



## S U M M A R Y

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting opened with introductions of task force members and members of the public.

### **Agenda Overview and Recap of Meeting #3**

Daniel Iacofano, the meeting facilitator, provided a brief recap of previous work done at the November 28, 2016 meeting. The City Budget Legislative Analyst Office (BLA) shared data in its report of how proposed UCSF developments would be addressed if UCSF were a private developer. This extended presentation affected other agenda items for the November meeting. Tonight's meeting is dedicated to neighbor presentations to ensure all information is considered in this process.

There was a brief discussion about whether there should be detailed minutes of meetings. Daniel clarified the intent is to provide meeting notes and use PowerPoint presentations for substantive materials. There will be a final report that will capture critical points of this process and outcomes.

### **Neighbor Presentations**

#### Presentation 1: Needs/Requests Related to UCSF Expansion into Dogpatch

J.R. Eppler reviewed slides related to neighbor requests for transparency and cooperation. He discussed ways in which building design and opportunistic design can work within the existing built environment. He suggested that mitigation and cushioning have overlapping circles of what is needed in the neighborhood to make developments work.

He believes UCSF and various City agencies have a role in seeing that things get done to improve the neighborhood. Regarding open space, Esprit Park is struggling as it's the only city park in Dogpatch and is intensively used. It has drainage and lighting, design and long-term health issues and needs restoration. He believes that Woods Yard falls short of the community's vision of a public open space that serves a broader set of constituents. It needs lighting, seating and greening upgrades as a key marker for defining the community character along 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. The Caltrain station at 22<sup>nd</sup> Street has had more of an increase in ridership in the Caltrain system than any other stop. At night, it is dark and needs safety improvements to enhance utility for the broader regional transit system. He believes an Open Space Acquisition Fund would help meet community needs for all of the new residents coming into the area. This would also help address the need for active recreation and provide permanent mitigation for the new developments coming to the area. He stated that Potrero Recreation Connector is looking to create a pedestrian pathway from Pier 70 to the Mission by bridging the gap between Connecticut and Missouri streets, traversing HWY 101. He said that Jackson Park is the closest recreation area to Dogpatch and used by at least 1000 San Franciscans each week. It needs to be reworked to accommodate all users coming to the area. This effort is being led by Friends of Jackson Park.

Regarding community space, he believes there is a need to bring the historic revitalization at Pier 70 over to the old police station at 20<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets to meet the need for complete neighborhood

services in Dogpatch. Streetscapes are also needed, but there is a lack of holistic infrastructure connections (sidewalk improvements, street trees, greening) that pace with area development as it occurs. He believes there are opportunities in the area at the 18<sup>th</sup> St. overpass, 19<sup>th</sup> St. Dogpatch Arts Plaza, connection to Crane Cove and other hot spots. This process is moving ahead without a plan – need a cadence for bulb-outs, streetlights, etc., that must be integrated, not piecemeal.

He said that Mariposa Street acts as a car river given its connection to the freeway, tying into the transportation issues, namely bike routes. There is a need for a bike network connection to 17<sup>th</sup> Street from Dogpatch. He also wants better connectivity via a one-seat bus service between Dogpatch, Potrero Hill and Mission Bay to the broader transportation network. Water ferry service is needed at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and should include water taxi access. He wants negative parking impacts to be addressed. He believes UCSF should look at offsite options as ways to keep parking working for residents, and shoppers and people who work in the neighborhood.

Regarding the BLA report, he said neighbors have since reviewed the agreements UCSF has with the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), the successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. He believes that neighbors view this matter as a moral issue in that a private developer would contribute a funding stream to the Eastern Neighborhoods fund. He believes these funds could be used for neighborhood and city services such as transit, homelessness, etc.

He said the DCTF scorecard provides a snapshot rating of UCSF's response thus far. He believes UCSF's response about its planned use of all five sites is incomplete since information is missing about 777 Mariposa. Neighbors appreciate the schedule and the extended comment period on the 2130 Draft EIR, but still want a guarantee that there will be no further intrusion into Dogpatch.

He believes that neighbors want support for rescinding the 2009 Eastern Neighborhoods Medical Overlay. He believes many now feel that it seems incompatible with the residential and arts uses that are growing in Dogpatch. Neighbors know UCSF is not taking advantage of this, but they don't want biomedical partners taking advantage of it.

He said that neighbors want UCSF to expand its local hire program. Tony Kelly noted some one-time contributions UCSF made at Mission Bay and annual contributions UCSF makes (UCSF provided the task force with these documents). He talked about a CPMC development agreement in which CPMC established specific goals for local hire and charity care. He believes this is relevant for 94124, 94134 and parts of 94107 because these areas have unemployment up to four times higher than other parts of the city, and more local hires decreases traffic impacts. He urged the DCTF to consider this as a template for UCSF to agree to commensurate local hire and charity care commitments.

