

S U M M A R Y

Welcome and Introductions

Barbara French welcomed everyone and noted that this meeting includes the design status of UCSF's proposed Dogpatch projects and the preliminary concepts of our vision framework for cushioning.

Agenda Overview and Recap of Meeting #4

Daniel Iacofano stated that the last meeting was devoted to a recap of neighbor needs and requests with extensive neighbor presentations on various issues for mitigation and cushioning. The Planning Department presented on the Public Realm Plan for Dogpatch, and Barbara highlighted issues related to the overall vision framework covered more extensively in this meeting.

Neighbor Presentation – Roadmap to Projects

Bruce Huie and JR Eppler presented on behalf of neighbors. Bruce noted two documents: a series of maps showing the proximity of priority neighbor projects to proposed UCSF developments and a project list handout describing neighbor projects.

J.R. Eppler reviewed the Dogpatch/Potrero Hill Project Profiles handout. Fundamentally, neighbors have baseline expectations for transparency and cooperation related to: a) identifying a community liaison for remediation during construction, b) expansion of the local hire/permanent jobs program, promoting the jobs-housing balance, c) effective participation and staffing of a Transportation Demand Management program, d) expanded indigent care similar to CPMC, e) information on the planned use of all UCSF properties in Dogpatch, especially 777 Mariposa, f) no further UCSF acquisition of Dogpatch parcels, and g) removal of the biomedical overlay.

Bruce explained that the maps provide quarter, half and mile reference points for the location of priority projects. The "complete neighborhood services" item addresses the need for community services and preservation of a historic resource in two separate, but related projects: a readily accessible pop-up program and an historic restoration, which could ultimately house the program. Next is "open space" with nearby Esprit Park and Woods Yard, which is maintained by MUNI and SFMTA and includes the neighbor-funded children's playground. The "22nd Street greening plan" extends across Woods Yard down to the Caltrain station. Neighbors want to open up the "Caltrain gateway" even though there are issues with the electrification project. This station is the fastest growing passenger station along the line.

Neighbors are interested in an “open space acquisition fund” to create more green space. They believe the community still has an active recreation need and a significant open space need.

Neighbors identified potential single-story warehouse spaces for conversion into new open space. The “22nd Street connector stairs” project improves access and connectivity between Dogpatch and Potrero Hill. Neighbors noted that Jackson Park needs further investment. “Streetscape” priorities include complete streets in Dogpatch: half the neighborhood has sidewalks, and the other half does not, so there is a need to complete the neighborhood. The 18th Street overpass area needs safe passage across intersections and walkable sidewalks. On 19th Street, there is an opportunity for UCSF and the City to create a green, walkable space down to the waterfront.

A number of transportation issues were identified. Crossing Mariposa is dangerous, and the freeway off-ramp makes it more challenging for pedestrians and bikes to cross. Bikes come up from 22nd Street Caltrain along Indiana, and there should be a safer way to connect to Minnesota. One-seat bus service would improve Dogpatch and Potrero access to the rest of the city. Neighbors would like to accelerate creation of water ferry and water taxi service, and the City has identified two potential sites. The neighbor presentation finished with a discussion of off-street “negative parking impacts” related to 2130 Third Street. The project includes 41 patient parking spaces with faculty and staff parking off-site.

Discussion

Some neighbors questioned the adequacy of parking at 2130 Third Street and expressed concerns about impacts. The valet operation requires patients to drop off cars, then the valets drive around the block to park in the garage. This generates more pollution and traffic for neighbors.

Daniel reminded task force members of the three categories/buckets for addressing impacts: design, CEQA and cushioning. The design process is the outgrowth of a series of discussions with neighbors, which will be summarized by the two project managers, Bruce Lanyon from UCSF’s Real Estate department, and Beth Piatnitzka from UCSF Capital Programs.

Project Design Status

- 2130 Third Street

Bruce Lanyon shared designs that have been discussed with the Dogpatch/Potrero Boosters Design and Development Committee (DDC) at design review meetings in November, December and February. He reviewed the elevations visible in the [design presentation](#), noting updates made in response to the DDC, including removal of the “eyebrow” feature. He showed the key entrances and the potential retail space at the corner of 3rd and 18th streets.

