

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
CAMPUS 2002 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, NORTHWEST CAMPUS
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT HOUSING AND DYKSTRA PARKING STRUCTURE
PROJECTS.**

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The University of California (“University”), as the lead agency, has prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) for the 2002 Long Range Development Plan for the University of California, Los Angeles (“2002 LRDP” or “Project”) and the development of the Northwest Housing Infill Project (the “NHIP”). The Final EIR has State Clearinghouse No. 2002031115.

The Final EIR consists of the November 2002 Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) and the February 2003 Final EIR (“Final EIR”). Volumes 1 and 1A of the Draft EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of implementation of the 2002 LRDP, identifies means to eliminate or reduce potential significant adverse impacts, and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the 2002 LRDP. Volume 2 of the Draft EIR analyzes the project-level environmental impacts associated with the NHIP, which includes the Northwest Campus Undergraduate Student Housing and Dykstra Parking Structure. The Final EIR (Volumes 3 and 3A) provides responses to comments on the Draft EIR from responsible agencies and interested groups and individuals, as well as revisions to the text of the Draft EIR based on those comments and responses.

Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15090, the Board of Regents certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, *et seq.* (“CEQA”) and the State CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, *et seq.* (“CEQA Guidelines”). The Board of Regents further certifies that it has been presented with the Final EIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making the approvals set forth below in Section III. The Board of Regents further certifies that the Final EIR reflects its independent judgment and analysis. The conclusions presented in these findings are based upon the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

II. FINDINGS

The Board of Regents is certifying the Final EIR for, and is approving and adopting the Findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the 2002 LRDP and NHIP development. It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other state and local agencies (who might be referred to as “responsible agencies” under CEQA). Because the University is the lead agency for the 2002 LRDP and subsequent campus developments, the Final EIR is intended to be the basis for

compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other state and local agencies that may be necessary to carry out the 2002 LRDP. In this action, the Board of Regents is approving the 2002 LRDP, certifying the 2002 LRDP EIR, and approving the Northwest Undergraduate Student Housing and Dykstra Parking Structure Projects for UCLA. Design approvals of future projects contemplated by the LRDP will be made by the Board of Regents and/or University officials delegated such authority pursuant to the standing orders and bylaws of the University, as applicable, in accordance with and based upon the analysis in the Final EIR.

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, which is herein incorporated into these Findings by reference, the Board of Regents hereby adopts the following Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Board of Regents certifies that its findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these Findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the Final EIR, and are supported by substantial evidence. The Board of Regents adopts these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in conjunction with its approval as set forth in Section III, below.

A. Environmental Review Process

1. *Preparation of the EIR*

On June 12, 2001, the University issued a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") announcing the preparation of the Draft EIR and describing its proposed scope. A revised NOP (including an Initial Study [IS]) was subsequently filed on March 20, 2002 to acknowledge that the potential environmental effects of both the 2002 LRDP and the proposed NHIP would be considered in a single EIR. The revised NOP was circulated to responsible agencies and interested groups and individuals for a 30-day review period ending April 19, 2002.

The University issued the Draft EIR on October 31, 2002 and initially circulated it for public review and comment for a 46-day period scheduled to end on December 16, 2002. In response to public request, the public review and comment period was extended to December 20, 2002. Beginning on November 1, 2002, the University widely circulated the Draft EIR by: (1) making copies available at several on- and off-campus libraries and at the UCLA Capital Programs building; (2) posting a copy on the University's Internet web site; (3) mailing hard copies as well as CDs of the document to 67 agencies, organizations and interested individuals; and (4) publishing a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Daily Bruin*. Additionally, the University held a public hearing at the UCLA Faculty Center on November 20, 2002, to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR.

Approximately 9 people provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. In addition, approximately 370 letters were received during the public comment period, including letters from state and local transportation agencies. The Final EIR contains all of the comments received during the public comment period, including a transcript of the public hearing, together with written responses to those comments which were prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Board of

Regents certifies that it has reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and finds that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments.

2. *Absence of Significant New Information*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR but before certification. New information includes: (i) changes to the project; (ii) changes in the environmental setting; or (iii) additional data or other information. Section 15088.5 further provides that “[n]ew information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.”

Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft and Final EIR and in the administrative record as well as the requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15088.5 and interpretive judicial authority regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, the Board of Regents hereby finds that no new significant information was added to the EIR following public review and thus, recirculation of the EIR is not required by CEQA.

B. Impacts and Mitigation Measures: 2002 LRDP

The following section summarizes the project and cumulative environmental impacts of the 2002 LRDP identified in the Final EIR, and provides findings as to those impacts, as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions is set forth in the Final EIR. These Findings hereby incorporate by reference the analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR’s findings and conclusions and in making these Findings, the Board of Regents ratifies, adopts and incorporates the evidence, analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments and conclusions of the Final EIR except where they are specifically modified by these Findings.

Certain environmental effects were determined to be “effects not found to be significant” based upon the analysis provided in the Initial Study for the 2002 LRDP. These impacts are summarized in the Initial Study and the Draft EIR. The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the Initial Study and Draft EIR as its grounds for concluding that further analysis of these impacts in the Draft EIR is not necessary or appropriate.

The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates as conditions of approval, the mitigation measures set forth in the findings below to reduce or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the 2002 LRDP, as well as certain less-than-significant impacts. In adopting these mitigation measures, the Board of Regents intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR, except to the extent such mitigation measures are specifically rejected or specifically modified by these findings.

In the comments on the Draft EIR, a number of measures were suggested by various commenters as potential mitigation measures. With respect to the measures that were suggested in the comments, and not adopted by the Final EIR, the responses to comments in the Final EIR explain that the suggested mitigation measures are either already part of ongoing campus programs and procedures, or why they are infeasible and thus not recommended by the Final EIR for adoption. The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the response to comments contained in the Final EIR as its grounds for finding these suggested mitigation measures to be infeasible.

1. *Aesthetics*

a. *Impact LRDP 4.1-1: Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista (focal views). This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.1-1(a) The design process shall evaluate and incorporate, where appropriate, factors including, but not necessarily limited to, building mass and form, building proportion, roof profile, architectural detail and fenestration, the texture, color, and quality of building materials, focal views, pedestrian and vehicular circulation and access, and the landscape setting to ensure preservation and enhancement of the visual character and quality of the campus and the surrounding area. Landscaped open space (including plazas, courts, gardens, walkways, and recreational areas) shall be integrated with development to encourage use through placement and design. *(This is identical to Land Use PP 4.8-1(a)).*

Program & Procedure 4.1-1(b) The Mildred E. Mathias Botanical Garden, Franklin D. Murphy Sculpture Garden, Dickson Plaza, Jans Steps, Stone Canyon Creek area, Meyerhoff Park, Wilson Plaza, Bruin Plaza, and the University Residence shall be maintained as open space preserves during the 2002 LRDP planning horizon.

Program & Procedure 4.1-1(c) New building projects shall be sited to ensure compatibility with existing uses and the height and massing of adjacent facilities. *(This is identical to Land Use PP 4.8-1(h))*

Program & Procedure 4.1-1(d) The integrity of the campus historic core shall be maintained. *(This is identical to Cultural Resources PP 4.4-1(b) and Land Use PP 4.8-1(g))*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact on scenic vistas, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.1-1(a) through 4.1-1(d) will further reduce impacts to scenic vistas (focal views).

b. *Impact 4.1-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area. This impact is less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 In conjunction with CEQA documentation required for each project proposal under the 2002 LRDP, a tree replacement plan shall be prepared and implemented. The tree replacement plan for each project shall determine the appropriate number of replacement trees in relation to the specific project site characteristics. The tree replacement plan would ensure that the appropriate number of new trees is planted within the available site area so that each tree planted has sufficient space to grow and thrive. *(This is identical to Biological Resources MM 4.3-1(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(a) Additions to, or expansions of, existing structures shall be designed to complement the existing architectural character of the buildings.

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(b) The architectural and landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character shall be respected and reinforced. *(This is identical to Land Use PP 4.8-1(f).)*

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(c) Development of the southern edge of the main campus shall be designed to enhance the campus interface with Westwood Village. *(This is identical to Land Use PP 4.8-1(b).)*

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(d) Projects proposed under the 2002 LRDP shall include landscaping.

