UCSF LRDP—Mission Bay Community Workshop #2

February 28, 2013
Summary Report
INTRODUCTION

UCSF hosted another in a series of community workshops on February 28, 2013 to share LRDP proposals for the Mission Bay campus and solicit feedback from neighbors. The workshop was held from 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Cardiovascular Research Building on the UCSF Mission Bay Campus and was attended by more than 30 people.

Outreach for the meeting included an ad in the Potrero View neighborhood newspaper (circulation 9,000) along with an ad in two issues of the Sun Reporter (circulation 11,000); a postcard mailing to over 3,500 neighbors; an email to approximately 500 neighbors on the UCSF listserv; over 500 notified via other email distribution lists including Bayview Footprints and the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association list; meeting information posting on Supervisor Malia Cohen’s D10 (District 10) blog; posting in Supervisor Jane Kim’s newsletter; and notification on the UCSF website and events calendar.

Vice Chancellor Barbara French welcomed participants and thanked them for attending to share their ideas related to the University’s Long-Range Development Plan. Following her remarks, she introduced Daniel Iacofano of MIG, Inc., who gave an overview of the evening’s agenda.

PRESENTATIONS

Esther Morales, Executive Director of UCSF Real Estate Services, next offered an update on the University’s short-term space needs for Mission Bay. Kevin Beauchamp, UCSF’s Director of Physical Planning, then provided a contextual overview of the Long-Range Development Plan and schedule, indicating some of the recent planning efforts and milestones for the current process.

Karen Alschuler, a principal with the firm of Perkins + Will, reviewed highlights of the previous community workshop held in October, noting the key themes and comments received that have been brought forward in the process. She then covered a series of slides describing physical plan proposals for the Mission Bay campus, focusing on specific blocks for new research, housing, infrastructure and retail. The final presentation of the evening was given by José Farrán with Adavant Consulting, who described the preliminary analyses that have been conducted to determine transportation impacts from the Mission Bay development proposals.

The entire PowerPoint presentation can be accessed at the UCSF LRDP website by clicking on the following links: UCSF LRDP Mission Bay Workshop 2013 0228 Presentation 1, UCSF LRDP Mission Bay Workshop 2013 0228 Presentation 2.

Community Feedback

Questions and comments from members of the public were submitted orally at the meeting and later via written comment forms. These are summarized below, organized by discussion topic (with responses from University staff and consultants, at the meeting and subsequently, shown in italics):

TOPIC #1: NEAR-TERM MISSION BAY SPACE NEEDS

- Is there a connection between new leased space and your departure from Laurel Heights?
  - We don’t know yet; but the funding is not linked.
How long are the lease terms being considered?
- The University is looking at long-term leases moving to ownership.

Would occupants in new leased space come from other sites?
- The University is looking to “mix and match” from all its sites to create the best fit between spaces and tenants.

TOPIC #2: LRDP PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW

There was no discussion regarding this topic.

TOPIC #3A: LRDP / MISSION BAY CAMPUS – PROPOSED PHYSICAL PLAN

- Have there been any shadow studies to determine the impact of the garage on the school site?
  - We reviewed shadows for the active school year from Fall through Spring:
    - Fall (Sept-Oct) – shadows extend very little into the school site – approximately 20-25% of the site
    - Winter (Nov-January) – shadows extend further into the site, but do preserve good sunlight conditions on the northern portion of the site – approximately 30% of the site retained in sunlight
    - Spring (February-June) -- shadows extend very little into the school site – approximately 20-25% of the site
  - The summer period June-August very little shadowing is predicted.

- What is the actual height of the research building at Block 16, including the roof mechanical?
  - The base height of the research building on Block 16 would be 85 feet, with an additional approximately 20 feet for mechanical equipment—similar to other research buildings on the campus site. The northern face of the building above 55’ (along the Commons) would step back 30 feet from the property line to minimize shading of the Commons, as specified by the UCSF Mission Bay Campus Master Plan. The potential shadow impact of rooftop mechanical equipment is considered in the shadow study.

- Will there be any shadowing of the commons in the summer?
  - There will be no shadowing on the commons from March 21 to September 21. This includes the Block 15 housing site. The Mission Bay Guidelines, which included the step-backs and height limits to the south of the Mission Bay Commons, ensure there would not be any shadows between March 21 and September 21 from 10am-4pm. Shadows after 4pm during this time period are actually pointing away from the commons, since the sun is setting in the northwest.

- What about the aesthetic appearance of the Central Utility Plant (CUP) on Block 16 and the noise impacts?
  - Community input was sought in developing the preliminary conceptual design of the CUP, which resulted in a building that would be visually compatible with other campus buildings. If and when a CUP is funded, UCSF will seek further community input into its design. If built, the CUP will meet or exceed noise compliance standards.

- Not convinced utility plant is a good neighbor. Design must be highest caliber with regard to noise control, façades, and service access; no big blank walls; color is good

- We would like to see you convene a special meeting regarding energy use and the power plant.

- What are the housing totals?
  - There are 431 units currently. With 523 units proposed, the total would be 954 housing units.

- Regarding Block 15: Glad to see housing; hopefully the housing design can echo the quality of the UCSF housing on Third Street.

- What is anticipated to be in the research building?
  - That is not yet determined.
Why is there no more retail on Third Street?
- The focus is to provide most of the retail on and near Fourth Street where pedestrian traffic is expected to be the heaviest, with enhanced connectivity to transit.
- Access to retail on Third Street is hampered by the unavailability of parking.

