



S U M M A R Y

Welcome and Introductions

Barbara French opened with introductions

Agenda Overview and Recap of Meeting #2

There was a discussion of the neighborhood priorities, emphasizing this meeting's focus on transparency and cooperation. The slides were sent to the task force in advance. In response to neighbor requests, the Budget Legislative Analyst was added to the agenda.

Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

City Legislative Budget Analyst Presentation

City staff gave a presentation of their estimates of the fees and property taxes that would be collected for the proposed UCSF projects if developed by a for-profit developer.

Three UCSF properties were examined: Minnesota student housing, The Child, Teen, and Family Center, and 777 Mariposa. Assumptions were made based on the type of use. The open space in lieu payment was not calculated because the open space is unknown. Payroll tax was also not included, because 2012's Prop E replaces the payroll tax with the gross receipts tax, which is a conservative estimate based on anticipated use and 2016 tax rates. It was not possible to determine the property tax for a private development because the buildings have not been built, so City staff made their assessment based on similar buildings in the neighborhood and in other parts of the city.

Discussion

- City staff were thanked for the report.
- Regarding the open space fee, what would be the fee? City staff responded that a developer can either provide the minimum required open space or pay a fee at a rate of \$76 for non-residential space.
- There is a distinction between impact fees versus the true impact that the City should consider. *UCSF is exempt from property tax and local zoning, but it takes its role in the community seriously. We are working with the Office of the President to identify how UCSF can make a positive impact and be a good neighbor. UCSF represents about 25% of state agency property in San Francisco, and is exempt from typical fees because it is a public institution of higher education.*
- The timing of the payment and when the fees are due is unclear. City staff responded that the fees are due at the time of sale, and the property tax is due annually. Development impact fees are due when the first construction permit is obtained. *UCSF and the City are involved in the negotiation of fees, and the task force was established to help negotiate fees. The UC Regents*

approves the agreement, to ensure we all fulfill our commitments. It is the intent that this Task Force discusses the enforcement mechanism.

- Is there something being done to revise the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, which was complete before this project, to include UCSF's new impacts? City staff responded that the proposal is consistent with current zoning. Whether the development is UCSF or not, the total development UCSF is doing should be covered within the plan. It is suspected that this is well within the total square footage of the EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods. *UCSF worked with the construction and design teams for the project, and the potential development was evaluated and UCSF is within the allowable range.*
- *In Mission Bay, some of the land was gifted and paid fees for infrastructure. Property was purchased south of 16th street, which included an agreement with neighbors to provide a fund for affordable housing, infrastructure, and neighborhood needs. This MOU applied to similar payments for property in the Mission Bay area. Redevelopment project areas use this fund for infrastructure and housing, which is typically built into the redevelopment agreements. When UCSF purchased Blocks 33 and 34 from Salesforce, UCSF applied the provisions of the MOU to this property. A separate MOU was given for affordable housing. Dogpatch is not in a redevelopment area so it doesn't have the same rules as Mission Bay, but the Mission Bay MOU can be available to the Task Force for a guide.*
- A comment was made that Mission Bay and Dogpatch are used inter-changeably, and they are separate. The Redevelopment Agency no longer exists, but it would be good to identify who is responsible for enforcing the agreement, and who are the parties involved. *UCSF acknowledges the task force is part of the decision-making and is happy to work to reach a decision that makes sense for everyone.*
- *UCSF has worked to understand the impacts and come up with cushioning tactics. UCSF hopes to reach a nexus of meeting benefits to the community and UCSF, as it needs to be careful on the gifting of public funds. In January, a vision is anticipated to look into cushioning impacts through three buckets: 1) what can UCSF invest and do on its own, 2) what's the monetary contribution associated with that; what can UCSF do partnering with others, because there's a desire of UCSF partnering with other groups, and 3) what can UCSF do with neighbors to influence additional resources. UCSF has an internal capital programs team, and is happy to work with others on how prices come out. The preliminary aspects will include SFMTA, Planning, and other natural city partners to be part of these discussions*
- There is interest in doing a needs assessment in the community.

UCSF Response to Neighbor Requests

Transparency:

The task force requested details for all recent UCSF Dogpatch acquisitions, describe building purpose, occupancy, and size. This includes CEQA and other approvals, demolition and construction schedules; request to improve public transportation in the Mission Bay/Dogpatch area and between Parnassus and Mission Bay and the rest of the City.

In response, UCSF listed the public meetings for each project along with CAG and Mission Bay projects. In addition, a matrix was offered describing the proposed use, development characteristics, and schedule information for each Dogpatch project.