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(e) The western, northern and eastern edges of the main campus shall include a landscaped buffer to complement the residential uses of the surrounding community and to provide an attractive perimeter that effectively screens and enhances future development. *(This is identical to Land Use PP 4.8-1(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.1-1(a), 4.1-1(b), 4.1-1(c), and 4.1-1(d) also apply to Impact 4.3-2.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly impact the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area, and therefore this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1-2, Program & Procedure 4.1-2(a) through 4.1-2(e), and 4.1-1(a) through 4.1-1(d) will further reduce any potential

impacts to the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area.

c. Impact 4.1-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could create a new source of substantial light or glare on campus or in the vicinity that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This impact is potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.1-3(a) Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass.

Mitigation Measure 4.1-3(b) All outdoor lighting shall be directed to the specific location intended for illumination (e.g., roads, walkways, or recreation fields) to limit stray light spillover onto adjacent residential areas. In addition, all lighting shall be shielded to minimize the production of glare and light spill onto adjacent uses.

Mitigation Measure 4.1-3(c) Ingress and egress from parking areas shall be designed and situated so the vehicle headlights are shielded from adjacent uses. If necessary, walls or other light barriers will be provided.

Program & Procedure 4.1-2(e) also applies to Impact 4.1-3.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.1-3(a) through 4.1-3(c) and Program & Procedure 4.1-2(e) will reduce the potentially significant impacts from new sources of substantial light or glare on campus or in the vicinity that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area to a less-than significant level.

2. *Air Quality*

a. Impact 4.2-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.2-1(a) The campus shall continue to provide on-campus housing to continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus. *(This is identical to Noise and Vibration PP 4.9-5(a) and Transportation/ Traffic PP 4.13-1(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.2-1(b) The campus shall continue to implement a TDM program that meets or exceeds all trip reduction and AVR requirements of the SCAQMD. The TDM program may be subject to modification as new technologies are developed or alternate program elements are found to be more effective. *(This is identical to Noise and Vibration PP 4.9-5(b) and Transportation/Traffic PP 4.13-1(d).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan; therefore this impact is less-than significant and no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.2-1(a) and 4.2-1(b) will further reduce any potential impacts.

b. *Impact 4.2-2 The 2002 LRDP construction could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This impact is significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) The campus shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than five minutes.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(b) The campus shall encourage contractors to utilize alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) and low-emission diesel construction equipment to the extent that the equipment is readily available and cost effective.

Program & Procedure 4.2-2(a) The campus shall continue to implement dust control measures consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust during the construction phases of new project development. The following actions are currently recommended to implement Rule 403 and have been quantified by the SCAQMD as being able to reduce dust generation between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of the dust generation:

- Apply water and/or approved nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas that have been inactive for 10 or more days)
- Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply approved chemical soil binders to exposed piles with 5 percent or greater silt content
- Water active grading sites at least twice daily

- Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer), in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code
- Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip
- Apply water three times daily or chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces
- Post and enforce traffic speed limits of 15 miles per hour or less on all unpaved roads

Program & Procedure 4.2-2(b) The campus shall continue to require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines will be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction.

Program & Procedure 4.2-2(c) The campus shall continue to require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the campus' existing electricity infrastructure rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-2(a) and 4.2-2(b), and Program & Procedure 4.2-2(a) through 4.2-2(c) will substantially reduce the generation of emissions of criteria air pollutants during the 2002 LRDP construction; however, these measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

c. Impact 4.2-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in daily operational emissions that contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during the regular session. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.2-3 The campus shall continue to implement energy conservation measures (such as energy-efficient lighting and microprocessor-controlled HVAC equipment) to reduce the demand for electricity and natural gas. The energy conservation measures may be subject to modification as new technologies are developed or if current technologies become obsolete through replacement. *(This is identical to Utilities and Service Systems PP 4.14-10(a).)*

Program & Procedures 4.2-1(a) - (b); 4.2-2(a)-(c) also apply to Impact 4.2-3.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly contribute daily operational emissions to an existing or projected air quality violation during the regular session, and therefore this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.2-3, and Program & Procedures 4.2-1(a)-(b); 4.2-2(a)-(c) will further reduce impacts from daily operational emissions.

d. *Impact 4.2-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would result in daily operational emissions that contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during the twelve-week summer session. This impact is significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 The TDM program will be extended through the student registration process to provide information concerning alternative transportation options to summer session students to increase awareness of, and participation in, alternative transportation programs during the summer session. *(This is identical to Noise and Vibration MM 4.9-6 and Transportation/Traffic MM 4.13-2(a).)* Program & Procedures 4.2-1(a) - (b); PP 4.2-2(a)-(c); and PP 4.2-3 also apply to Impact 4.2-4

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 and Program & Procedures 4.2-1(a), 4.2-1(b), PP 4.2-2(a) through (c), and PP 4.2-3 will reduce the generation of daily operational emissions of criteria air pollutants during the twelve-week summer session; however, these measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

e. *Impact 4.2-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which*

the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. This impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 and Program & Procedure 4.2-1(a), 4.2-1(b), and 4.2-3 apply to Impact 4.2-5.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard, and that this impact is less than significant. Therefore no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 and Program & Procedure 4.2-1(a), 4.2-1(b), and 4.2-3 will further reduce impacts.

f. Impact 4.2-6 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors near roadway intersections to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors near roadway intersections to substantial pollutant concentrations; this impact is less than significant therefore no mitigation is required.

g. Impact 4.2-7 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors on- or off-campus to substantial pollutant concentrations due to campus-generated toxic air emissions. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors on- or off-campus to substantial pollutant concentrations due to campus-generated toxic air emissions; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

h. Impact 4.2-8 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

3. *Biological Resources*

a. *Impact 4.3-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could have a substantial adverse effect as a result of the direct loss of nesting habitat for resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors. This impact is potentially significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) Prior to the onset of construction activities that occur between March and mid-August, surveys for nesting special status avian species and raptors shall be conducted on the affected portion of the campus following USFWS and/or CDFG guidelines. If no active avian nests are identified on or within 250 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) If active nests for avian species of concern or raptor nests are found within the construction footprint or a 250-foot buffer zone, exterior construction activities shall be delayed within the construction footprint and buffer zone until the young have fledged or appropriate mitigation measures responding to the specific situation have been developed and implemented in consultation with CDFG.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(c) In conjunction with CEQA documentation required for each project proposal under the 2002 LRDP, a tree replacement plan shall be prepared and implemented. The tree replacement plan for each project shall determine the appropriate number of replacement trees in relation to the specific project site characteristics. The tree replacement plan would ensure that the appropriate number of new trees is planted within the available site area so that each tree planted has sufficient space to grow and thrive. *(This is identical to Aesthetics MM 4.1-2.)*

Program & Procedure 4.3-1(a) Mature trees to be retained and protected in place during construction, shall be fenced at the drip-line, and maintained by the contractor in accordance with landscape specifications contained in the construction contract.

Program & Procedure 4.3-1(b) Trees shall be examined by an arborist and trimmed, if appropriate, prior to the start of construction.

Program & Procedure 4.3-1(c) Construction contract specifications shall include the provision for temporary irrigation/watering and feeding of these trees during construction, as recommended by the designated arborist.

Program & Procedure 4.3-1(d) Construction contract specifications shall require that no building material, parked equipment, or vehicles shall be stored within the fence line.

Program & Procedure 4.3-1(e) Examination of these trees by an arborist shall be performed monthly during construction to ensure that they are being adequately maintained.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) through 4.3-1(c) and Program & Procedure 4.3-1(a) through 4.3-1(e) will reduce the potentially significant impacts from the direct loss of nesting habitat for resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors to a less than significant level.

b. *Impact 4.3-2 The 2002 LRDP construction could interfere with the movement of resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors. This impact is potentially significant.*

Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a), 4.3-1(b), 4.3-1(c), and Program & Procedure 4.3-1(a), 4.3-1(b), 4.3-1(c), 4.3-1(d) and 4.3-1(e) also apply to Impact 4.3-2.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) through 4.3-1(c) and Program & Procedure 4.3-1(a) through 4.3-1(e) will reduce the potentially significant impacts from interference with the movement of resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors to a less than significant level.