Retail (existing and proposed) appears scattered and random. Graphics / signage need more focus and orientation onto 3rd Street. Need to capture potential for on campus retail uses taking into account potential enterprises that can provide service in the larger urban context serving a broader market beyond UCSF.

Will this dispersing of retail create the lively street life that we said we desired?
- The placement of retail on and around Third and Fourth Streets will help activate these public streets and provide greater connectivity to transit and the adjacent open spaces.

Is there an opportunity to create something that will be a draw for the broader community?
- With the retail planned around the plaza, Koret Quad and along Fourth Street, UCSF will be developing a critical mass of retail services that will support the campus community and be a draw for the larger community.

Regarding Koret Quad: a very pleasant open space, but needs activating uses.

Variation in building heights is desperately needed to break up predominate monoliths on campus.

Have you done analysis of cumulative impacts of all new development on infrastructure capacity?
- Consultants determined that no upgrades to Mission Bay public infrastructure were needed to accommodate UCSF’s increased entitlement, with the possible exception of upgrades to the pumps and breaker switches in Sewer Pump Station P15.

Regarding the buildings along Third Street north of the hospital, what is going to be inviting about them? Create some amenities at the southeast corner of Block 25.
- UCSF’s Physical Design Framework provides guidelines that require future buildings to address and improve the public realm.

Regarding the retail shown in Genentech Hall, will that be accessible to the public?
- No, that is intended for internal use.

Community function: Provide small building or space with a community focus, to reinforce ties with the surrounding community. Could be multi-focus and welcoming: a place to learn about the amazing work being done on campus; learn about advances in health sciences / programs dealing with personal health and well-being; hold community meetings and lectures; a “mini Exploratorium” to learn hands-on information about the sciences and related fields.

**TOPIC #3B: LRDP / MISSION BAY CAMPUS – PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Does the traffic analysis include hospital traffic?
- The potential transportation impacts of the entire UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay were analyzed in the 2008 EIR. In the LRDP EIR, the Medical Center will be included in the transportation analysis as part of the background conditions (Phase 1 in the interim year analysis and Phase 1 + Phase 2 in the 2040 analysis)

Can you illustrate traffic impacts at some interim point between now and 2040?
- Yes. The LRDP EIR will analyze one interim year--2018, 2019 or 2020 pending coordination with SFMTA and City Planning--for the Mission Bay campus.

In response to questions, it was clarified that the following are being analyzed in the LRDP EIR:
- the roundabout at Owens/Channel/Mission Bay Blvd/Mission Bay Drive
- the intersection of Mariposa/Fourth/Minnesota

Include the Daggett Triangle and Concourse Exhibition Center projects in the cumulative analysis.
- These projects are already included in the 2040 cumulative analysis.

Consider additional mitigations at Channel and Fourth and Channel and Third.
The LRDP EIR will look at potential cumulative impacts and conditions, but no impacts have been identified yet since these intersections are not expected to fail. The LRDP EIR will identify the need for mitigation measures, if transportation impacts are identified.

- Can you coordinate your traffic analysis with the MTA’s TEP proposal in order to compare apples to apples?
  - SFMTA is evaluating various changes to MUNI routes as part of their Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). One of them includes a project to provide bus-only lanes on 16th St. The analysis of cumulative transportation conditions in the LRDP EIR will incorporate the SFMTA assumptions as part of the analysis of cumulative conditions.

- We understand there have been discussions about removing the elevated portion of Interstate 280 to west of the campus. Have you considered the plans and impacts on Mission Bay from the High-Speed Rail (HSR) proposal to depress 16th Street?
  - These plans are in flux. We agree with many neighbors that 16th Street should not be lowered. The SF Planning Department considers the HSR project to be too speculative and does not include it in the cumulative assessment of 2040 transportation conditions. The LRDP will discuss it qualitatively but will not include it in the quantitative analysis.

- How are additional trips handled by transit?
  - Most of these trips will be picked up by Third Street light rail and the new central subway by 2040. Central Subway expected to open in 2019; UCSF shuttle service will also take care of about half of the UCSF generated transit trips.

- Are you studying cumulative transit demand? We would like that information.
  - Transit demand will be discussed in the EIR.

- What comprises the “other trips” shown in your presentation?
  - These are bicycle and pedestrian trips.

- Transportation study was disappointing with too much focus on vehicular issues with an unending discussion of level-of-service at intersections. With issues as sizeable as those confronting the Mission Bay community, detailed discussions with the SFMTA and other critical groups needs to be a priority.
  - The analysis to date is preliminary and serves to inform the planning process. The LRDP EIR will conduct a multi-modal analysis of future transportation conditions and will include plans being considered by SFMTA for the Mission Bay Area.

- Need to cover roadway patterns (directions, volumes, primary ingress/egress points for service and garage access); how the changes under the City’s TEP program can be maximized to bring real transit service to the area; integration with the Waterfront Transportation Assessment; and need ways to consolidate and minimize the UCSF shuttle program.
  - The LRDP transportation analysis will be multi-modal. The TEP plans for the Mission Bay area being developed by SFMTA will be incorporated into the analyses.

- Look at how UCSF shuttles and the private shuttle systems and carriers are increasingly clogging local streets and creating conflicts at public transit stops. Must eliminate the duplicity of coverage and routes with all of our “smart technology” today there ought to be some way of doing this.

OTHER COMMENTS

I want to commend those involved in the LRDP planning process for maintaining contact with local residents and considering how to make UCSF become an even better partner with the adjoining neighborhoods. As a patient at UCSF for many years, I have received the finest level of care available. Thank you for listening to our comments and suggestions for fine tuning proposals for the Mission Bay campus.

ADJOURN