- CEQA is still listed as mid-March, which feels a little odd, staff responded it should be delayed until fall. *UCSF will look into that and respond.*

- What about 777 Mariposa? *The process for determining usage must be cleared internally. Then an external process will include design and help inform the process. Right now there's no plan for this site.*

Cooperation:

The UC Regents want to see things in the context of an overall vision for UCSF, rather than piecemeal. There will be no surprises in the coming months regarding Dogpatch. UCSF is focusing on building Block 33, as there is a timely need to re-locate the Laurel Heights campus. There is also major work at Parnassus with the renovation of UC Hall and the Clinical Sciences Building. With this active capital program, there is a commitment of no surprise announcements in the coming months. We are in exploratory discussions about possibilities such as UC Berkeley's idea of a global campus in Richmond and what's happening with the Giants and Pier 70.

OEWD presentation and discussion

There was a community request to rescind rescinding the Life Sciences and Medical Special Use District created in the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. In response, UCSF invited Laurel Arvanitidis, from OEWD to discuss the history and purpose of the special use district. The Eastern Neighborhoods plan was written to 1) Support the economic stimulation in the area, and 2) Increase economic security for the neighbors. OEWD works closely with neighbors to address these goals.

Discussion

- Neighbors questioned why UCSF property is in Dogpatch. The neighborhood was supposed to be protected from having medical uses, and neighbors feel it takes over the neighborhood. About 1-3 life sciences buildings have come into the neighborhood in nine years.
- Discussion occurred on how to study the PDR (Production, Distribution and Repair) space and the overlay. The Planning Dept. indicated that they are looking at updates to the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan.
- Next step on this item is to hear from Planning Dept. on their ability to enter a study process and provide recommendations on this issue. A document was previously created on deficiencies of open spaces in the area.
- The Planning Department indicated that parks and green space would not be part of their analysis, as open space is not a key issue with Esprit and Mariposa Park and additional parks planned along the waterfront near the Warriors project and Crane Cove Park. Neighbors expressed concerns about the lack of active recreation in light of all pending developments.

Request to improve public transportation in the Mission Bay/Dogpatch area and between Parnassus and Mission Bay and the rest of the City. In response, UCSF has committed to be active to advocate and cooperate regionally on transit-orientated policies and programs, with specific note for Caltrain projects of electrification, downtown extension, and the California High Speed Rail projects. UCSF has advocated for better connectivity to SFMTA for buses and the T light rail, is joining a coalition to bring ferry service to 16th street, and intends to expand shuttle service to meet the demands from UCSF students, staff, and patients.

Request for providing new and safer bike routes and crossings. In response, UCSF has committed to working with SFMTA and City Planning for new and safer bike routes and crossings. One idea is to include a safe Mariposa street crossing. A UCSF transportation consultant will work with SFMTA to evaluate options and prepare formal recommendations for review by the DNA and the SF Bicycle Coalition.

Discussion

- UCSF was asked to include funding for transportation in the area. Money has consistently been a problem for upgrades to transportation services, which could be accelerated if UCSF invests. Are there any legal restrictions UCSF may have in providing dollars to this issue? *UCSF must look at the nexus to the benefit to the community and UCSF. UCSF must understand the bigger picture vision, so dollar figures are not available tonight.*
- Discussion occurred regarding a 5-year plan, including the T-line and creation of additional bus lines, bike lanes, and trial ferry service to the area. Assessing investment in the neighborhood with a longer term visioning was encouraged. Short-term solutions to begin addressing the problem, such as Caltrain investment and increased bike lanes would be helpful.
- The City's intent is to put together a transportation budget at the beginning of 2018, so hoping to work with the neighborhood in 2017. Expediting ferry service to the area is in exploration, as the Warriors stadium is slated to open in 2019, and ferry service not until 2022.
- Neighbors asked to be consulted on UCSF shuttle routes and requested that the shuttles should have minimal impact on the neighborhoods

Neighbors' request to expand local hire efforts, including non-construction jobs. In response, UCSF stated it participates in a number of local hire programs to provide health, biotech, and other non-construction jobs. Such programs include the EXCEL program, the Bridge to Biotech programs, early academic outreach program, and the Science Health and Education Partnership.

UCSF is evaluating its Community Construction Outreach Program (CCOP) and is committed to providing opportunities for qualified workers on construction projects.

Discussion

- There is interest in obtaining data on the progress of the programs. *UCSF voluntarily set up their local hire efforts, and currently involved in evaluating how to expand that to other construction opportunities. UCSF is restricted from mandating slots like the City can, but has a 30% goal for construction projects of \$5 million or more. These goals have not been achieved, and there is evaluation to identify ways to achieve the goals.*
- Concern raised regarding the Bridge to Biotech program not living up to its goals. Supervisor Cohen is interested in holding a hearing to assess this program. *UCSF is happy to partner with the City to assess and evaluate these programs*
- *Since the program was reconstituted in 2010, there have been 180 graduate, and 70% of the graduates have found full time employment. UCSF has 22,000 employees and create 42,000 jobs region-wide.*

A comment was made at this point about the time needed to review the remaining agenda items for the meeting. After discussion, a decision was reached to finish the UCSF responses and information.