4. ***Cultural Resources***

a. *Impact 4.4-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of structures that have been designated as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.4-1(a) The campus shall continue to implement all modifications to historic structures in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties

with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

Program & Procedure 4.4-1(b) The integrity of the campus historic core shall be maintained *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-1(d) and Land Use PP 4.8-1(g).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact resulting from an adverse change in the significance of structures that have been designated as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Therefore no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.4-1(a) and 4.4-1(b) will further reduce impacts resulting from adverse changes in the significance of structures that have been designated as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR.

b. *Impact 4.4-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in the demolition of historic or potentially historic structures. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.4-1(b) also applies to Impact 4.4-2

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact resulting from the demolition of historic or potentially historic structures. Therefore no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.4-1(b) will further reduce any potential impacts.

c. *Impact 4.4-3 The 2002 LRDP construction would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. This impact is less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(a) Prior to site preparation or grading activities, construction personnel shall be informed of the potential for encountering unique archaeological resources and taught how to identify these resources if encountered. This shall include the provision of written materials to familiarize personnel with the range of resources that might be expected, the type of activities that may result in impacts, and the legal framework of cultural resources protection. All construction personnel shall be instructed to stop work in the vicinity of a potential discovery until a qualified, non-University archaeologist assesses the significance of the find and implements appropriate measures to protect or scientifically

remove the find. Construction personnel shall also be informed that unauthorized collection of archaeological resources is prohibited.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(b) A qualified archaeologist shall first determine whether an archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a “unique archaeological resource” under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). If the archaeological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the campus that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2.

If the archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, the archaeologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center.

The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the University and to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact resulting from a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Therefore no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-3(a) and 4.4-3(b) will further reduce any potential impacts.

d. Impact 4.4-4 The 2002 LRDP construction could directly or indirectly result in damage to, or the destruction of, unique paleontological resources on site or unique geologic features. This impact is potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(a) Prior to site preparation or grading activities, construction personnel shall be informed of the potential for encountering paleontological resources and taught how to identify these resources if encountered. This shall include the provision of written materials to familiarize personnel with the range of resources that might be expected, the type of activities that may result in impacts, and the legal framework of cultural resources protection. All construction personnel shall be instructed to stop work in the vicinity of a potential discovery until a qualified, non-University paleontologist assesses the significance of the find and implements appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall also be informed that unauthorized collection of paleontological resources is prohibited.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(b) A qualified paleontologist shall first determine whether a paleontological resource uncovered during construction meets the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). If the paleontological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the paleontologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the campus that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2.

If the paleontologist determines that the paleontological resource is not a unique resource, the paleontologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the University and to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-4(a) and 4.4-4(b) will reduce the potentially significant impacts from direct or indirect damage to, or the destruction of, unique paleontological resources on site or unique geologic features to a less-than significant level.

e. Impact 4.4-5 The 2002 LRDP construction would not result in the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.4-5 In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the University immediately shall notify the Los Angeles County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of P.R.C. Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact resulting from the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.4-5 will further reduce potential impacts.

5. *Geology, Soils and Seismicity*

a. *Impact 4.5-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismic-related ground failure (i.e., liquefaction), or landsliding. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a) During project-specific building design, a site-specific geotechnical study shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a California Registered Engineering Geologist or licensed geotechnical engineer to assess detailed seismic, geological, soil, and groundwater conditions at each construction site and develop recommendations to prevent or abate any identified hazards. The study shall follow applicable recommendations of CDMG Special Publication 117 and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to

- Determination of the locations of any suspected fault traces and anticipated ground acceleration at the building site
- Potential for displacement caused by seismically induced shaking, fault/ground surface rupture, liquefaction, differential soil settlement, expansive and compressible soils, landsliding, or other earth movements or soil constraints
- Evaluation of depth to groundwater

The campus shall incorporate into project design the recommendations for the prevention and abatement of any identified hazards, including landslides and liquefaction, as well as for groundwater dewatering, as necessary, to ensure soil stability during construction and operation of the project.

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(b) The campus shall continue to implement its current seismic upgrade program.

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(c) The campus shall continue to comply with the University Policy on Seismic Safety adopted on January 17, 1995 or with any subsequent revision to the policy that provides an equivalent or higher level of protection with respect to seismic hazards.

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(d) Development projects under the 2002 LRDP shall continue to be subject to structural peer review.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from rupture of a

known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismic-related ground failure (i.e., liquefaction), or landsliding, therefore this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a) through 4.5-1(d) will further reduce any potential effects from this Impact.

b. *Impact 4.5-2 The 2002 LRDP construction and operation would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.2-2(a) also applies to Impact 4.5-2

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact from substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.2-2(a) will further reduce any potential impacts.

c. *Impact 4.5-3 The 2002 LRDP construction in areas underlain by soils of varying stability would not subject people and structures to hazards associated with landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or differential settlement. This is a less than significant impact.*

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a), 4.5-1(c) and 4.5-1(d) also apply to Impact 4.5-2.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly subject people and structures to hazards associated with landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or differential settlement, and therefore this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a), 4.5-1(c) and 4.5-1(d) will further reduce potential effects from this Impact.

d. *Impact 4.5-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in construction of facilities on expansive soils, and would not create a substantial risk to people and structures. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a) also applies to Impact 4.5-4.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not have a significant impact from construction of

facilities on expansive soils, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.5-1(a) will further reduce impacts from construction of facilities on expansive soils.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. *Impact 4.6-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose campus occupants or the nearby public to a significant hazard due to the routine transport, use, disposal, or storage of hazardous materials (including chemical, radioactive, and biohazardous waste). This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.6-1 The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) health and safety plans, programs, practices, and procedures related to the use, storage, disposal, or transportation of hazardous materials during the 2002 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Business Plan, Hazardous Materials Management Program, Hazard Communication Program, Injury and Illness Prevention Program, Chemical Exposure Monitoring Program, Asbestos Management Program, Respiratory Protection Program, Risk Management Prevention Plan for the use and storage of ammonia in the ESF, EH&S procedures for decommissioning and demolishing buildings that may contain hazardous materials, and the Broadscope Radioactive Materials License. These programs may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the programs become obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly expose campus occupants or the nearby public to a significant hazard due to the routine transport, use, disposal, or storage of hazardous materials (including chemical, radioactive, and biohazardous waste), and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further reduce any potential effects from this Impact.

b. *Impact 4.6-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to a significant hazard through the renovation or demolition of buildings or relocation of underground utilities that contain hazardous materials. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.6-1 also applies to Impact LRDP 4.6-2.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not significantly expose construction workers and campus occupants to significant hazards through the renovation or demolition of buildings or relocation of underground utilities that contain hazardous materials, and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore, no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further reduce any potential impacts.

c. Impact 4.6-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.6-1 also applies to Impact LRDP 4.6-3.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further reduce hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

d. Impact 4.6-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not create a significant risk of exposure of campus occupants and construction workers to contaminated soil or groundwater. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.6-4 While not expected to occur on-campus, if contaminated soil and/or groundwater is encountered during the removal of on-site debris or during excavation and/or grading activities, the construction contractor(s) shall stop work and immediately inform the EH&S. An on-site assessment shall be conducted to determine if the discovered materials pose a significant risk to the public or construction workers. If the materials are determined to pose such a risk, a remediation plan shall be prepared and submitted to the EH&S to comply with all federal and State regulations necessary to clean and/or remove the contaminated soil and/or groundwater. Soil remediation methods could include, but are not necessarily limited to, excavation and on-site treatment, excavation and off-site treatment or disposal, and/or treatment

without excavation. Remediation alternatives for cleanup of contaminated groundwater could include, but are not necessarily limited to, on-site treatment, extraction and off-site treatment, and/or disposal. The construction schedule shall be modified or delayed to ensure that construction will not inhibit remediation activities and will not expose the public or construction workers to significant risks associated with hazardous conditions.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not create a significant risk of exposure of campus occupants and construction workers to contaminated soil or groundwater, and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore, no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-4 will further reduce risk of exposure of campus occupants and construction workers to contaminated soil or groundwater.

e. Impact 4.6-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in hazardous emissions but could require the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Program & Procedure 4.6-1 also applies to Impact LRDP 4.6-5.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact from the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further reduce impacts from the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

f. Impact 4.6-6 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in construction of facilities on sites containing hazardous materials, and thus would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

Program & Procedure 4.6-1 also applies to Impact LRDP 4.6-6.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact from the construction of facilities on sites containing hazardous materials, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further

reduce impacts from the construction of facilities on sites containing hazardous materials.

g. Impact 4.6-7 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a safety hazard for an increased number of people residing or working on campus due to its proximity to the UCLA Medical Center helipad.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a safety hazard for an increased number of people residing or working on campus due to its proximity to the UCLA Medical Center helipad; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

h. Impact 4.6-8 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.6-8(a) To the extent feasible, the campus shall maintain at least one unobstructed lane in both directions on campus roadways. At any time only a single lane is available, the campus shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls to allow travel in both directions. If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway segment, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative routes. *(This is identical to Traffic/Transportation PP 4.13-6.)*

Program & Procedure 4.6-8(b) To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, UCLA shall consult with the UCPD, EH&S, and the LAFD to disclose temporary lane or roadway closures and alternative travel routes. *(This is identical to Traffic/Transportation PP 4.13-9).*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact from impairing the implementation of, or physically interfering with, an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.6-1 will further reduce impacts from impairing the implementation of, or physically interfering with, an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.