- Minnesota Graduate Student and Trainee Housing

Beth Piatnitzka gave an overview of the project, including the review process undertaken with the DDC. The DDC has been reviewing siting, building massing, the ground level program and

site development. She pointed out that the concepts are still preliminary, and the team will continue to share design updates with the DDC and stakeholders.

The project is situated on two parcels facing Indiana and Minnesota, with a courtyard on each. The setback along Indiana will increase from eight feet to fifteen feet. The design includes pedestrian pass-throughs along the sides of the buildings abutting the 18th Street overpass, ranging from 11 to 18 feet wide. Both buildings have parking, which is not for students (who have been instructed not to bring cars), but for staff. Ground floor active uses include a gym, community room and a 4500-square-foot corner market that will serve neighbors and the student population. The buildings are within the 58-foot height limit permitted by city zoning and are sculpted to form setbacks in contouring. The project team is working to break up the bulk. Since 600 Minnesota Street is a historic resource, the team is planning to feature an onsite photo gallery to educate and memorialize the history of the site.

Discussion and Public Comment

--What is the plan for roof treatment? *We want to address views from all sides of the building.*

--The photo display is not enough. The building needs to be saved and the housing relocated.

--The market is too small; neighbors need tens of thousands of square feet.

--The City recently passed urban design guidelines in legislation outlined by the Planning Department. Projects sponsors need to demonstrate these standards.

--We appreciate the plaque or photo gallery, but that's not sufficient mitigation. The DDC has given input, but the project is still unspectacular and does not fit into Dogpatch. Please review the "neighborhood norms" presentation for reference. UCSF should look at the two buildings as fraternal twins or distant cousins. We do not want identical buildings straddling the overpass, as it would be a missed opportunity.

--Regarding 2130 Third Street, the DDC and architects seemed to be willing to look at and make changes to the massing. What is the status? *This is a work in progress for the design team.*

--The Esprit building tried to have retail space for a market, and it was too small to be successful. I would like to see the proposed retail component work. It would be great if the façade could be preserved. I agree on not having two identical buildings.

UCSF Vision Framework

Barbara French discussed the fundamental criteria required for UCSF to make an investment of public funds: there must be a nexus of benefits to neighbors and UCSF while addressing agreed-upon impacts of the proposed projects. She reviewed the filters for any UCSF cushioning investment: 1) must benefit neighbors and UCSF, 2) must address agreed-upon potential

impacts of UCSF developments, 3) must be visible and meaningful in impact, rather than small and unmemorable, and 4) the scope has to be larger than any of the individual projects or sites.

The benefit of UCSF's cushioning dollars is that they are more direct and immediate, unlike that of a private developer who would pay impact fees to Eastern Neighborhoods and property taxes. Only about 65% of property tax revenues go into the general fund for use throughout the city. With an estimated \$130M in total impact fees, Dogpatch will have only received about \$11M, or 9 cents on the dollar by 2021. UCSF's investment is a dollar-for-dollar investment into Dogpatch.

We have been listening carefully to understand neighbor priorities and City priorities for investment. This process has come a long way. Neighbors provided a thoughtful presentation of their requests. What is the overall need, what is the dollar amount for that need and who is funding what? This is an important piece of the puzzle in the process for developing an informed decision for investment. We are looking at where UCSF can augment or advance the neighborhood vision rather than duplicate. UCSF is committed to using its investment to advance projects that are important to the community and to complement what the City is doing. We look forward to getting your response and input.

