



Dogpatch Community Task Force
Meeting #1 – September 29, 2016

S U M M A R Y

Welcome and Introductions

Participants were welcomed and 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.

Facilitated Discussion on Desired Outcomes

The facilitator asked members to describe desired outcomes for the cushioning process.

Task Force Member Comments:

- Proposed UCSF developments should bring needed community services, provide architectural appeal, preserve community's unique character and enhance quality of life.
- Deep pockets are buying up real estate, building scary out-of-scale developments, and pushing renters out.
- UCSF must be earnest in these proceedings.
- UCSF should build trust, enter into formal agreements and create a grievance process to help ensure honesty.
- UCSF should fold the 777 Mariposa location into cushioning, even though a future use is not yet determined and it is not yet clear when a future use will be determined.
- Triage immediate concerns versus long-range issues as they relate to quality of life in Dogpatch.
- Respond to connectivity needs of area.
- Address projects' scale and potential amenities.

Review of Task Force Organizing Framework and Planning Process

The facilitator reviewed the phases of the neighborhood engagement process as noted on the Neighborhood Planning Process graphic:

- Phase I – Map existing conditions to identify issues, opportunities and goals (informed by Walkabout);
- Phase II – Concept Development, identify ways to offset potential project impacts; and
- Phase III – Draft & Finalize Report on recommended actions for cushioning

Brief Presentation on History, Background and Context:

UCSF staff provided an overview of the purpose and framework of the 2014 UCSF Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which is a physical master plan charting growth over the next 20 years. It is a "living document," updated and amended to keep it current. An overview was provided of campus developments, past to present, with projected projects in the context of LRDP capacity.

Task Force Member Comments:

- If UCSF is already proposing developments that were not anticipated in the 2014 LRDP, it seems that the LRDP falls short, and UCSF should take a hard look at what really will be needed between now and the end of this LRDP in 2035.

- UCSF needs to direct its donors to pursue development activities on campus as opposed to in neighborhoods like Dogpatch.

Managing Growth in Dogpatch

CAG leaders presented on neighborhood issues and outlined their priorities for neighborhood improvements.

Task Force Member Comments:

- What are UCSF's space needs and options for staying on its campus. Is UCSF mapping out a campus in Dogpatch, then Potrero and Bayview? *(UCSF note: the university is not mapping out campuses in Dogpatch, Potrero or Bayview)*
- In the next year, a total of 800-900 residential units are coming online in Dogpatch—the population will double. UCSF's proposed development will place additional burden on a neighborhood that is already underserved in terms of infrastructure, amenities, etc.
- Add Pier 70, NRG Development, ReBuild Potrero and the Golden State Warriors to the neighborhood influences map along with the Coro Van site.
- Approximately 5,500 additional residential units are slated to open in Dogpatch within the next 5 years, with the Dogpatch population growing possibly 10 fold in 10 years.
- UCSF parking is still an issue along with smokers, their cigarette butts and the purple glove waste. *(UCSF note: we're working on a plan to address these issues)*
- The land underneath the 18th St. overpass is a priority for the neighborhood. It's an opportunity to open up the area and provide access between Indiana and Minnesota. Also, need to figure out safe Mariposa crossing for cyclists.

Facilitated Discussion – Identify key issues, challenges and topics to be addressed

Task Force Member Comments:

- Revise the format for public participation during the DCTF meetings: Members of the public need to be able to speak at natural discussion points. Members of the public were asked to be sensitive to the process and not jump in insisting to be heard out of turn. DCTF members have made the time commitment to participate in the process fully. We all need to be mindful. *(UCSF note: we have added an extra public comment period to the agenda for the Oct 24 meeting and will endeavor to do so at natural discussion breaks in the agenda)*
- Members asked to receive meeting materials in advance, so that they can come prepared. *(UCSF note: we will do our best to provide materials in advance)*
- How does the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan relate to UCSF? Member response: UCSF is exempt from the Eastern Neighborhoods Development Fee because it is a public university and member of the UC system. Can we evaluate how much a private developer would pay? Private projects in the City's planning pipeline are estimated to contribute \$192M. However, according to City Planning, impact fees only mitigate 36% of project impacts. Can we look at the opportunity cost of foregone development fees?
- UCSF should consider: (a) growth constraints; and (b) neighborhood investment to improve quality of life with a diversity of uses – food, shopping, makers, jobs, etc.
- UCSF's projected 2017 construction start for Minnesota graduate student housing sounds aggressive, and too fast. How can design inform the cushioning process? *(UCSF note: the design and cushioning processes are parallel and will likely inform each other)*
- Establish links between design and benefits – be agile and iterative.

- Can UCSF consider free parking for its employees?
- Need to be transit-first and advocate for improvements in existing transit infrastructure. Boost T-Line service frequency. This is critical since the line will connect directly to Chinatown.
- Need to create recreation opportunities (basketball, tennis and volleyball). Caltrans needs to make more of their verges available for such uses. The two state agencies can work together to respond to community needs.
- Improve streetscape and access near I-280 overpass and Mariposa.
- Create educational opportunities for children K – 6th grade. *(UCSF note: UCSF has a science education program, SEP that provides a myriad of educational enrichment programs to the community, including science education in K-5 schools.)*
- How many more properties is UCSF going to acquire during this process, before we can come to an agreement?
- Audra, Julie, Janet and Kieran volunteered to work with Michele on setting the walkabout route, key points of interest and relevant issues.
- Neighbors need UCSF to help with the cost of renovation of the old police station at 20th & 3rd Streets into a community hub. It's estimated to cost \$10M. Neighbors use the Tivoli Room now, but have outgrown it and would like to linger after 9 pm.

Public Comment

- Said he supports the Minnesota Street affordable housing for students and is fine with the number of units within the height and bulk limits.
- Discussed her history with UCSF since 1972 and pointed out that UCSF is accountable to the State Legislature through the UC Board of Regents.