7. *Hydrology and Water Quality*

a. *Impact 4.7-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not violate existing water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not violate existing water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

b. *Impact 4.7-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would increase impervious surfaces at the site, it will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or affect groundwater recharge; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

c. *Impact 4.7-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially alter site drainage patterns and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would increase impervious surfaces at the site, it will not substantially alter site drainage patterns and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

d. *Impact 4.7-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially alter site drainage patterns or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff and would not result in flooding either on or off site. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would slightly alter site drainage patterns, it would not substantially alter site drainage patterns or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff and would not result in flooding either on or off site; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

e. *Impact 4.7-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in runoff that exceeds the capacity of existing storm drain systems or*

provides substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.7-5 Project design shall include measures to upgrade and expand campus storm drain capacity where necessary. Design of future projects will include measures to reduce runoff, including the provision of permeable landscaped areas adjacent to structures to absorb runoff and the use of pervious or semi-pervious paving materials.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would slightly alter site drainage patterns, it would not result in runoff that exceeds the capacity of existing storm drain systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.7-5 will further reduce impacts from runoff.

f. Impact 4.7-6 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require the construction of new stormwater conveyance systems or the expansion of existing stormwater conveyance systems. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.7-5 applies to Impact LRDP 4.7-6.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would slightly alter site drainage patterns, it would not require the construction of new stormwater conveyance systems or the expansion of existing stormwater conveyance systems, and this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.7-5 will further reduce impacts relating to stormwater conveyance.

g. Impact 4.7-7 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that while implementation of the 2002 LRDP would create runoff from the site, such runoff will not substantially degrade water quality; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

h. Impact 4.7-8 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

i. *Impact 4.7-9 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

j. *Impact 4.7-10 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding due to the failure of Stone Canyon Reservoir. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding due to the failure of Stone Canyon Reservoir; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

k. *Impact 4.7-11 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of mudflows. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of mudflows; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

8. *Land Use and Planning*

a. *Impact 4.8-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in potential incompatibilities between campus development and adjacent land uses. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(a) The design process shall evaluate and incorporate, where appropriate, factors including, but not necessarily limited to, building mass and form, building proportion, roof profile, architectural detail and fenestration, the texture, color, and quality of building materials, focal views, pedestrian and vehicular circulation and access, and the landscape setting to ensure preservation and enhancement

of the visual character, and quality of the campus and the surrounding area. Landscaped open space (including plazas, courts, gardens, walkways, and recreational areas) shall be integrated with development to encourage use through placement and design. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-1(a).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(b) Development of the southern edge of the main campus shall be designed to enhance the campus interface with Westwood Village. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-2(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(c) The western, northern, and eastern edges of the main campus shall include a landscaped buffer to complement the residential uses of the surrounding community and to provide an attractive perimeter that effectively screens and enhances future development. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-2(e).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(d) The existing recreational fields in the Central zone of campus shall be maintained and will continue to provide a buffer between campus development and the residential uses north of Sunset Boulevard.

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(e) Infill development of the campus shall be continued, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and energy consumption.

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(f) The architectural and landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character shall be respected and reinforced. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-2(b).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(g) The integrity of the campus historic core shall be maintained. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-1(d) and Cultural PP 4.4-1(b).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(h) New building projects shall be sited to ensure compatibility with existing uses and the height and massing of adjacent facilities. *(This is identical to Aesthetics PP 4.1-1(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.8-1(i) Facilities shall be sited and designed to enhance spatial development of the campus while maximizing use of limited land resources.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP will have a less-than significant impact from potential incompatibilities between campus development and adjacent land uses, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.8-1(a) through 4.8-1(i) will further reduce impacts from potential incompatibilities between campus development and adjacent land uses.

b. *Impact 4.8-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.*

All relevant 2002 LRDP mitigation measures that ensure consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations shall be applied during the LRDP planning horizon.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; therefore, this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required. However, the Board of Regents finds that application of all relevant 2002 LRDP mitigation measures that ensure consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations during the LRDP planning horizon will further reduce impacts.

9. *Noise*

a. *Impact 4.9-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose new on-campus student residential uses to noise levels in excess of the State's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.9-1 The campus shall continue to evaluate ambient noise conditions when placing new student housing near regular sources of noise such as roadways and stationary equipment and design the new buildings to ensure that interior noise levels would be less than 45 dBA CNEL.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose new on-campus student residential uses to noise levels in excess of the State's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise

standard, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-1 will further reduce impacts from exposure of new on-campus student residential uses to noise levels in excess of the State's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard.

b. *Impact 4.9-2 The 2002 LRDP construction could generate and expose persons on campus to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This is a significant impact.*

c. Program & Procedure 4.9-2 The campus shall continue to notify research facilities located near approved construction sites of the planned schedule of vibration causing activities so that the researchers can take necessary precautionary measures to avoid negative effects to their research.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-2 will reduce the potential for exposure to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; however, no feasible mitigation is available and this Program & Procedure will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore this impact remains significant. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G. of these Findings.

d. *Impact 4.9-3 The 2002 LRDP construction would not generate and expose persons off campus to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the 2002 LRDP construction would not generate and expose persons off campus to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

e. *Impact 4.9-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not generate and expose persons on or off campus to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not generate and expose persons on or off campus to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

f. *Impact 4.9-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would generate increased local traffic volumes, but would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient roadway noise levels in*

the project vicinity during the regular session. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.9-5(a) The campus shall continue to provide on-campus housing to continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus. *(This is identical to Air Quality PP 4.2-1(a) and Transportation/Traffic PP 4.13-1(c).)*

Program & Procedure 4.9-5(b) The campus shall continue to implement a TDM program that meets or exceeds all trip reduction and AVR requirements of the SCAQMD. The TDM program may be subject to modification as new technologies are developed or alternate program elements are found to be more effective. *(This is identical to Air Quality PP 4.2-1(b) and Transportation/Traffic PP 4.13-1(d).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient roadway noise levels in the project vicinity during the regular session, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-5(a) and 4.9-5(b) will further reduce impacts from increases in ambient roadway noise levels in the project vicinity during the regular session.

g. Impact 4.9-6 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would generate increased local traffic volumes, but would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient roadway noise levels during the summer session. This impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-6 The TDM program will be extended through the student registration process to provide information concerning alternative transportation options to summer session students to increase awareness of, and participation in, alternative transportation programs during the summer session. *(This is identical to Air Quality MM 4.2-4 and Transportation/Traffic MM 4.13-2(a).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient roadway noise levels in the project vicinity during the summer session, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9-6 will further reduce impacts from increases in ambient roadway noise levels in the project vicinity during the summer session.

h. *Impact 4.9-7 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could add new stationary sources of noise, but would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient noise levels. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.9-7(a) The campus shall continue to shield all new stationary sources of noise that would be located in close proximity to noise-sensitive buildings and uses.

