Current LRDP

- Current LRDP adopted January 1997; Planning horizon is 2011-12 academic year
- Major LRDP Themes
  - Reinvest in existing sites
  - Acquire a major new site (Mission Bay)
  - Provide space for decompression, expansion and consolidation of activities
- Three Amendments to the LRDP have been approved by The Regents
  - Housing added to the Mission Bay campus
  - Clinical recommendations for major inpatient and outpatient sites at Parnassus and Mission Bay, with outpatient hub at Mount Zion
  - Mission Bay Planning Principles
Current LRDP – Outcomes

- Campus space grew from 5.0 million gsf to 7.8 million gsf (56% increase)
- Major new site with critical mass of science established at Mission Bay
- Significant reinvestment occurred at Parnassus Heights and other sites
- Flexible framework of the LRDP supported opportunistic projects (e.g., Regeneration Medicine)
- Successful connection between physical planning and community involvement allowed plans to move forward smoothly
Next LRDP

- **Next LRDP is expected to have a planning horizon of 2030**
  - 15+ years from expected adoption in 2014
  - Coincides with Senate Bill1953 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 may decline going forward due to resource constraints and other factors
LRDP Preparation and Input Structure

• LRDP Oversight Committee
  – Instruction, Research, and Clinical Subcommittees

• Other UCSF Input
  – Academic Senate
  – Faculty Councils
  – Town Halls
  – Other

• UCSF Foundation
  – Real Estate Committee

• UC Office of the President

• Public Input
  – Community Advisory Group
  – Public Meetings
Faculty Participation in LRDP Process

- Academic Senate and AP&B reps. on LRDP Oversight Committee
- Faculty participation in Oversight Committee and subcommittees
- Presentations to Academic Planning & Budget
- Faculty input to Deans
- Presentations to Faculty Councils (tbd)
- Other?
Phases of LRDP Process

- **Phase One:** Background and Data Discussion
  - Site specific background information
  - Academic Program Configuration
  - Projected 2030 Space Needs
  - Facilities constraints (including seismic)
  - Hospital replacement Phase 2

- **Phase Two:** Options Analysis
  - Develop and analyze physical site options
  - Select preferred option for LRDP

- **Phase Three:** Publish LRDP Report and EIR
  - Prepare draft LRDP and EIR
  - Incorporate public comment
  - Final LRDP and EIR for Regental approval
Primary Questions for the LRDP

1. How will UCSF’s academic program (instruction and research) be physically configured across UCSF’s campus sites?

2. What are UCSF’s projected space needs through 2030?

3. How should future space needs be met?

4. Should/can existing agreements be renegotiated to help meet space needs?

5. How will UCSF’s seismically poor and very poor buildings be addressed?

6. How will the next phase of the Hospital Replacement strategy be defined in the LRDP?

7. How will the LRDP respond to system-wide mandates such as the Policy on Environmental Sustainability and Climate Action Plan goals?
Academic Site Themes

- Develop recommendations regarding Major Site Themes to help define what physical facilities the LRDP should plan for at each campus site through 2030
- The LRDP Instruction, Research and Clinical Facilities Subcommittees are developing projections on the potential growth of each respective type of space
- The Major Site Themes will, at a high level, inform UCSF’s optimal academic configuration across sites, which in turn will inform how the space needs projected by the Subcommittees should be distributed across sites
- Breakout groups, with representatives from each school, to make recommendations for Major Site Themes formulated based on faculty familiarity with sites
  - Parnassus Heights (co-facilitators: Robert Bleloch, Joe Guglielmo, Matthias Hebrok)
  - Mission Bay/SFGH (co-facilitators: Sue Carlisle, Clay Johnston)
  - Mount Zion/Laurel Heights (co-facilitators: Claire Brindis, Christine Miaskowski)
Physical Site Options

- Once space needs are projected and distributed by campus site, physical site options will be developed.
- Options lay out future development, by demolition/replacement, site expansion, new construction (additions/new buildings), rehabilitation/reuse and conversion.
- Options identify development capacity defined by building envelopes (height, mass, footprint).
- Physical site options to be evaluated against programmatic, physical, financial, environmental, community criteria.
- Preferred option to be described in Draft LRDP.
### Big Picture Questions by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>PHTS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>MZ</th>
<th>LHTS</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do major programs need to move off of Parnassus Heights in order to</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address the seismically compromised buildings and the space ceiling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will be the solution for UCSF’s space in seismically “Poor” and</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Very Poor” buildings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should additional land be acquired to accommodate growth?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should existing land be developed to a greater density?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will UCSF’s long-term future be at SFGH in light of City funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the size of UCSF’s presence at SFGH change, in light of the City’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-range plans for the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relative importance of quality-of-life improvements (child</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care, housing, recreation, aesthetics, open space) compared with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programmatic improvements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications of the Medical Center at Mission Bay on future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research programming at the campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should the academic program needs (office and research space) of</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinicians be met?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>PHTS</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>LHTS</td>
<td>SFGH</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should more housing be provided?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the move of inpatient Cancer and Women’s services to Mission Bay, what programs should populate the vacated space at Mount Zion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is more research space needed to support clinical activities at Mount Zion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should existing programs in leased space be moved to owned space after moves to Mission Bay occur?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will the goals and themes of research at each major UCSF site be, in the context of other UCSF sites, through 2030?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the optimal relationship of clinical uses between Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion, and Mission Bay?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will didactic instruction continue to occur primarily at Parnassus Heights in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Moffitt Hospital be replaced at Parnassus Heights or Mission Bay when it is decommissioned as an inpatient facility in 2030?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?