#### Presentation 2: Dogpatch/Potrero Development Mitigation

Janet Carpinelli shared Minnesota Housing slides from earlier meetings UCSF held with the DNA/Boosters Design & Development Committee (DDC) and expressed concerns about the project size. *UCSF noted that we are working with the DDC in an iterative process, and the drawings shown have since undergone two revisions with the Committee.* She expressed concerns that the 2130 Third Street seems like Mission Bay and has a zero lot line. She suggested urban design elements like midblock passages, green spaces, pocket parks and plazas to break up buildings. She mentioned other elements such as sidewalk activation, setbacks, permeability and bulb-outs to contribute to Vision Zero.

Julie Christensen focused on what fits into the Venn diagram. She said the Kieran Timberlake design set a clear boundary at the edge of property with no improvements for 18<sup>th</sup> and Indiana and the top of the freeway overpass. She wants to know how far UCSF can go beyond the boundaries for the benefit of students and neighbors. She thinks these projects provide an opportunity to do something positive with the City's help. She wants to improve the top of the 18<sup>th</sup> Street overpass – paving, lighting, etc. She asked for a sketch for 18<sup>th</sup> and Indiana to help the City conceptualize a new vision. The intersection at 18<sup>th</sup> and Minnesota needs attention, as does Mariposa and Minnesota.

Heidi Dunkelgod noted that mid-block passages are suggested on both sides of the 18<sup>th</sup> Street overpass as part of the Minnesota housing design. She said the narrowest pinch point is 9 feet, and that is too small for 60-foot buildings. *UCSF noted that the proposed width of this area has increased.*

J.R. acknowledged that the neighborhood is infrastructure-poor, and that will be exacerbated by UCSF projects. He further noted that the neighbors' mitigation slides require the City's partnership. He asked UCSF to address procedural impacts of dealing with hazardous soils/materials and construction impacts and to provide a community liaison to provide updates on construction schedules and respond to concerns and minimize impacts. He added that traffic issues include Transportation Network Services that are overwhelming street grids, and he asked UCSF to address TDM measures and try to reduce UCSF trips. He asked UCSF to help create a complete neighborhood to provide essential resources to help eliminate the need for car trips – and said grocery is key. He asked for the City to work with UCSF to provide sidewalk and pedestrian connectivity as part of traffic-calming.

Heidi addressed the bicycle network stating the need to complete the circulation between Dogpatch, Potrero Hill, Mission Bay, Bayview, Showplace Square and the Mission by creating “dog-leg” connections. She wants a route through Dogpatch with a connection between the Caltrain station and campus. She highlighted hazardous areas at Cesar Chavez, at 280, Owens and Mariposa interchanges and a need for a secure lane for bikes on Mariposa. She believes Mariposa and Illinois are especially dangerous. She thinks class two routes would work for the rest of the area from Caltrain to campus through Dogpatch and lower Potrero. She is also seeking to add a bike lane at Caltrain to cross the bridge to Mariposa.

J. R. suggested new bus line connections to Castro and North Beach that do not rely on going through 16<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets when the Warriors have events. He believes shuttles are a mixed blessing and do not help the community because neighbors cannot use them.

Heidi noted that the neighborhood has changed parking to two hour-limits as a disincentive to UCSF Med Center employee parking. Area parking capacity is only 2300, and if 10% goes to the CTFC, that will affect neighborhood needs. She believes that student resident vehicle parking should be voluntarily restricted from RPP from the Minnesota housing project. *Community Relations has indicated that students will not be eligible for Residential Parking Permits (RPP).* She wants to see the CTFC lot expanded to meet its own daily needs and believes that commuters could meet daily demand by sharing parking, or by UC development of parking lots.

Heidi said that the Dogpatch historic district includes boundaries that define the Medical Overlay and the America Industrial Center (AIC) Special Use District. She wants to maintain the historic integrity of Dogpatch to protect against the encroachment of office, life science and research uses. She would like to see a serious preservation effort and is recommending a buffer around the historic district to protect against other uses.

J.R. noted that open space is oversubscribed in Dogpatch as new users come in. He asked UCSF to acquire land to create a new park, fund capital and maintenance improvements at Esprit Park, Woods Park and Jackson Park, and fund capital improvement connections between Dogpatch and Potrero that would make the Potrero Recreation Center more accessible to Dogpatch. He asked UCSF to continue the good job of contributing to the Green Benefit District for all of UCSF's acquisitions.