Program & Procedure 4.9-7(b) The campus shall continue to provide a landscaped buffer along the western, northern, and eastern edges of the main campus in order to maximize the distance between the roadways and new buildings and provide an acoustically soft environment. At a minimum, this environment can be provided by planting grass and other low landscaping.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not cause a substantial permanent on- or off-campus increase in ambient noise levels, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-7(a) and 4.9-7(b) will further reduce impacts from increases in ambient noise levels.

i. *Impact 4.9-8 The 2002 LRDP construction would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels at on-campus locations. This is a significant impact.*

Program & Procedure 4.9-8(a) To the extent feasible, construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday, and no construction on Sunday and national holidays, as appropriate, in order to minimize disruption to area residences surrounding the campus and to on-campus uses that are sensitive to noise.

Program & Procedure 4.9-8(b) The campus shall continue to require by contract specifications that construction equipment be required to be muffled or otherwise shielded. Contracts shall specify that engine-driven equipment be fitted with appropriate noise mufflers.

Program & Procedure 4.9-8(c) The campus shall continue to require that stationary construction equipment material and vehicle staging be placed to direct noise away from sensitive receptors.

Program & Procedure 4.9-8(d) The campus shall continue to conduct regular meetings with on-campus constituents to provide advance notice of construction activities in order to coordinate these activities with the academic calendar, scheduled events, and other situations, as needed.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-8(a) through 4.9-8(d) will reduce the potential for substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels at on-campus locations; however, no feasible mitigation is available and these Programs & Procedures will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore this impact remains significant. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G. of these Findings.

j. *Impact 4.9-9 The 2002 LRDP construction would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels at off-campus locations. This impact is significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.9-9 The campus shall continue to conduct meetings, as needed, with off-campus constituents that are affected by campus construction to provide advanced notice of construction activities and ensure that the mutual needs of the particular construction project and of those impacted by construction noise are met, to the extent feasible.

Program & Procedure 4.9-8(a), 4.9-8(b), and 4.9-8(c) also apply to Impact LRDP 4.9-9.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-8(a) through 4.9-8(c) and 4.9-9 will reduce the potential for substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels at off-campus locations; however, no feasible mitigation is available and these Programs & Procedures will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore this impact remains significant. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G. of these Findings.

k. *Impact 4.9-10 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to special events. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to special events; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

1. *Impact 4.9-11 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose additional students, faculty, and visitors within the UCLA campus to excessive noise levels generated by helicopter operations. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not expose additional students, faculty, and visitors within the UCLA campus to excessive noise levels generated by helicopter operations; therefore, this impact is less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

10. *Population, Employment, and Housing*

a. *Impact 4.10-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would accommodate population growth on the UCLA campus. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would accommodate population growth on the UCLA campus; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

b. *Impact 4.10-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a substantial increase in demand for housing.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in a substantial increase in demand for housing; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

11. *Public Services*

a. *Impact 4.11-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for fire protection services, but would not require the construction of new or physically altered facilities to accommodate the increased demand and maintain acceptable response times and fire flows. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.11-1 Fire alarm connections to the University Police Command Center shall continue to be provided in all new and renovated buildings to provide immediate location information to the Los Angeles Fire Department to reduce response times in emergency situations.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for fire protection services, but would not require the construction of new or physically altered facilities to accommodate the increased demand and maintain acceptable response times and fire flows, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.11-1 will further reduce impacts relating to fire protection.

b. Impact 4.11-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for police services, but would not require new or physically altered facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios for police protection services. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.11-2(a) Police staffing levels and equipment needs shall continue to be assessed on an ongoing basis as individual development projects are proposed and on an annual basis during the campus budgeting process to ensure that the appropriate service levels will be maintained to protect an increased campus population and an increased level of development.

Program & Procedure 4.11-2(b) Annual meetings will be attended by the Director of UCLA Housing and the UCPD to evaluate the adequacy of police protection service for University-owned housing, assess institutional priorities and budgetary requirements, and identify and implement appropriate actions to ensure the continued adequacy of police protection services for resident students.

Program & Procedure 4.11-1 also applies to Impact LRDP 4.11-2.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for police services, but would not require new or physically altered facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios for police protection services, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.11-1, 4.11-2(a) and 4.11-2(b) will further reduce impacts relating to police protection.

c. *Impact 4.11-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require new or physically altered facilities to accommodate additional students in LAUSD schools. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require new or physically altered facilities to accommodate additional students in LAUSD schools; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

12. *Recreation*

a. *Impact 4.12-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would increase the campus population but would not result in the increased use of parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.12-1(a) The campus shall continue to provide, operate, and maintain recreational facilities for students, faculty, and staff on campus.

Program & Procedure 4.12-1(b) The campus shall continue to integrate landscaped open space (including plazas, courts, gardens, walkways, and recreational areas) with development to encourage use through placement and design.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in the increased use of parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.12-1(a) and 4.12-1(b) will further reduce impacts relating to parks and recreational facilities.

b. *Impact 4.12-2 The 2002 LRDP would include recreational facilities as part of the proposed Northwest Housing Infill Project, the construction of which would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment. This impact is less than significant.*

All relevant 2002 LRDP mitigation measures shall be applied during construction activities.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in significant impacts from the

construction of recreational facilities as part of the Northwest Housing Infill project, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation all relevant 2002 LRDP mitigation measures will further reduce construction impacts.

13. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

a. *Impact 4.13-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would result in additional vehicular trips during the regular session, which would result in a substantial degradation in intersection levels of service. This is a significant impact*

Mitigation Measure 4.13-0 The campus shall prepare a long range plan to address bicycle commuting as part of the TDM Program.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Montana Avenue/Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue.

Program & Procedure 4.13-1(a) The campus shall continue to maintain the 1990 LRDP vehicle trip cap of 139,500 average daily trips.

Program & Procedure 4.13-1(b) The campus shall continue to maintain the 1990 LRDP parking cap of 25,169 spaces.

Program & Procedure 4.13-1(c) The campus shall continue to provide on-campus housing to continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus. *(This is identical to Air Quality PP 4.2-1(a) and Noise and Vibration PP 4.9-5(a).)*

Program & Procedure 4.13-1(d) The campus shall continue to implement a TDM program that meets or exceeds all trip reduction and AVR requirements of the SCAQMD. The TDM program may be subject to modification as new technologies are developed or alternate program elements are found to be more effective. *(This is identical to Air Quality PP 4.2-1(b) and Noise and Vibration 4.9-5(b).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 and Program & Procedure 4.13-1(a) through 4.13-1(d) will reduce impacts from additional vehicular trips during the regular session; however, these measures will not reduce

this impact to a less-than significant level, and no additional feasible mitigation is available. The Board of Regents further finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles, which can and should implement this Mitigation Measure, and is not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation, including impacts at the intersection of Montana Avenue/Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue, which would remain significant and unavoidable if Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 is not implemented by the City of Los Angeles. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

b. Impact 4.13-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would result in additional vehicular trips during the twelve-week period of summer instruction, which would result in a substantial degradation in intersection levels of service. This impact is significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) The TDM program will be extended through the student registration process to provide information concerning alternative transportation options to summer session students to increase awareness of, and participation in, alternative transportation programs during the summer session. *(This is identical to Air Quality MM 4.2-4 and Noise and Vibration MM 4.9-6.)*

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(b) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Montana Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(c) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Strathmore Place and Gayley Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(d) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Weyburn Avenue and Gayley Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(e) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Kinross Avenue and Westwood Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(f) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(g) The campus shall provide fair share

funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Gayley Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(h) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for restriping of Malcolm Avenue at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard to provide dedicated northbound and southbound right-turn lanes.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(i) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Beverly Glen Boulevard.

Measure Mitigation 4.13-2(j) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Ohio Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard.

