carbon footprint by 2025. TDM is a substantial part of achieving this goal.

Barbara then discussed the request for expanded indigent care. She explained the distinction between indigent care and care for the underinsured. UCSF, as a public institution, is committed to caring for the public. We have a quaternary and tertiary care hospital, which means we get the sickest of the sick. We do transplants, neurosurgery and treat children who are often in our hospital for four to seven months because of cancer and other serious conditions. Seventy percent of our kids in Oakland, and fifty percent of our kids in San Francisco are on Medi-Cal. We work with Family House who supports our families who often come from outlying areas for specialized care and are housed at no cost to them.

California has one of the lowest reimbursement rates in the country. What that means is for every dollar spent in caring for someone, we only get sixty cents in reimbursement. That forty cent differential has to be made up somewhere. In 2015, we subsidized our Medi-Cal population in the amount of \$217 million. That means that we are taking care of individuals who are not being taken care of by other hospitals. Kaiser is one of our partners, and two percent of their population are Medi-Cal patients. Our rate is 33%. Sutter Health may do a higher percentage of indigent care, but with the Affordable Care Act, UCSF provides more support for the underinsured in which the coverage falls short of the total cost of care. The number of people in this group has increased from 25 million five years ago to 35 million. Our commitment to patient care is among the best in the city. UCSF is one of the sponsors of the Charity Care Report in which we make the distinction between indigent care and providing care in support of our Medi-Cal population.

Barbara then discussed the request that UCSF define planned uses for all five properties in Dogpatch. As we've said, we have yet to identify a use for the 777 Mariposa property. The future of that site is unclear. As soon as we determine potential use, we commit to return to the community to discuss it further. We thank John Rahaim for meeting with the Chancellor on how to better communicate with the City and neighbors regarding planning and space needs.

Barbara discussed the subject of no further development in Dogpatch. She noted that she has previously conveyed information about her continued discussions with UCSF's leadership team regarding this request. At this point, there is no traction with the leadership team for absolutes on this issue. To our knowledge, there has never been such terms set with any other institution in the city. The team is committed to continuing this discussion, using the CAG as a vehicle, and remains open. Given our current building program, the next big need will be to figure out how to fund the replacement of Moffitt Long Hospital at Parnassus to meet seismic compliance with state requirements. That is the location for performing transplants, neurosurgery and heart surgery. She said she doesn't believe UCSF would take on anything else in Dogpatch, given the demands at Parnassus where the average building age is 70 years old. However, we can continue this discussion about 777 Mariposa and how UCSF can better communicate with the community and the City.

John Rahim referenced discussions with the community about next steps and how to have a better dialogue. He would like to have an early dialogue with UCSF when the university has a need so that the City could help identify suitable locations. He said he understands the university's position and looks forward to continued discussions given the effect the institution has on neighbors and its importance to the city.

Barbara discussed the request from neighbors that UCSF supports rescinding the Life Sciences Medical Use District. She noted the City's commitment to evaluating the effectiveness of the District and UCSF's support of that. John Rahaim said that he is working with OEWD and would like to have a more robust discussion with the community about options. This use district is about private companies that are not under the control of UCSF. Is there a place for them to locate in close proximity to the bioscience community?

Julie expressed a desire to protect PDR uses in southern Dogpatch. She noted that there are entire blocks that lack streetscape improvements.

Barbara thanked the Dogpatch Community Task Force and Supervisor Cohen's office again for their involvement and participation. UCSF is committed to proceeding with these projects, and we look forward to working with you.

Adjourn

Task Force Members in Attendance:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ John Rahaim & Robin Abad (SF Planning) ✓ Adam Van de Water (SF OEWD) ✓ Kevin Beauchamp (UCSF) ✓ Janet Carpinelli (Dogpatch) ✓ Yoyo Chan (Sup. Cohen) ✓ Julie Christensen (GBD) ✓ Michele Davis (UCSF) ✓ Katherine Doumani (Dogpatch) ✓ Heidi Dunkelgod (Dogpatch) <input type="checkbox"/> Mark Dwight (Dogpatch) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ J.R. Eppler (Potrero) <input type="checkbox"/> Susan Eslick (Dogpatch) ✓ Susan Fitch (Dogpatch) ✓ Barbara French (UCSF) ✓ Christine Gasparac (UCSF) ✓ Jonathan Goldberg (SF Public Works) ✓ Keith Goldstein (Potrero) ✓ Kevin Hart (CAG) ✓ Bruce Huie (Dogpatch) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Tony Kelly (Potrero) ✓ Kieran Lal (Dogpatch) ✓ Irma Lewis (Dogpatch) <input type="checkbox"/> Audra Angeli-Morse (Dogpatch) ✓ Sandra Padilla (SFMTA) <input type="checkbox"/> Mikael Wagner (Dogpatch) ✓ Lori Yamauchi (UCSF)
--	--	---