UCSF Vision Elements

- A. Cushioning Projects: UCSF's six proposed cushioning projects: 1) Streetscape improvements: enhance public realm investment above the base level with enhanced design and street furnishings and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, 2) Pedestrian safety improvements: traffic light at 18th and Minnesota, as well as pedestrian safety improvements at other locations, including Minnesota and 19th, Tennessee and 19th, Tennessee and 18th, 3) Bike safety improvements: proposed "dogleg" to improve bike safety by directing bike traffic to Minnesota Street for a safer Mariposa Street crossing, 4) Bike share station at Minnesota Street, 5) Area under the overpass on 18th and Indiana improvements: improve the design and accessibility of the area beneath the overpass, 6) Open space investment in Dogpatch.
- B. UCSF's Advocacy for Eastern Neighborhoods: UCSF is committed to working with the City and other entities to advance multimodal projects, improved connectivity with SFMTA and better shuttle service. If the Caltrain electrification and high-speed rail projects move ahead, there will be great benefits to the eastern side of the city.
- C. Monitoring and Accountability: UCSF is committed to a good neighbor program to minimize project construction impacts and respond to neighbor concerns.

Discussion and Public Comment

--The Venn diagram for UCSF's investment needs to include an area for development impacts. UCSF needs to provide some numbers indicating the scale of investment. Everything seems to

serve design or CEQA mitigations, rather than general community enhancement, the latter of which is typically addressed by other developers in the normal course of their projects. There are comparison points for making financial contributions – payments made to the Mission Bay Redevelopment Project Area community facilities district could serve as a model here for supporting growth in Dogpatch to get a measurable contribution given UCSF growth impacts. Concerning transparency and cooperation, you are missing local hire and indigent care.

--Nothing on the action list seems to be anything you would not do under normal circumstances. Everything benefits your own property. Going back to your cushioning filters, what is big, visible or meaningful?

--The proposal is amazingly deficient for addressing students, patients and staff needs. Not only are you not looking at neighbor needs, you are forgetting your own community.

--It seems like UCSF's proposal focuses on picking the lowest hanging fruit. We want to clarify that developer impact fee contributions are projected to be \$161M, not \$130M, of project impact fees of which 9.1% go to Dogpatch. Private developers are paying the full amount to offset impacts.

--Open space and central waterfront space will not come on line for 10 years. We are below the 5.5 acres of open space per resident. We do not want to wait for waterfront parks, but want it now.

--UCSF is taking over here like at Parnassus. The interpretation of impact fees and impacts on the neighborhood is disappointing.

--After the walkabout, Barb expressed the importance of making memorable investments. A bike share station is not memorable. The proposed list is not memorable and substantial. We understand that there are requests that do not have price tags. Esprit Park is an easy conversation to have with the City to separate out infrastructure work, leaving UCSF to take on memorable needs for investment.

--We need a comprehensive study and plans that do not look at isolated intersections and segments of the bike share expansion. There is no credit if another entity is covering portions of it. We need bus transit instead of pictures of high-speed rail and Caltrain electrification.

--I'm surprised that UCSF is doing so little planning; management needs to allow your planners to do the job.

--With regard to open space contributions, do you plan to put in a little money here and there, or is there a plan? *UCSF as a public university system is exempt from property tax and development fees, so there is no guidepost for determining an adequate cushioning investment. The task force was set up to identify potential project impacts and projects to help offset those impacts. The leadership has committed to a \$10M investment in Dogpatch. The specific areas*

have not been identified because we are evaluating all potential priorities with the City to maximize our investment. We need to identify the lead City agencies for implementing proposed projects as we work to better define our commitment in our cushioning proposal.

--A lot of thought has been put into this by neighbors and the City regarding what is needed. There is an incredible lack of infrastructure, and a hope for area enhancements. It's great to talk about flashy improvements around UCSF projects, but what about a block away? To a certain extent, the City is really at fault, because we should not have to look to UCSF for improvements that are standard for other parts of the city. It seems like there is a better nexus of projects for UCSF to offer. We cannot answer what UCSF is to provide until we know what the ENCAC and the City will provide. Planning and OEWD, where are we in response to this list of neighbor requests?

--Every developer provides a package of bulb-outs, sidewalk greening and pays impact fees. The City is planning for our needs, after the fact. This is not done in other parts of the city.