Framework for Cushioning Opportunities

Integration: Reasonable Height and bulk/Adaptive Reuse

UCSF's current building designs comply with city height and bulk requirements and is exploring reuse of some building materials. It is committed to working with neighborhood organizations and groups to

make the projects a design asset to the community. The existing structures at the Minnesota Housing Project and 2130 Third street are not suitable for reuse.

Discussion

- Where are the reports that indicate these buildings are not suitable for reuse? Concerns were raised about no attempts to maintain the neighborhood character, with the example of 600 Minnesota as a historical building, and interest in UC investing in renovating. *There was an assessment of the building that indicated environmental and physical safety of the buildings.* Neighbors provided mixed feedback about the historical value of these buildings.
- Concerns were raised about community feedback, and who the developers for 2130 Third Street answer to if there's competing interest. *UCSF needs to assess the programmatic needs, and balance that with community needs. UCSF has been meeting and presenting to DNA/Boosters Design and Development Committee. The team is trying hard to accommodate and understand the needs and concerns.*

Opportunistic Building Design: Midblock Passages/Pocket Parks and Plazas. Midblock passages are not suited for the 2130 Third street site, but current plans include an atrium and outdoor seating. The Minnesota Housing design includes a midblock passageway, visual permeability to inner courtyards, and public realm improvements.

Sidewalk Activation/Vision Zero/Neighborhood Safety. UCSF's current building designs include sidewalk activation, transparency and security. We're working on traffic calming like speed bumps and lighting. Relationship between design and function – the project team explored modifying the unit mix.

Environmental Sustainability. UCSF is committed to environmental sustainability. Current plans include various methods of achieving this, ranging from water use and re-use, energy storage and daylighting, and drought-resistant landscapes.

Neighborhood-serving businesses/18th Street Project/Plan Holistically for Minnesota and Indiana. There are opportunities for retail and food spaces that are planned holistically with regard to the context of the neighborhood. These designs will be reviewed in future meetings, as well as identifying ways to address neighborhood traffic concerns.

Mitigation & Cushioning. UCSF is actively exploring opportunities to minimize traffic impacts, improve pedestrian and bike crossings, calm traffic on Minnesota/Indiana/Tennessee, address connectivity and safety issues. In the interim, UCPD installed a digital slow traffic sign on 18th approaching Minnesota.

The community asked UCSF to fund open space improvements, contribute to the GBD, reduce construction and demolition impacts. UCSF is committed to open space improvement and community engagement during construction. UCSF has contributed \$50,000 to Esprit Park, and is an active GBD member and contributor to the GBD. UCSF is mindful of the safety concerns regarding demolition, and will work with our Environmental Health and Safety department and engage the community on construction plans.

The community asked UCSF to create, expand and improve open space and streetscapes, support the HUB, and explore ways UC constituent services can benefit neighbors.

Discussion

- Regarding building design improvements, neighbors hope for UCSF to be similar to the for-profits developers who need to obtain community buy-in.
- Looking for streetscape and traffic calming. West to Potrero Hill, there are recreation centers available for people to go play and hang out. Hoping for investment in renovation in spaces such as Jackson Park and Potereo Recreation Center.
- SFMTA and Planning have been trying to map the Central Waterfront area to identify needs. This will lead to how much it will cost and will then be published in early 2017 after additional conversation with neighbors about open space. This map is available now, but costs are not available for each need.
- Woods Yard is an opportunity, and the neighborhood is interested in re-visiting this space, and 22nd Street is the primary connectivity in the area.

Facilitated Discussion and Public Comment

- It is important to make an assessment of how the Minnesota Housing project will fit into the character of the neighborhood in the long-term.
- UCSF has a responsibility to put some solution in place for transporting its people.
- UCSF staff should be required to review the neighborhood presentation.
- Concerns raised about toxic dirt from developments along the waterfront.
- Mitigation solutions must be addressed for bike lanes. Encouraging city staff to look at the mitigation measures and work with UCSF and the community on the needs.
- The City should look at the mitigation slides, as we need the City to work with the task force and UCSF to execute.

Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

Review of Task Force Schedule and Next Steps

UCSF will look at the overall vision and how it works holistically. We will bring this with appropriate imagery. An attempt will be made to integrate the community presentation not presented.

The next Dogpatch Community Task Force meetings are:

Thursday, January 19, 2017

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

Tuesday, March 21, 2017

All task force meetings held at UCSF Mission Bay, Genentech Hall, Room N-114, beginning at 6:30 pm.

DCTF Meeting #3 Attendance

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

