PURPOSE

The southeast sector of San Francisco expects 75% of the growth that the city will see over the next 30 years with approximately 75,000 housing units and 150,000 jobs, doubling the area’s population.

Many of the southeastern neighborhoods were primarily industrial land. As these neighborhoods become more residential and denser, it is critical to plan for this growth by staging investments that make each neighborhood more livable. The Southeast Framework sews together specific plans, identifies the gaps, points the way toward a seamless integration of future plans, and integrates the burgeoning southeast with the rest of the city and region. The objective is to ensure that, at minimum, these new and growing neighborhoods have a quality of life and access to amenities and services equivalent to those enjoyed by neighborhoods throughout the city. This report examines seven community facility types that are generally built by the City: Police Stations, Fire Stations, Libraries, Recreation Centers, Public Health Clinics, Child Care Facilities, and Public Schools.

PROCESS

This framework includes a growth analysis for each facility type, existing standards, and opportunities and recommendations for how we think about community facilities in the southeast through 2040.

This process began with analysis of existing standards for each facility type and different scenarios for future growth. Based on the results, recommendations for new facilities were developed to ensure that all residents, existing and new, in the southeast part of the city have adequate access to community services. The research and analysis also included a conversation with City agencies on the likely impact of growth on their respective operations. Meetings took place in the spring and summer of 2017. Each agency was asked about physical parameters and plans to build new facilities.

KEY FINDINGS

Based on research, analysis, and conversations with City agencies, the following key findings across all studied facility types have been identified.

- All types of new community facilities are needed.
- There are limited plans to provide new facilities across all facility types.
- The focus of many agencies is on the expansion and renovation of existing facilities.
- A standard for the number or distribution of facilities generally does not exist.
- Staffing is a barrier to expanding services at existing facilities.
- The price and availability of land are primary barriers to creating new facilities.
- There is an opportunity to better coordinate among city agencies in the planning for new facilities.
- Agencies plan in silos.
- New physical and programmatic models for community facilities are needed given the limited amount of available land and ongoing densification.
**Recommendations**

**Citywide for Community Facilities**

In an effort to identify gaps and find potential for integration across City agencies, the Southeast Framework recommends the following to ensure that the quality of life and access to amenities and services is equivalent to those enjoyed by all neighborhoods of San Francisco.

1. **Allow and incentivize community uses at the ground floor**
   The City should explore locations where community facilities could be programmed into existing ground floors. In many instances ground floor spaces remain vacant although rents remain high. Community serving uses are a viable ground floor use that benefit the development project and activate the ground floor. Ground floor uses should consider flood maps and reduce risk and damage where possible.

   **Responsible Agency:** Office of Economic Workforce & Development, Planning

2. **Include new community space in master developments taking into account long term resiliency**
   The City should integrate space for community facilities into new developments. These community spaces provide amenities for new residents as well as existing residents. The exact type and scale of facilities can be determined per project in the initial planning phase.

   **Responsible Agency:** Real Estate, Capital Planning

3. **Study co-location of community facilities**
   The City should coordinate agencies to co-locate complementary uses. This could take different forms, programming a shared space or sharing a building or a parcel. It can be cost effective for agencies to co-locate and share resources, and it can be more convenient for the population that is being served.

   **Responsible Agency:** Capital Planning, Office of Economic Workforce & Development

4. **Maximize the use of existing City facilities**
   Consider physical expansion of existing community facilities to increase capacity within existing the building. In many cases it may be more cost effective to redesign and rebuild an existing building to increase capacity.

   **Responsible Agency:** All

5. **Increase budget for staffing, management, and maintenance costs**
   Existing facilities can expand service to residents by increasing the budget to allow for increased hours of operation and additional staffing. Compared to building new facilities, this is a relatively inexpensive way to increase service and ensures that the City is using its existing assets to their fullest.

   **Responsible Agency:** Each Agency, Mayor’s budget office

6. **Ensure more robust data collection, data sharing and analytical capacity to better understand how facilities are used today and in the future**
   City agencies should collect data from users and residents to understand how their facilities are being used and where there is overcrowding. This data collection should inform changes to existing operations including hours of operation, type of programming, and equipment which respond to demographic changes.

   **Responsible Agency:** All

7. **Develop a citywide process to identify and prioritize new community facilities.**
   The City should develop a near term and long term community facilities plan to understand how population growth will affect their facilities. Agencies should regularly discuss their needs with Capital Planning to best serve the existing and future population of San Francisco.

   **Responsible Agency:** Capital Planning, Each Agency

8. **Study the creation of a public lands policy for community facilities.**
   Currently the City’s policy is to build housing on surplus public lands. This is not informed by analysis of future community facility needs. There is not a formal policy or program to plan for new community facilities.

   **Responsible Agency:** Capital Planning
Recommendations for Specific Facilities

Below are recommendations for each individual agency in addition to the Citywide recommendations on the left page. These recommendations are informed by GIS analysis, existing standards and conversations with City Departments.