Measure Mitigation 4.13-2(k) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Ohio Avenue and Veteran Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(l) If the City of Los Angeles elects not to install ATCS at the intersection of Ohio Avenue and Veteran Avenue, the campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for restriping of Veteran Avenue at the intersection of Ohio Avenue to provide dedicated northbound and southbound right-turn lanes.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(m) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard (North) and Veteran Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(n) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard (North) and Westwood Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(o) The campus shall provide fair share funding to the City of Los Angeles for installation of ATCS at the intersection of Beverly Glen Boulevard and Greendale Drive.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(p) If the City of Los Angeles elects not to install ATCS at the intersection of Beverly Glen Boulevard and Greendale Drive, the campus shall provide fair share funding for restriping the west side of Beverly Glen Boulevard by the City of Los Angeles to provide dedicated southbound through and left-turn lanes.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-0, 4.13-1 and Program & Procedure 4.13-1(a)

through 4.13-1(d) also apply to Impact 4.13-2

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-0, 4.13-1, 4.13-2(a) through 4.13-2(p) and Program & Procedure 4.13-1(a) through 4.13-1(d) will reduce impacts from additional vehicular trips during the summer session; however, these measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than significant level, and no additional feasible mitigation is available. The Board of Regents further finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2(a) through 4.13-2(p) is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles, which can and should implement these Mitigation Measures, and is not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation, including impacts at the above-referenced intersections, which would remain significant and unavoidable if Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2(a) through 4.13-2(p) are not implemented by the City of Los Angeles. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

c. Impact 4.13-3 The 2002 LRDP construction would result in the generation of construction-related vehicle trips, which would impact traffic conditions along roadway segments and at individual intersections. This impact is significant.

Program & Procedure 4.13-3 UCLA Capital Programs will assess construction schedules of major projects to determine the potential for overlapping construction activities to result in periods of heavy construction vehicle traffic on individual roadway segments, and adjust construction schedules, work hours, or access routes to the extent feasible to reduce construction-related traffic congestion.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Program & Procedure 4.13-3 will reduce impacts from construction-related vehicular trips; however, these measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than significant level, and no additional feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

d. Impact 4.13-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would result in additional vehicular traffic volumes, but would not exceed established service levels on roadways designated by the Los Angeles Congestion Management Program. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not exceed established service levels on roadways designated by the Los Angeles Congestion Management Program; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

e. Impact 4.13-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

f. Impact 4.13-6 The 2002 LRDP construction would not substantially increase vehicular hazards due to closure of traffic lanes or roadway segments. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.13-6 To the extent feasible, the campus shall maintain at least one unobstructed lane in both directions on campus roadways. At any time only a single lane is available, the campus shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls to allow travel in both directions. If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway segment, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative routes. *(This is identical to Hazards and Hazardous Materials PP 4.6-8(a).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the 2002 LRDP construction would not substantially increase vehicular hazards due to closure of traffic lanes or roadway segments, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.13-6 will further reduce impacts from vehicular hazards due to closure of traffic lanes or roadway segments.

g. Impact 4.13-7 The 2002 LRDP construction would not substantially increase pedestrian hazards due to closure of sidewalks or paths. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.13-7 For any construction-related closure of pedestrian routes, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative routes, and provide curb cuts and street crossings to assure alternate routes are accessible

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the 2002 LRDP construction would not substantially increase pedestrian hazards due to closure of sidewalks or paths, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.13-7 will further reduce impacts from pedestrian hazards due to closure of sidewalks or paths.

h. *Impact 4.13-8 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate emergency access; this impact is less-than-significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

i. *Impact 4.14-9 The 2002 LRDP construction would not result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.13-9 To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, UCLA shall consult with the UCPD, EH&S, and the LAFD to disclose temporary lane or roadway closures and alternative travel routes. *(This is identical to Hazards and Hazardous Materials PP 4.6-8(b).)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the 2002 LRDP construction would not result in inadequate emergency access, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.13-9 will further reduce impacts to emergency access.

j. *Impact 4.13-10 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate parking capacity during the regular session. This impact is less than significant.*

Program & Procedure 4.9-5(b) and 4.13-1(b) also apply to Impact LRDP 4.13-11

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate parking capacity during the regular session, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.9-5(b) and 4.13-1(b) will further reduce impacts on parking capacity during the regular session.

k. *Impact 4.13-11 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate parking capacity during the summer session. This impact is less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) also applies to Impact LRDP 4.13-11.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in inadequate parking capacity during the twelve-week summer session, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) will further reduce impacts on parking capacity during the twelve-week summer session.

l. *Impact 4.13-12 The 2002 LRDP construction could result in temporary elimination of on-campus parking spaces and could require additional temporary parking for construction workers. This impact is potentially significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.13-12 To the extent that construction worker parking demand exceeds historical levels or available supply, off-site construction worker parking shall be provided with shuttle service to the remote parking location.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-12 will reduce the potentially significant impacts from the temporary elimination of on-campus parking spaces to a less-than significant level.

m. *Impact 4.13-13 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. This impact is less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) also applies to Impact 4.13-13.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) will further reduce impacts from conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

n. *Impact 4.13-14 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not increase demand for public transit during the regular session. This impact is less than significant.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not increase demand for public transit during the regular session; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

o. Impact 4.13-15 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could slightly increase demand for public transit during the summer session, but would not require an increase in transit service. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require an increase in transit service during the summer session; therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

14. *Utilities*

a. Impact 4.14-1 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

b. Impact 4.14-2 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would generate an additional demand for water, but would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or result in the need for new or expanded entitlements.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(a) New facilities and renovations (except for patient care facilities in the Medical Center) shall be equipped with low-flow showers, toilets, and urinals.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(b) Measures to reduce landscaping irrigation needs shall be used, such as automatic timing systems to apply irrigation water during times of the day when evaporation rates are low, installing drip irrigation systems, using mulch for landscaping, subscribing to the California Irrigation Management Information System Network for

current information on weather and evaporation rates, and incorporating drought-resistant plants as appropriate.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(c) The campus shall promptly detect and repair leaks in water and irrigation pipes.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(d) The campus shall minimize the use of water to clean sidewalks, walkways, driveways and parking areas.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(e) The campus shall avoid serving water at UCLA food service facilities except upon request.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(f) The campus shall provide ongoing water treatment programs for campus cooling equipment by adding biodegradable chemicals to achieve reductions in water usage.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(g) The campus shall educate the campus community on the importance of water conservation measures.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or result in the need for new or expanded entitlements, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-2(a) through 4.14-2(g) will further reduce impacts on water supplies.

c. Impact 4.14-3 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not generate solid waste that exceeds the permitted capacity of landfills serving the campus. This impact is less than significant.

Program & Procedure 4.14-3 The campus shall continue to implement a solid waste reduction and recycling program designed to limit the total quantity of campus solid waste that is disposed of in landfills during the LRDP plan horizon.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not generate solid waste that exceeds the permitted capacity of landfills serving the campus, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-3 will further reduce impacts on solid waste disposal.

d. *Impact 4.14-4 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-3 will further reduce impacts on solid waste disposal.

e. *Impact 4.14-5 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

f. *Impact 4.14-6 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could require the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental effects.*

Program & Procedure 4.14-6 As part of the design process for proposed projects, an evaluation of the on-campus sewer conveyance capacity shall be undertaken, and improvements provided if necessary in order to ensure that connections are adequate and capacity is available to accommodate estimated flows.

All relevant 2002 LRDP mitigation measures shall be applied during construction activities.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds while implementation of the 2002 LRDP could require the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems, the construction of such systems would not cause significant environmental effects, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-6 and all relevant 2002 LRDP Mitigation Measures will further reduce impacts from the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems.

g. *Impact 4.14-7 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not increase wastewater generation such that treatment facilities would be inadequate*

to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Program & Procedure 4.14-2(a) through 4.14-2(g) apply to Impact LRDP 4.14-7.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not increase wastewater generation such that treatment facilities would be inadequate to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-2(a) through 4.14-2(g) will further reduce potential impacts on wastewater facilities.

h. Impact 4.14-8 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for electricity, but would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact, and this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

i. Impact 4.14-9 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP could increase the demand for natural gas, but would not require or result in the construction of new gas production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not require or result in the construction of new gas production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact, and this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

j. Impact 4.14-10 Implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy by UCLA.

Program & Procedure 4.14-10 The campus shall continue to implement campus energy conservation measures (such as energy-efficient lighting and microprocessor-controlled HVAC equipment) to reduce the demand for electricity and natural gas. The energy conservation measures may be subject to modification as new technologies are developed or if current technologies become obsolete

through replacement. *(This is identical to Air Quality PP 4.2-3.)*

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the 2002 LRDP would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy by UCLA, and this impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Program & Procedure 4.14-10 will further reduce impacts from energy use and consumption.