--The Mission Bay Redevelopment Area serves as a financing model. *The Redevelopment project was a state financing tool for generating reinvestment of tax increments back into the area to stimulate future growth. At Mission Bay, we were required to conform to an existing redevelopment framework per contractual obligations.*

--Development activities by private developers allow for budgeting to cover impacts related to police and fire. For tax-exempt entities such as UCSF, there is no means for budgeting.

--(SFMTA) Stop signs do not cost any money. We're happy to review intersection proposals. However, there are costs related to analyses by traffic engineers to assess needs and potential impacts, such as impacts to MUNI.

--(Supervisor Cohen's office) We are missing critical costing information that needs vetting by the City and UCSF to make sure our numbers are aligned.

--(Planning Department) We are costing everything in the Public Realm Improvement Plan to help with the funding decision process. Every stop sign, every sidewalk, every curb will have a number. The Department is mapping which items may be funded by other sources such as Pier 70, etc. We still need to identify items for impact funds. Many elements of the plan are unfunded. *We need to identify funding gaps and how partners can come together to make projects happen. This is a critical action item.*

--We need to hear from OEWD. We are talking about a number of projects and dates. The scope needs to be reconsidered, as well as the investment level. We want a map of decision points, and OEWD is the master keeper. We need to talk about revisiting the scope and identify dates for arriving at decisions.

--(OEWD) We negotiate with some of the large sponsors of the big signature projects within the Southern Bayfront as an integrated network. These properties include Mission Rock, Warriors, Associated Capital (Power Plant), India Basin, Pier 70. How do we leverage those negotiations to address transit, sea level rise, affordable housing, adaptation and protection and workforce development as part of an integrated network? We need to look at how we can work together to address some of the deficiencies and look at how we can provide enhancements. It's complicated: there is the Public Realm Plan, the CIP programs that SFMTA is working on, the 16th Street ferry landing (Port project), the MIT measures and TSA impacts of Forest City and UCSF cushioning. We want to make sure projects fit into an overall master plan. We still have work to do. We have many of the same concerns as those noted on the neighbor list, including specific street-level improvements, basic sidewalks and stop signs, connections, the ferry landing, transit (T-Third improvements and the XX bus service), sidewalks, etc. We are aware of the changing neighborhood and its existing and future needs. The things that neighbors have been consistently requesting are very much on our radar, and we are trying to align those needs with funding streams. We continue to work through various channels on various issues and priorities.

--We all agree there is a huge need here. The question is how do we get that accomplished? Can we identify funding sources and opportunities? Can we use this process convened by UCSF to bring these resources to the table, so that the result addresses these critical neighbor needs? It's important to consider that these needs may be beyond what UCSF can provide. Ten million dollars is the number, but there are other sources that could be tapped to achieve a greater result. No, it is not an easy process, but to focus only on UCSF to deliver on the total of what has been neglected is probably not realistic. There is obviously more work to be done with our partners.

--Neighbors' expectations far exceeded the \$10M offer for streetscapes and stop signs. This is disappointing.

--UCSF does not get credit for decorative seating and sidewalks: this is what developers customarily do. UCSF will not get credit for bike lanes and stop signs because neighbors advocate for it with the City, and the City puts them in. We are going to get these things because of Vision Zero, not UCSF, because of our own advocacy, because we are good at it and can get it from the City through our influence.

--(Planning Department) We should work to identify potential funding sources to help define priorities. This phase of the plan is coming up shortly. The Public Realm Plan will be very important in setting priorities. It would help if UCSF could look at how far afield from proposed projects could investments be made, given legal and political limitations. The community is saying you are only doing things that affect your projects. From the community and city standpoint, it would help if UCSF could prioritize its list. What are the highest priorities for completion in the shortest timeframe?

--Following up on the request for dates, we would like to see implementation occur at the time the new populations arrive at the proposed developments. It is important to sync implementation of improvements with the time of the impacts.