**LIBRARIES**
- Integrate library facilities into HOPE SF projects, which provide a wide range of community serving uses. Libraries would be an additional amenity for new and existing residents.
- Explore new service models and opportunities for more bookmobiles in the southeast.
- Consider co-locating a library with other community facilities that provide complimentary services, such as recreation facilities, child care, etc.
- Explore opportunities in the South Downtown area in OCI properties where there is vacant retail at the ground floor.
- Explore one new full service library

**PUBLIC SCHOOLS**
- Coordinate City services with SFUSD to plan for two new schools.
- Explore new models for school facilities and consider mixed uses.
- Develop a five year and a ten year plan for new school facilities.
- Recommendation for the number of new schools pending latest enrollment projections and further input from SFUSD.

**POLICE STATIONS**
- Explore expanding Bayview station.
- Explore the feasibility for a joint Police/Fire training center in the southeast part of the City.
- Understand how the number of officers translates to stations to know if new stations are needed.
- Explore the feasibility of one new police station in Hunters Point Shipyard or Candlestick Point

**RECREATION CENTERS**
- Assess users of existing recreation facilities to understand needs and gaps in service.
- Continue to work with CBOs to allow use of RDP facilities when RPD-led programs are not taking place.
- Increase budget for staffing to expand services and programs in existing facilities.
- Explore two new recreation centers based on the identified gaps.

**FIRE STATIONS**
- Encourage the search for a new training facility in the southeast part of the City.
- Explore the feasibility for a joint Police/Fire training center in the southeast part of the City.
- Explore the feasibility of a new Fire Station in Bayview to fill the gap between stations 9, 25, 17, and 42.
- Explore the feasibility of a new Fire Station at Hunters Point Shipyard.

**PUBLIC HEALTH CENTERS**
- Complete the renovation of the Southeast Health Center.
- Additional public health centers are not recommended at this time.
- Assess public health facility needs as new demographic data comes available to ensure needs are being met.
- Consider co-locating health centers with other community facilities such as libraries, child care, etc.

**CHILD CARE FACILITIES**
- Consider co-locating child care centers with other community facilities such as public health centers, recreation center, libraries, schools, etc.
- Explore new child care facilities in city owned and leased buildings.
- Consider child care facilities as a ground floor use in affordable housing developments.
- Work with private development to encourage and incentivize the construction of new child care facilities.
- Construct 30 new childcare facilities (1,500 spaces; 75,000 sq. ft) to meet the planned growth in the southeast.

**Planned Community Facilities**

There are plans to build and set aside space for new community facilities in the Southeast. The table on the right summarizes the planned facilities.

In addition, ground floor space and parcels of land could be available for future community facilities as part of large master development projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Planned Facility of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>Parcel has been set aside for a Fire Station at Hunters Point Shipyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Clinics</td>
<td>Wellness Center is planned at each Hope SF site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Facilities</td>
<td>Ten new childcare facilities are planned in the Southeast, New childcare facilities are planned at each Hope SF Sites, Potrero Power Plant site and Pier 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centers</td>
<td>Expansion to Jean Friend Recreation Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>New schools are planned at Mission Bay and one at Candlestick Point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted and Pending Area Plans and Development Agreements

Major land use plans, site-specific master plans, and development agreements have been adopted over the past decade and continue to be developed in this part of the city. Each plan and project has strived to be comprehensive in providing policies and supporting systems and infrastructure that support its own growth, that tie the neighborhood or site back to the rest of the city, and align with City policy objectives. However, the reality is that many of the supportive systems and overarching strategies can only be achieved with a comprehensive, holistic look at the southeast. Solutions may often (or necessarily) transcend the boundaries of development sites or plan areas, and can be best realized through bringing in resources that are pooled or external to these neighborhoods.

Adopted Area Plans & Notable Projects
1. Transit Center District
2. Rincon Hill
3. 5M
4. East SoMa
5. Western SoMa
6. Market & Octavia
7. Mission
8. Showplace/Potrero
9. Central Waterfront
10. Mission Bay Redevelopment
11. Warriors Arena
12. Hunter’s Point Shipyard/ Candlestick Point Redevelopment
13. Schlage Lock
14. Executive Park
15. Bayview
16. Bayview Industrial Triangle Redevelopment
17. Potrero HOPE SF
18. Sunnydale HOPE SF
19. Pier 70
20. Central SoMa
21. Mission Rock
22. Build Inc India Basin

Planning Efforts Underway
1. District 9 (General areas: boundaries are not yet formalized)

Pending Area Plans & Development Agreements
1. Market Octavia Plan Amendment
2. Potrero Power Plant

Project Team
Heather Green
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Lily Langlois
Planning Department
Leigh Lutenski
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Josh Low
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Mat Snyder
Planning Department
Brian Strong
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Joshua Switzky
Planning Department

Agencies consulted
- Office of the City Administrator
- Office of the Controller
- San Francisco Fire Department
- San Francisco Planning Department
- San Francisco Police Department
- San Francisco Public Library
- San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
- San Francisco Unified School District
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