15. *Cumulative Impacts*

Cumulative impacts would result from implementation of the 2002 LRDP in combination with the development of related projects in the area and projected regional growth. As analyzed in the Final EIR, most of the contributions of the 2002 LRDP to potential cumulative impacts are less than considerable and/or not significant. With respect to issue areas where this is the case, the Final EIR explains why the contribution of the 2002 LRDP is less than considerable and/or less than significant, and the Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference this analysis in the Final EIR. The impact issue areas in which the contribution of the 2002 LRDP to potential cumulative impacts is less than considerable and/or not significant are Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population, Employment and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that, based upon the analysis in the Final EIR which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference, the contribution of the 2002 LRDP to cumulative impacts in the issue areas of Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population, Employment and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities will be less than cumulatively considerable and/or the cumulative impact is less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of the project-specific Mitigation Measures and Programs & Procedures set forth in the Final EIR and in these Findings will further reduce potential cumulative impacts.

The impact areas identified in the Final EIR for which there is a significant and unavoidable contribution of the 2002 LRDP to significant and adverse cumulative impacts are the following:

- Exceedance of the applicable LOS criteria would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative traffic impacts on local streets and intersections resulting from project operation during both the regular and summer sessions.
- Construction vehicle activity would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on local streets and intersections for both the regular and summer sessions during project construction.
- Air emissions impacts would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative significant impacts on regional air quality from daily emissions of criteria pollutants during project construction.

The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the analysis stated in the Final EIR regarding the significance of cumulative impacts and the contribution of the 2002 LRDP to those impacts.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that although the contribution of the 2002 LRDP to significant cumulative impacts will be mitigated to the extent feasible by the project-specific Mitigation Measures and Programs & Procedures set forth in the Final EIR and in these Findings, the 2002 LRDP will result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts associated with vehicle traffic during construction and operation, and air quality during construction. The Board of Regents hereby finds the significant and unavoidable contributions of the 2002 LRDP to significant and adverse cumulative impacts to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

C. Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Northwest Housing Infill Project

The Northwest Housing Infill Project (NHIP) is a project-specific component of the 2002 LRDP. Because the findings concerning project-level and cumulative impacts of the 2002 LRDP made in Section II(B), above, fully address most of the impacts of the NHIP, this section contains additional findings only to those resource areas where it was determined that additional analysis was necessary to evaluate project-specific impacts of the NHIP and project-specific mitigation measures. This analysis is found in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR.

1. *Aesthetics*

a. *Impact NHIP 4.1-1 Implementation of the NHIP would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area. This impact is less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure NHIP 4.1-1 Landscaping along the western edge of the Dykstra Parking Garage, or other edges of development that are visible from the residential uses west of Gayley Avenue, shall consist of trees that are at least 36-inch box size for all species except eucalyptus trees, which shall be planted from 15-gallon containers.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that implementation of the NHIP would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area, and therefore this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required; however, the Board of Regents finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure NHIP 4.1-1 will further reduce impacts on the visual character or quality of the campus and the immediately surrounding area.

2. *Noise*

a. *Impact NHIP 4.9-2 The NHIP construction could generate and expose persons on campus to excessive groundborne vibration or excessive groundborne noise levels. This is a significant impact.*

Mitigation Measure NHIP 4.9-2 The campus shall notify on-campus residential and administrative users in the Northwest zone when construction activities that could produce excessive groundborne vibration (such as the use of large bulldozers and loaded trucks) are anticipated to occur within 50 feet of the residence halls.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measure NHIP 4.9-2 will reduce impacts from construction-related groundborne vibration and noise levels; however, these measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, and no additional feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Board of Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in Section II.G of these Findings.

D. Other CEQA Considerations

1. **Growth Inducing Impacts** CEQA Guidelines §15126 requires consideration of the potential growth inducing impact of proposed projects, including the ways in which “the proposed project could foster economic and population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment...and the characteristic of some projects which may encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.”

Implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not result in growth inducing impacts, as the 2002 LRDP will not remove an impediment to growth, will not result in the urbanization of land in a remote location (i.e., “leapfrog development”), will not induce substantial economic and population growth in the region, and will not result in the construction of significant additional housing. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents hereby finds that the Project site is already developed and is located in a highly urbanized setting, and implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not result in a substantial extension of infrastructure, and would not open up undeveloped areas to new development. Therefore, the Board of Regents hereby finds that the growth inducing impacts are less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

2. **Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects** CEQA Guideline §15126.2(c) indicates that the “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of a project may be irreversible since a large commitment of resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely.”

Implementation of the 2002 LRDP will not result in significant irreversible environmental impacts, as the 2002 LRDP will not represent a significant change in the use of non-renewable resources, result in irreversible damage to the environment, or result in a wasteful or unjustifiable use of energy or other resources. This impact is less than significant.

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that construction and operation of the Project would necessarily consume certain limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable natural and energy resources. These resources are similar to those currently utilized by the existing campus, and the consumption of resources proposed with respect to the 2002 LRDP is less than significant when compared to existing local and regional consumption levels. As indicated in the Final EIR, the potential for irreversible environmental damage from an accident associated with the 2002 LRDP is less than

significant, in light of existing and ongoing hazardous materials handling practices. Finally, the University has instituted and will continue efficient energy use and conservation practices, as described in the Final EIR. On this basis, the Board of Regents hereby find that the 2002 LRDP will not result in significant irreversible environmental changes and that therefore no mitigation is necessary.

E. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Public Resources Code §21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines §15091(d) require the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted by the Board of Regents requires the University to monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to reduce environmental impacts which are less than significant. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program includes all of the Mitigation Measures and Programs & Procedures identified in the Final EIR and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the 2002 LRDP. The Board of Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached hereto and incorporated herein.

- (1) The Board of Regents finds that the impacts of the 2002 LRDP have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the Mitigation Measures identified in the Final EIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Board of Regents adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 2002 LRDP that accompanies the Final EIR. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation for conditions within the jurisdiction of the University. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures specified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be accomplished through administrative controls over Project planning and implementation, and monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through verification in periodic Mitigation Monitoring Reports and periodic inspection by appropriate University personnel. The University reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of Mitigation Measures if, in the exercise of discretion of the University, it is determined that the amended or substituted Mitigation Measure will mitigate the identified potential environmental impact to at least the same degree as the original Mitigation Measure, or would attain an adopted performance standard for mitigation, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

- (2) The Regents finds that Programs & Procedures incorporated into the Project and identified in the Final EIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will eliminate the potential for certain environmental impacts, as indicated in the Final EIR. Implementation of the Programs & Procedures specified in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be accomplished in the same manner as the Mitigation Measures, and will be enforceable to the same extent. The University reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of Programs & Procedures if, in the exercise of discretion of the University, it is determined that the amended or substituted Program & Procedure will eliminate the potential for an environmental impact to at least the same degree as the original Program & Procedure, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

F. Alternatives

Volume 1 of the Draft EIR evaluated a reasonable range of potential alternatives to the 2002 LRDP, both on-site and off-site. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis also included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and discusses the environmentally superior alternative. The analysis examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives identified in Section 3.3 of Volume 1 of the Draft EIR. Volume 2 of the Draft EIR evaluated a reasonable range of potential alternatives to the NHIP.

The Board of Regents certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the administrative record, and finds that all the alternatives are infeasible or undesirable in comparison to the 2002 LRDP (including the NHIP) for the reasons set forth below.

1. *Project Objectives*

The Board of Regents finds that the project objectives for the Project are as described in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. The overall guiding project objective is to update the current LRDP for the UCLA campus, which was previously adopted by the Board of Regents in November, 1990. Specific project objectives that facilitate achievement of the guiding project objective are described in full in Section 3.3 of Volume 1. These specific project objectives are as follows:

Academic Objectives

- Offer teaching, research, and service programs of the highest quality to serve the needs of the Los Angeles region, the State of California, and the nation.

- Build an academic community of faculty and students in keeping with an institution of UCLA's caliber.
- Build a strong organization of staff employees through training and professional development programs and attention to the working environment.
- Foster diversity among students, faculty, and staff, and through curriculum, academic programs, and public service.
- Ensure student access in a manner consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program and meeting the University enrollment growth target to accommodate an additional 4,000 FTE students at UCLA by 2010–11.
- Develop an academic, administrative, and physical environment that supports outstanding research and creative activity.
- To the extent feasible, site new buildings in locations that offer programmatic advantages due to proximity to related academic disciplines.
- Create an intellectual milieu and shared ethic that fosters excellence and a sense of community on campus.
- Create an environment for student life that fosters students' academic, personal, and social development.
- Continue to serve the Los Angeles region through provision of cultural, health, educational, and other community programs.