Katherine Doumani presented on neighbors' desire to preserve and restore the police station at 20<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets. She noted that not since the 1860s has the neighborhood seen such dramatic change. The area is losing buildings, warehouses and Production Distribution and Repair (PDR) uses that define this quirky mixed-use neighborhood. She noted that the UCSF project at 600 Minnesota was the California Peach Canning building, built in 1890. The buildings at 20<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets, built in 1912, with an adjoining hospital built in 1915, are owned by the San Francisco Police Department. She said the City has expressed a willingness to turn them over to the community to serve as a facility for the community for the future. Horton, adaptive reuse experts working on Pier 70, verified that the structures are sound, as they have been working with neighbors to assess restoration potential. She believes these buildings are priceless and need saving as a historic architectural asset as the neighborhood is redeveloped.

J.R. closed the neighbor presentations by noting that some projects are clearer for the university to help with than others are. In addition to actual investments, influence is a key part of this as related to transit and transportation to provide better access for neighbors to the rest of the city.

#### Facilitated Discussion and Public Comment

Supervisor Cohen updated neighbors on the police station at 20<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets. She said that in the last 60 days, a team comprised of Real Estate, Planning and a consultant assembled to refine the scope of temporary measures to secure and protect the station with consideration of the historic value the building brings to the neighborhood. This includes wiring and decontaminating the interior.

Keith Goldstein commented on how the Medical Overlay needs to respect the value of PDR (Production, Distribution and Repair). The "R" is very important, as repair shops are as important as manufacturers and makers such as seamstresses and stone masons.

#### **Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm Plan**

Robin Abad from City Planning presented the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm Plan (PRP). He reviewed the purpose of the plan: 1) it provides an implementation framework for delivering services; 2) it is the City's instrument for setting the framework for where to deliver public funding to the area, and 3) it is the City's capital planning instrument for figuring out when MTA and DPW are going to implement new sidewalks, etc. He said the area needs pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, reinvestment into existing open space assets, as well as the acquisition and development of new open space assets.

The other reason there is a PRP is that agencies need to be coordinated with one another. The SFMTA has some of their biggest citywide serving facilities including a railyard and a bus yard in Dogpatch. Planning, Public Works, Caltrans, Caltrain and UCSF are each proposing plans for improving the area. City departments asked the Planning Department to pull together a coordinated approach.

The PRP planning effort reflects the most recent set of community priorities, which have changed over time. They are working to coordinate with other planning strategies (Green Connections Plan, Better Streets Plan, and the Port's Blue Greenway plan, Caltrans, Caltrain, SFMTA, GBD Vision and Management Plan). The City Planning Department is integrating and coordinating these plans through the PRP. The Central Waterfront Plan sets the City's broad directives that inform the Central Waterfront Dogpatch PRP, which moves the process forward by operationalizing policies and objectives. This establishes the City's directive for increasing connectivity, acquiring more parks and open space, reinvesting and improving the ones that exist.

Robin shared updated numbers on population and housing unit projections in his presentation. They are anticipating a huge curve of growth in the area with the unit load tripling and the population more than quadrupling. The impacts are heavily concentrated in northern Dogpatch, including UCSF projects. There are still open space and pedestrian and bicycle circulation needs in Baja (southern) Dogpatch. The plan will come out in the spring (second quarter) of this year. The final plan will provide a set of conceptual designs and cost estimates that will facilitate the City's process for programming public investment dollars for public realm projects in Dogpatch.

There will be subsequent phases of development with detail design efforts for RPD, Esprit, streets and streetscapes, and 22nd Street.

Robin reviewed several projects within the broader scope, including the Citywide Better Streets Plan, the Pier 70 Master Plan, Citywide Bicycle strategy, the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Greening Master Plan (formed the basis for DPW work), the GBD work. Various other projects are included along with smaller projects like Angel Alley, Tunnel Top Park and Muni Woods Yard. They are over halfway through this interagency planning effort and are close to having an implementation framework.

To recap the priority projects, City Planning did a scan of all prior plans (public and private) and identified all discrete projects posted on Neighborland, an online polling platform. It was up for four months to kick off neighbor engagement and had a public workshop (March 2016) to come up with an initial project list reviewed by city departments. This was to identify a final priority list. They have done some preliminary cost estimates to make sure investments are targeted to Dogpatch; DPW is working on estimates for the entire neighborhood, to share in the coming weeks. The plan is focusing on urban design generally, and specific locations, building frontages and intersections in need of investments to enhance residential development around UCSF projects and other developments.

At the intersection of 18<sup>th</sup> and Minnesota, Planning has identified this as a site for either signalization or stop controls to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. Southern Dogpatch has pedestrian and bicycle safety issues along the 25<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. PRP coordination efforts with other public realm projects were instrumental in getting Eastern Neighborhood Community Advisory Committee (ENCAC) support for initial funding. They are looking to implement by early next year including decorative crosswalks.

