UC Hall at Parnassus Heights Community Meeting

February 13, 2012
### Agenda Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/Introduction</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Process</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Hall</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Feedback</td>
<td>70 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ground Rules

UCSF Commitment to the Community

- Will listen
- Will be honest and forthcoming
- Will be prepared with as much information as is available
- Will continue to commit to being a good neighbor

Let’s all commit to respectful discussion

- Speaker card system
- Speak only when acknowledged by facilitator
- One person speaks at a time
Traffic Management
Traffic Management:

What We Have Done Already

• Met with MTA
• Agreed to share our traffic study
• Agreed to involve MTA in the scoping of the LRDP EIR traffic analysis
• Alerted MTA staff that Parnassus neighbors will convey their concerns about Inner Sunset traffic (including 5th and Kirkham traffic calming) directly to MTA
Traffic Management: Near-Term Steps

- Continue to work with MTA and neighbors to implement traffic mitigation measures at 5th and Kirkham
- Continue to increase use of Oyster Point for centralized receiving and limited deliveries to Parnassus
- Develop more loading spaces off Medical Center Way
Traffic Management: Long-Term Opportunities

- Continue to work with MTA and neighbors to address Inner Sunset/Cole Valley traffic issues
- Develop off-street loading spaces at west end of UCH
- Relocate contractor parking from Parnassus Avenue to back of campus parking lot to free up curbside space for large trucks
- Assign loading spaces in the back of campus for vendors who remain all or most of the day and who are willing to commit to traveling to and from the campus by designated, dispersed routes
- Consider developing a secondary path for small vehicles at back of the campus to better distribute deliveries
Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Process
LRDP Background

- Guides physical development over a period of approximately 15 years
- The Regents approve the LRDP and Major Amendments
- Strategic and academic planning informs space needs and program requirements, which drive the LRDP
Current LRDP

- Adopted by The Regents in January 1997 with a planning horizon to 2012
- Developed through a robust, multi-year consultation process
  - Community Advisory Group
  - Community-Wide Workshops
  - University Advisory Group (Staff)
  - Planning Committee for the 21st Century (Faculty)
- Guided by *Goals and Objectives* prepared jointly by UCSF, Community Advisory Group, and community-wide workshops
- Periodic LRDP Updates and Amendments as needed
- Documents available at LRDP website: ucsf.edu/lrdp
1976 Parnassus Commitments Embodied in Current LRDP

- Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve to be permanent
- Permanent campus boundaries
- Limit property acquisition in surrounding area
- Sale of houses on west side of 3rd Avenue
- Office space on 3rd and 5th Avenues to be converted back to residential
- Limit campus population
- Space ceiling of 3.55 million gross square feet
Current LRDP – Major Themes

1. Reinvest in existing sites
2. Acquire a major new site (Mission Bay)
3. Provide space for decompression, expansion and consolidation of activities
Current LRDP – Status

• Significant reinvestment (new buildings, major renovations and infrastructure renewal) at Parnassus Heights (and other sites)
  – Regeneration Medicine Building
  – Kirkham and Lucia Child Care
  – Aldea Student Housing
  – Central Utility Plant
  – Parnassus Services Building
  – 145 Irving Housing

• Major new campus site at Mission Bay with built space equivalent to two-thirds of that at Parnassus

• Overall campus space at all UCSF sites grew from 5.0 million gsf to 7.8 million gsf (56% increase)
Current LRDP – Status

• LRDP amended in March 2005 to adopt clinical recommendations in light of state seismic requirements for inpatient facilities

• Two major inpatient sites integrated with basic and translational research, plus an outpatient hub
  – *Parnassus Heights*: full-service hospital focused on high-end adult surgical and medical services with Emergency Department
  – *Mission Bay*: new specialty hospital complex for children’s, women’s and cancer services
  – *Mount Zion*: major outpatient hub
Next LRDP

• Next LRDP is expected to have a planning horizon of 2030
  – 15+ years from expected adoption in 2014
  – Coincides with Senate Bill 1953 state seismic deadline for inpatient facilities

• Anticipated growth through 2030 will need to be estimated, so potential strategies for meeting that need can be identified and analyzed
  – Historic growth rate likely to decline going forward due to resource constraints and other factors

• Due to space constraints at Parnassus Heights, major growth is expected to continue to be accommodated elsewhere
Next LRDP – Potential Major Themes

1. Address seismically compromised buildings
2. Optimize the use of existing campus sites (building renovation, replacement and infill development) and space (asset management)
3. Consider potential expansion strategies
4. Articulate a strategy for leased locations
5. Incorporate environmental sustainability into plans (e.g., by improving jobs-housing balance and reducing transit trips)

See LRDP website at ucsf.edu/lrdp
Parnassus Issues to be Addressed by the Next LRDP

• Seismic Strategy
• Functionally Obsolescent Buildings
• Moffitt 2030 Replacement
• Space Ceiling Strategy
• Urban Design Goals and Guidelines

UC Hall reuse and cushioning actions must be considered in context with other needs at Parnassus Heights and analyzed in the LRDP Environmental Impact Report
Space Ceiling Status

Percent Over Parnassus Heights Space Ceiling

- 1976 Space Ceiling
- 1996 LRDP Status: 3.8%
- 2012 Target: 1.8%
- 2011 Actual: 8.2%
UC Hall
Planning and Policy Issues Affecting UC Hall

- Space Ceiling
- Seismic Safety Standards
- Energy Use and Sustainability
- Financial Realities
- Historic Preservation Value
- Faculty Office Demand
Demolition Versus Reuse

- $80 Million Demolition Costs Exceeded Initial Estimates
- Cost of Demolition and Rebuilding Greater Than Reuse
Options Discussed and Evaluated

- 9 CAG Study Group meetings over the past year
- Campus Planning estimated population changes and determined pros and cons for options
- Transportation Consultant analyzed daily vehicle trips and parking and loading demand for options
- 9 options were studied including:
  - Demolition and replace with open space
  - Demolition and replace with housing
  - Reuse with all housing
  - Reuse with clinics and faculty offices only
  - Reuse with clinics only
  - Reuse with offices only
  - Reuse with housing, clinics and offices
  - Reuse with 2 levels of housing with offices
  - Reuse with 3 levels of housing with offices (B3)
- Decisions will be made as part of the LRDP process
How Proposed Option B3 Came About

• UCSF Leadership recommended options with no housing (business need for faculty offices)

• CAG Study Group insisted upon some housing (space ceiling; fewer traffic impacts)

• UCSF Leadership compromised and agreed to two floors of housing

• CAG Study Group continued to push for more housing

• Leadership committed to three floors of housing
Leadership Committed to Proposed Cushioning Actions as part of Project Cost
Proposal for UC Hall with Cushioning Actions

ADDITIONAL CUSHIONING ACTIONS
- Stem Cell Loading Improvements
- 5th and Kirkham Traffic Calming Measures
- Campus Core Improvements
- Convert Some Avenue Houses to Faculty Housing
- Shift to Central Delivery Model at Oyster Point
- Small Building Demolition
Note: brick specialty paving warns through-traffic that this is a special pedestrian zone
Community Feedback