



Dogpatch Community Task Force
Meeting #2 – October 24, 2016

S U M M A R Y

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting opened with a review of the three ways in which UCSF can address potential project impacts: 1) Design, 2) CEQA, and 3) Cushioning. The latter is the focus of meetings during the Dogpatch Community Task Force (DCTF) meeting series. UCSF is working with neighbors and the City to identify potential impacts for cushioning, which must comply with the UC Office of the President requirements for any funds expended by UCSF to benefit UCSF in addition to neighbors. To be in compliance, we need to evaluate potential cushioning investments in a manner that jointly benefits the UCSF campus community and neighbors.

Agenda Overview and Recap of Meeting #1

The facilitator reviewed the overall process and goal for achieving consensus.

The facilitator reviewed the October 13 Dogpatch Walkabout and thanked neighbors who volunteered as tour organizers and guides – Janet Carpinelli, Julie Christensen and Kieran Lal. They shared knowledge of various sites and issues throughout the walk. Through the lens of desired outcomes expressed at the September DCTF meeting, the facilitator took everyone on a virtual tour of Dogpatch. He noted design considerations and the stated desire for preserving the unique character in Dogpatch, maximizing opportunities for improving pedestrian-friendly scale and a safe environment, reducing traffic congestion and parking.

At the restaurant after the tour, the group worked together to identify the major overarching findings and issues, including quality, scale, integration of old and new, need for recreation space, desire to maintain residential and kid-friendly environment, pedestrian safety, need for improved transit, local-serving retail and need for community space at the HUB. These issues will be addressed further in the agenda item led by neighbors.

Task Force Member Comments:

- Requested that minutes be taken at meetings to document who said what and when.
- Asked UCSF to reuse 600 Minnesota with a full grocery store as part of the Minnesota housing project and include other ground floor retail.
- Asked to augment the photographic evidence of the tour and include a better image of the old police station at 20th and Third streets and the pedestrian path along the 18th Street overpass.
 - In response, the facilitator invited neighbors to send any images to Michele that better document key sites and issues.
- Pointed out that there is no image of the area along Indiana underneath the 18th Street overpass. *UCSF has revised the presentation to include this image.*

Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

Dogpatch Neighbor Presentation: Neighbor Task Force Member List

The topics and presenters included: Transparency and Cooperation (Bruce & Tony), Integration, Programming and Building Design (Heidi), Opportunistic Design (Julie), Mitigation (J.R.), Cushioning (Katherine). UCSF was asked to respond to Transparency and Cooperation at the next meeting.

Neighbors drafted a list of “asks” to UCSF as a framework for discussion. This is not a final list, but will help guide discussion. The group has been organizing their requests to UCSF to help UCSF in working with the City.

Neighbors requested a response from the university on Transparency and Cooperation. Neighbors asked for a matrix of the planned use for all properties with specific details for each, including purpose, occupancy and size. This is to help neighbors work with a third party to assess the economic value of each property, comparing UCSF to a private developer.

Neighbors also requested CEQA and other approvals, demolition and construction schedules for each project.

Discussion:

- Asked for transparency in how UCSF will ensure safety for those living nearby, during the demolition of the buildings at the Minnesota housing site. There is concern about lead paint. The neighbor requested the staging to take place off Indiana Street (not Minnesota) or create a cut-through onsite.
- (UCSF) asked for clarification on what’s included in the five properties. They were identified as: 1) 2130 Third Street, 2) 566 Minnesota, 3) 590 Minnesota, 4) 600 Minnesota, 5) 777 Mariposa. A request was made to include 654 Minnesota since there were changes when the IT center moved out. UCSF clarified that no other uses are planned for the occupied 654 Minnesota site (*which went through an EIR process*), so it’s not relevant.
- Asked for updates at each meeting of any changes in the schedule.
- Asked how the current plans fit within the LRDP, which is a living document.
- Asked what contaminants are in the building and the soils underneath?
- Stated it’s difficult to opine on cushioning as it relates to the design of the UCSF projects, so need clarification on the design review schedule.
- Commented on concerns about this process and how it relates to the design process, noting the tentative schedule for Minnesota Housing design review is for the first design meeting with the DNA/Boosters Design & Development Committee by mid-November, then Dec. 5 and Jan. 17.
- Requested a summary of all detailed information about projects and design review.
- Requested a written agreement for no further expansion into Dogpatch with the DNA and possibly another entity as well. The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Medical Overlay was not understood by neighbors. Wants UCSF to work with the City to consider rescinding this policy.
- Expressed need for new and safer bike routes, including along Indiana. There is no clear cut-over access point from Indiana (via 18th or 19th) for safe crossing to Mariposa.
- Stated that UCSF has a great program with local hiring, but should include a provision for offering sustainable living wage programs for permanent employment. Also asked UCSF to help advocate for improved transit services. Requested that employment opportunities be available to local landscape architects on UCSF projects.

- Noted that OEWD is coordinating construction and preparing a matrix on all projects with respect to street and land closures and construction activities. It would be good if they would include all UCSF projects. *UCSF noted that we are participating in this venture.*

Integration: Programming and Building Design (Heidi)

DNA has been working with developers to improve projects and the public realm. The new normal takes into consideration growth, change, care with urban planning innovation. The aim is to have a complete neighborhood in historic context. The following typologies were reviewed:

Adaptive Reuse Projects – 1275 Minnesota Street Gallery, Esprit Condominiums, Piccino.

Mid-block Pedestrian Passages – 950 Tennessee drawings show the conceptual design of recreating the old Kentucky Passage. Serpentine stairs at Pennsylvania will connect Dogpatch with Potrero Hill.

SF Planning Living Alley program – Passage proposed at 888 Tennessee along the 20th Street overpass.

Sidewalk activation – Avalon Bay project and west side of Esprit condos with stoops along the streetscape. Projects should include outdoor seating for businesses to facilitate activation.

Traffic Calming – Conceptual designs of large bulb-outs by Public Works helps achieve this. There are also plans to upgrade the crosswalks.

Pocket Parks and Plazas – Avalon development has area for seating in their gateway. The Dogpatch Arts Plaza at the end of 19th along Indiana will have bleachers in back for gathering and a take-away restaurant. Clarification was requested about the Cresco equipment rental company needing access to the plaza from time to time. In response, Heidi noted that the plaza entrance may be used by staff occasionally, as the main access for business is in a different location. 888 Minnesota allows views between buildings as it converts to private space, designed by David Fletcher.

Expanded Municipal Lighting – DNA is looking at this along with GBD. Neighbor commented that undergrounding utilities will be required. *Since the presentation, it has been confirmed that it is part of the DNA design guidelines.*

Environmental Sustainability – Piccino's roof water is collected to direct storm water run-off for sidewalk vegetation. Solar cells desired to drive electrical and hot water.

Opportunistic Design (Julie)

There are opportunities to address elements that fall between mitigation and design intrinsically tied to the student housing site that would benefit students and neighbors. This project is very large and unusual in that it straddles the 18th Street overpass. Dogpatch has a dearth of simple basic retail services (groceries, cleaners, sandwich shop). Need a place to pull in off the street for delivery trucks, and Uber. How can the ground floor deal with serving students and neighbors while minimizing congestion? The “ask” in this case is to engage a retail specialist to ascertain what kinds of retail uses could be successful in this location.

The 18th Street/Indiana space which is almost 100 feet deep could provide a potential public open space benefit if the buildings are pulled back from 18th at the corners to open up mid-block pedestrian passages, improve visibility and improve safety. The solution is to convert 18th Street from a problem into an asset.

From above, the 18th Street overpass could be improved as a connection between Dogpatch and Potrero Hill to make it more welcoming and safe. Along the overpass, we should consider a wider pedestrian path, a dedicated bike lane with non-slip surface and a protective planting barrier. The Minnesota Housing and 777 Mariposa sites will have an enormous impact on those two blocks and will set a tone for the area with its choice of street lights, setbacks, sidewalk gardens. Whatever UCSF designs for its side of the street should be considered across the street.