--I do not see this as impactful and visible, other than beneath the underpass, unless you are talking about putting most of the \$10M towards the ferry landing, which would benefit UCSF. It would also help mitigate traffic for neighbors, but remember we are going to have the Warriors here too, so that might not help very much. What part is branded UCSF and is visible and meaningful? *Potentially, three projects are visible and meaningful: 1) activating the area beneath the 18th Street overpass. We would take an unattractive space and create an area of engagement with the Dogpatch Arts Plaza, 2) providing a safe transition for bicyclists from Indiana to Minnesota to safely cross Mariposa into Mission Bay to get downtown, and 3) improving pedestrian safety—we know 18th and Minnesota is very hazardous, and the other intersections also warrant attention. While stop signs are free, we need traffic analysis to make a case for installing stop signs.*

--A couple of tables at the underpass is not very big. There is so much on the neighbor ask list, like Esprit Park, or a new “UCSF park” that would be responsive. *The proposal to enhance the underpass was brought to us by the task force. All over the city and beyond, communities are taking back spaces beneath overpasses to create new parklets and active space. The idea is to engage it as an active area, not just for benches and such.*

--UCSF can help with recreation resources such as Jackson Park because that is within the sphere of project impacts. It is not that our project is not on the list, it is not within your boundaries. We have tangible improvements you can make today.

--Since the beginning, we have asked for a large new park space and for restoration of the historic police station (to offset the loss of an historic resource). These are two simple, large projects.

--Preservation of the police station is a priority. We continue to ask the City about the next steps for securing the site and preventing further damage. Some in the neighborhood are working to bifurcate the community hub pop-up to test the operational concept, which will ultimately be housed in the restored police station.

--If you renovate the old police station, the pop-up concept could go in there, but regardless, the project can start right now.

--The next meeting is April 24. Here's what we heard from the task force about what's needed for this next phase in the process:

1. *More specifics in costing out projects in the Public Realm Plan, as well as UCSF's proposals.*
2. *More complete inventory of funding sources to identify how best to fund items.*
3. *Schedule for improvements. Delivery of projects before impacts are felt.*
4. *UCSF should not fund items that would be better covered by other entities, like street improvements. Consider public open spaces.*

--Neighbors need to prioritize the list. If there are projects on the list that do not meet the nexus, make adjustments.

--(OEWD) We will attempt to marshal internal resources to identify existing funding for other projects in the vicinity. This should be identified first, so we can strategically identify gaps.

--*We need to get these numbers in advance of the next meeting so the information can be fed into this process and examined. If we can sit down with the City and look at a funding and priorities list, we can identify gaps to inform the list of projects and make investments based on the guidelines we need to follow. We need to get this done in the next 2–3 weeks.*

--(DPW) The City can learn from UCSF with respect to the expediency. Based on similar efforts, there is generally a significant funding gap, and UCSF should work with the City to look at creative financing for addressing needs. Impact fees and developer in-kind agreements will still likely have serious deficiencies in meeting the growing needs for this area. OEWD and City Planning should work with the Controller's Office to examine how the City can begin to catch up with what the Public Realm Plan outlines to address current needs. These projects are not 20 years down the line, but require budgeting with alternative financing and revenue streams in the near-term.

--Is this the forum that will take us to the next level? We have worked down from super highway to the capillary level. Until there is more information and more insight, it is hard to go forward. The Public Realm Plan doesn't say where the money is going to come from, only that it is needed. Saying that impacts fees are going to cover this in the next five years does not help in most cases. It is now time for the City to respond in a meaningful, holistic, cohesive way; we cannot have a piecemeal, Lego-like response. We need to know what to expect at 3 years, 4 years, and 5 years. How do we proceed? This will help UCSF determine what they can contribute to in a meaningful way so we can move ahead, but we need the City's input.

We suggest that we would have a more meaningful meeting number six if postponed until April, so we have time to assemble the needed information and present a more definitive package.

UCSF has heard you. This is the first time we have engaged in a cushioning process. It is new, a little bumpy, and that is okay. Our goal is a constructive outcome. UCSF is sticking with this process, and we are committed to working with neighbors and the City. We look forward to the next step to see where our investment can move projects and help contribute to the neighborhood. Thank you for your honest and forthright contributions and desire for meaningful outcomes.

Next Steps and Adjourn

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