There have been multiple workshops and focus groups and meetings with the Boosters and DNA. There will be a workshop on Feb. 8 on Esprit Park followed by DNA's hosting of a streetscapes meeting on Feb. 21 at Harmonic Brewing.

#### Facilitated Discussion and Public Comment

Q: With respect to the area-wide diagram and various improvement points for the identified, will there be a funding plan for implementing the various projects that will be included in the final plan?

A: DPW is working on cost estimating, and we anticipate that there is not enough money. We are looking for coordination opportunities with developers and state and federal grant opportunities.

Comment: Thank you, on behalf of DNA, for all of your hard work.

Q: What is Baja Dogpatch? Not everyone prefers this term.

A: Southern Dogpatch

Q: To what scale is the PRP incorporating underground infrastructure into its cost estimation and to what extent is the PUC involved in that effort?

A: To the extent that proposed interventions might have impacts, is the extent to which we have worked with the PUC. Neighbors have expressed a desire to see bulb-outs to shorten crosswalk distances for enhanced pedestrian safety. Although Illinois was highly rated in the early phase of feedback, it was excluded from the PRP. OEWD has indicated that Illinois Street will be an outgrowth of this effort in its planning and coordination with Pier 70.

Q: When you finally figure out the costs, note that impact fees have been allocated to other projects. Am I correct in assuming the city will use general fund money for improvements after all impact fee projections have been taken into account?

A: That has yet to be determined. About \$8M-10M remains unprogrammed from the 2020 budget.

Comment: The neighbor project descriptions list is believed to have a decent amount of nexus with UCSF projects, please note opportunity areas identified by neighbors as a guide.

Comment: Please check with the City to see how much will be collected from pipeline projects. Neighbors have submitted a list of projects that UCSF needs to work with the City on execution. The list of projects includes Esprit Park which needs to be restored – drainage, layout design to accommodate long-term demand for increased use.

### **UCSF Vision Framework**

Barbara French commended neighbors on their hard work in preparing information for the task force. In the beginning, some task force members mentioned that they were skeptical of this process, but now realize that it has afforded an opportunity to coalesce and plan for the future. Besides focusing on UCSF, it has helped us all understand the needs of the community and its priorities.

We are looking at the Venn diagram of where the cushioning requests mesh with UCSF needs. UCSF is part of a 10-campus public university system. In order to expend funds in areas not specifically tied to education, we have to make a case to our own leadership and the university system that any investment benefits both the neighbors and UCSF. Any investment outside of our educational mission must provide a benefit to us, to avoid a gift of public funds. We also have to demonstrate that any investment helps to mitigate potential project impacts. Our Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) states that investments must be tied to development impacts. We are looking at meaningful investments that are visible, significant and memorable. There are three buckets that interconnect to some degree, but are distinct: design, CEQA and cushioning. The cushioning is beyond the scope of what the individual project could do.

Regarding the City's Budget Legislative Analyst Report, UCSF has been a tax-exempt public university for over 150 years. The basis for this tax-exempt status is to provide the public benefit of education, patient care and research. The City has, in many instances, acknowledged this. We are one of many tax-exempt organizations, like state agencies and museums in the City of San Francisco.

Another issue raised at the last meeting was the acquisition of land at Mission Bay. The Mission Bay Redevelopment Project Area is governed by a different set of rules. One, within the project area, there are certain contractual obligations that set legal requirements for the acquisitions of the land. Two,

when UCSF was invited to the area, the City needed an anchor tenant to help make the area viable. The tax increment revenues are generated by development activities, which lead to increased area property values. Those tax increments are used for area reinvestment to fund infrastructure improvements. When nonprofits, such as UCSF, acquire land in such areas, they enter into payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) negotiations, discussions and agreements with OCII to make sure the area has long-term funding to cover infrastructure costs.

She thanked neighbors for preparing the neighbor scorecard as it gives us a sense of how neighbors are feeling. This process is scheduled to end by March, though we have a placeholder for April 24 if needed. She thanked task force members for their earnest and thoughtful response.

Facilitated Discussion and Public Comment

Comment: We all know that Mission Bay Redevelopment entered into an agreement with UCSF. However, I would not be sitting here today if UCSF stuck to the Mission Bay area. We did not agree to that.

Comment: Looking at #2, this is by far and away an impact.

Comment: There is an expectation for a legal agreement (MOU or binding contract) with Supervisor Cohen’s office, the City Attorney and UCSF. I hope every member of the DNA anticipates collaborating on this agreement.

Supervisor Cohen: We have reached out to the City Attorney for a response.

Next meetings: Wednesday, February 22, 2017

Tuesday, March 21, 2017 (Note: *Cancelled at Feb. 22 meeting*)

Monday, April 24, 2017 (TENTATIVE)

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