Discussion:

- Noted that in these two categories, other developers make accommodations as part of their natural development process and project review. There are often setbacks of 5-10 feet.
- Asked UCSF to confirm the “ask” from neighbors. 1) Include neighborhood-serving businesses at ground level of Minnesota Housing site, 2) address parking issues associated with the use, 3) 18th Street is a public right-of way, and we will work with city and neighborhood, 4) examine how buildings can be treated on both sides of the 18th Street overpass to make it safer, and 5) holistically address Indiana and Minnesota streets along the two blocks from Mariposa.
- Commented that Tennessee Street should be included since it sees construction and employee and visitor traffic and congestion and requires attention. Part of this is game day traffic. Tennessee and Mariposa are particularly dangerous. From Tennessee to Minnesota Street and from Mariposa to 19th Street, the neighborhood faces problems with Medical Center staff gloves and cigarette butts. *UCSF responded that we are working with facilities management to do a regular sweep for garbage and will engage a security guard to address smoking issues.*
- (Supervisor Cohen) asked about SFMTA’s presence, stating that they need to consistently be at the table. An SFMTA representative is on the task force and attended the first meeting.

Traffic Mitigations (J.R.)

This concerns EIR mitigations. This is not a full list, but provides a sense of key issues. Traffic and transit will need to be addressed as part of the EIR, looking at the impact of students as they use methods other than the shuttle system. There is a need to improve bicycle and pedestrian crossings. There is a need for adequate bulb-outs and traffic circles to appropriately manage traffic flows emanating from the projects. There is a need to look at all channels – Minnesota, Indiana and Tennessee.

Discussion:

- Commented that local hiring reduces traffic impacts if employees live in San Francisco.
- (City Planning) indicated that they are working with SFMTA to address traffic- calming strategies in working with MUNI and Rubber Tire Fleet. They have done all of the analyses on street corners where bulb-outs can occur, addressing MUNI’s challenges for turning radii without posing conflicts for bulb-outs. They are working to get funding to provide for an integrated approach to addressing these issues.
- (Facilitator) asked about the plans for major developments such as Pier 70 and NRG, each of which appear to be equal in size.
 - A neighbor noted the Southern Bay front Strategy is looking at mitigation requirements for many waterfront developments where OEWD is looking at how to identify needs in a coherent comprehensive way for directing impact fees to serve the area.
- (Facilitator) asked at what point the cars can be addressed, since you can reach a point of not being able to mitigate and need to proactively invest in infrastructure to prevent such problems.
- UCSF is on CWAG, but not on the southern Bayfront Strategy, which is in the formation stages. (UCSF) asked if the group had a name. Supervisor Cohen’s office noted that this group is in its infancy and agreed to help facilitate the connection for UCSF to participate since the jurisdiction is everything south of Mission Rock development.

Open Space Mitigations (J.R.)

There is a need to provide improvements to Esprit Park, which neighbors expect will be strained. UCSF has a unique status, so should use mitigation to provide for ongoing investment. UCSF is a member of the Green benefits District and contributes to this fund. J.R. expressed a desire to have UCSF increase its

contributions as the footprint increases as part of the mitigation process. The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan failed to address community needs for public open space. UCSF should address passive and active open space needs. UCSF could repurpose Caltrans property as open space as neighbors have done with Progress Park.

Discussion:

- Noted that open space and active recreation are important issues. The GBD would like to repurpose Caltrans property for open space, but it requires immediate action given the scarcity of land. Every development that brings a significant population to the area needs to abide by the standard development process for addressing resource needs.
- Commented that every development process must consider its impacts. UCSF has a cushioning process to address these issues.
- (City Planning) noted that it is impossible for them to access Caltrans property and asked for help from UCSF to access such lands without being subjected to market rate values. Caltrans needs to do something given the freeway impacts that are right here in Dogpatch and Potrero.
- Introduced the concept of 'shared space' in which certain open space uses are programmed at certain times in urban centers in US and Europe. This typology can be combined with traffic mitigation as a form of street closure at certain times. Agencies at the table can look at these issues more programmatically which may include re-routing bus traffic at certain times. This could improve livability and character.
- Commented that the Marina has blue work-out stations which drive activity. Perhaps part of Mariposa Park could be repurposed to accommodate such uses.
 - Another neighbor clarified that Mariposa Park is NOT a UCSF park, but is governed by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), which is not amendable to active uses. You have to be more than 100 feet in from the water, where they do not have jurisdiction, to get active recreation on public open space.

Construction Mitigation (J.R.)

Construction planning and scheduling should be transparent. There should be proper staging to reduce impacts on the neighborhood. Neighbors also should know when demolition is being scheduled and the clear plan for safety from an environmental standpoint.

Cushioning (Katherine)

UCSF should provide information to better ascertain cushioning to address a broader spectrum of neighbor concerns. The process requires transparency on the part of UCSF for neighbors to assess true impacts for brainstorming and evaluation of what is planned. This will enable the DCTF to work with community organizations to create and vet a draft list of needs to bring back to the DCTF.

Create, expand and improve open space. UCSF should consider services for neighbors. Also, the HUB suffered another fire, the second in two weeks and third in two years. This is the site neighbors hope to adaptively reuse. The City's Real Estate Department said they do not have the funds to secure the site.

Homework

Neighbors want a response to Transparency and Cooperation. Neighbors have a list of things that is still in flux, but need to refine it and prioritize. If some of their items can be woven into the UCSF planning and design process, how would that affect UCSF scope. For example, how much space will UCSF make available in our buildings for use by the community? Neighbors would like quantification of the impacts.

Discussion:

- (UCSF) indicated that we will respond to the first two points. 1) We need to work with our design teams to see what is far enough along to share; 2) we need to meet with the City and other groups to see where we can leverage what is in place and partner; 3) we need to identify potential areas of compatibility by looking at what helps the neighborhood and UCSF, is being done at other campuses, and is acceptable to the UC Office of the President; and 4) another filter to be mindful of is that anything approved here must go to the Regents. While we will keep an open mind to innovative and new options, we also have a framework within which UCSF must work.
- Expressed a desire to be bold in considering new options.
- Expressed concerns about neighborhood meeting schedule in an iterative process.
- In response, another neighbor expressed confidence in being able to meet the schedule. UCSF should look at options that are not necessarily low-hanging fruit and be willing to push the envelope and make these buildings remarkable. Take the time to identify the opportunity areas.

Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

DCTF Meeting #2 Attendance:

✓ Robin Abad (City)	✓ J.R. Eppler (Potrero)	✓ Tony Kelly (Potrero)
✓ Kevin Beauchamp (UCSF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Susan Eslick (Dogpatch)	✓ Kieran Lal (Dogpatch)
✓ Janet Carpinelli (Dogpatch)	✓ Susan Fitch (Dogpatch)	✓ Irma Lewis (Dogpatch)
✓ Yoyo Chan (City)	✓ Barbara French (UCSF)	✓ Audra Angeli-Morse (Dogpatch)
✓ Julie Christensen (GBD)	✓ Christine Gasparac (UCSF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sandra Padilla (City)
✓ Michele Davis (UCSF)	✓ Jonathan Goldberg (City)	<input type="checkbox"/> Mikael Wagner (Dogpatch)
✓ Katherine Doumani (Dogpatch)	<input type="checkbox"/> Keith Goldstein (Potrero)	✓ Corinne Woods (Mission Bay)
✓ Heidi Dunkelgod (Dogpatch)	✓ Kevin Hart (CAG)	✓ Lori Yamauchi (UCSF)
✓ Mark Dwight (Dogpatch)	✓ Bruce Huie (Dogpatch)	