Physical Objectives

- Maintain the 1990 LRDP campus parking cap of 25,169 spaces.
- Maintain the 1990 LRDP campus vehicle trip cap of 139,500 average daily trips.
- Develop a maximum of 1.71 million gsf of additional building space, which represents the remaining approved 1990 LRDP development allocation.
- Continue the infill development of the UCLA campus, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and energy consumption.
- Retain the human scale and rich landscape of the campus while enhancing its function as a mature university in a fully developed urban environment.
- Site and design facilities to enhance spatial development of the campus while maximizing use of limited land resources.
- Respect and reinforce the architectural and landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character.
- Continue to integrate landscaped open space (including plazas, courts, gardens, walkways, and recreational areas) with development, to encourage use through placement and design.

- Provide recreational facilities for students, faculty, and staff on campus.
- Provide a landscaped buffer along the western, northern, and eastern edges of the main campus.
- Design future development on the southern edge of the main campus to enhance the campus interface with Westwood Village.
- Maintain the integrity of the campus historic core.
- Site new building projects to ensure compatibility with existing uses and the height and massing of adjacent facilities, to the extent feasible.
- Provide accessibility for the disabled in the siting and design of new buildings or the renovation, restoration, or reconstruction of existing buildings.
- Clarify and strengthen existing pedestrian and vehicular circulation to enhance way-finding and promote safety.
- Develop on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus.

Operational Objectives

- Accommodate a proportion of enrollment growth by utilizing existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer, thereby minimizing capacity impacts to student services, housing, parking, and traffic, and limiting population growth in the regular session when campus activity is highest.
- To the extent practicable, continue to incorporate design features, technological adaptations, and/or planning principles into future campus development to encourage or reinforce the concept of environmental sustainability and stewardship, including the conservation of resources and the minimization of waste.
- Promote the efficient use of water through the use of natural drainage patterns, drought tolerant landscaping, and recycling and reuse.
- Encourage energy efficiency through thoughtful design that considers the effective placement of buildings and the use of shading, to the extent feasible.
- Continue to acquire and use clean fuel vehicles for public transit and fleet vehicles.
- Provide and promote opportunities for the use of alternative transportation modes.
- Plan, design, and implement the proposed project within the practical constraints of available funding sources.

2. **Alternatives to the 2002 LRDP**

- a. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative/Continued Implementation of the 1990 LRDP through 2010-11.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR evaluates Alternative 1, the “No-Project Alternative,” which compares the impacts of approving the 2002 LRDP with the impacts of not approving it. Alternative 1 analyzes the existing environmental conditions (as described more fully in Section 4.0.2 of the Draft EIR), along with a discussion of what would be reasonably expected to occur at the site in the foreseeable future, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Alternative 1 assumes the same development levels, vehicle trip limits, parking limits, and population growth as articulated in the 1990 LRDP, which would permit a maximum of 1.7 million gsf of new development, limit the on-campus parking inventory to 25,169 parking spaces, and result in a total estimated headcount of 55,507 faculty, staff and students, and an average weekday campus population of 58,430. This alternative assumes that the 1990 LRDP would be continued unless and until another LRDP is adopted, to allow for a plan-to-plan comparison of the 1990 LRDP and the 2002 LRDP, as articulated in Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) of the CEQA Guidelines. Under this alternative, the Northwest Housing Infill Project (NHIP) would not occur, as that proposal is not consistent with the 1990 LRDP. Because the population growth would be limited to the levels identified in the 1990 LRDP and the 1990 LRDP Final EIR, as amended, and the additional enrollment under the 2002 LRDP would not occur, this alternative also serves as a reduced population and enrollment alternative.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Although Alternative 1 would allow for full structural development envisioned under the project, while maintaining the existing vehicle trip limits and parking limits, it would not meet the 2002 LRDP objective of accommodating an increase of 4,000 FTE students at UCLA. Therefore, the University goal to accommodate enrollment growth resulting from a projected increase in the number of high school graduates over the next decade would not be met because UCLA would not absorb its share of that growth (4,000 FTE students). By limiting the campus population to the 1990 LRDP levels, including the student population, the University would not achieve the 2002 LRDP objective that seeks to ensure student access in a manner consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in

California, while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program and meeting the University enrollment growth target to accommodate an additional 4,000 FTE students at UCLA by 2010–11.

Additional student housing would not be provided under this alternative, which would result in a higher unmet demand for student housing than the 2002 LRDP. The housing goals of the 2001 Student Housing Master Plan (SHMP) would not be met with respect to the percentage of students housed in University-owned or private-sector housing (within walking distance to campus). The 2002 LRDP objective of developing on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus would not be met to the same degree as the Project and in particular the reduction in the triple room accommodations for students housed on campus would not be realized. Lastly, this alternative would hinder the objectives of the campus to further its academic, research, and public service mission because it does not accommodate the enrollment growth target for UCLA or provide campus housing to accommodate student needs.

Specifically, the following 2002 LRDP objectives would not be met:

- Ensure student access in a manner consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program and meeting the University enrollment growth target to accommodate an additional 4,000 FTE students at UCLA by 2010–11.
- Develop on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus.
- Accommodate a proportion of enrollment growth by utilizing existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer, thereby minimizing capacity impacts to student services, housing, parking, and traffic, and limiting population growth in the regular session when campus activity is highest.

Air quality impacts resulting from construction under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than under the 2002 LRDP, because a single project the size of the NHIP would not be constructed under this alternative. In addition, a slight reduction in operational air quality would occur during the summer session under the No Project Alternative, due to a reduced summer campus population. However, the No Project Alternative would not substantially reduce the significant and

unavoidable impacts to air quality from construction which would occur under both the No Project Alternative and the 2002 LRDP. Impacts from construction noise would be slightly less under the No Project Alternative, due to a lesser amount of construction near existing residential structures, but would remain significant and unavoidable under both scenarios. The No Project Alternative would result in slightly lower impacts on operational traffic impacts during the summer session than the 2002 LRDP, due to reduced campus population, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at specific intersections. Impacts from construction vehicles would be slightly less under the No Project Alternative than the 2002 LRDP, because a single project the size of the NHIP would not be constructed under this alternative. However, this reduction is not substantial, and impacts from construction vehicles would remain significant and unavoidable under both scenarios.

FINDING: Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* §21081(a)(3) and *CEQA Guidelines* §15091(a)(3) The Board of Regents finds that the No Project Alternative is inferior to the Project because it does not eliminate or reduce any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to below a level of significance. Moreover, this Alternative cannot attain the University's objectives to the same extent as the Project, and would result in a substantial negative impact on the University's ability to further its academic, research and public services missions, as indicated above.

b. Alternative 2 – Off-Site Alternative

Alternative 2 assumes the relocation of discrete programs, which could include the Law School and the Anderson Graduate School of Management, associated graduate housing, recreational facilities, and parking to a 35-acre site at the Playa Vista Phase II Development site located in the City of Los Angeles.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The development of an off-campus self-contained satellite campus would fail to meet several of the objectives set forth in the 2002 LRDP and would also create significant new obstacles to the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of University education. Despite the fact that the programs that would be candidates for relocation to the satellite campus would be discrete, self-contained academic units, such as the Law School, The Anderson Graduate School of Management, or other graduate

programs, the interdisciplinary nature of many programs on campus establishes a framework that permits students the opportunities for specialization in a wide variety of academic disciplines. The physical proximity of many departments and facilities is of critical importance, and relocation to a satellite campus could compromise the academic objectives of these programs. In addition, a wide range of academic programs and organized research units are established in areas not accommodated within traditional academic departments. Proximity of facilities and academic office space is especially critical for interdisciplinary research programs, where faculty and research staff from various departments often interface and share ideas on research topics. The potential separation of academic and research functions could impose functional and operational constraints, and sites more proximate to the main campus would entail the least disruption to campus programs and activities.

Specifically, the following 2002 LRDP objectives would not be met:

- To the extent feasible, site new buildings in locations that offer programmatic advantages due to proximity to related academic disciplines.
- Create an intellectual milieu and shared ethic that fosters excellence and a sense of community on campus.
- Continue the infill development of the UCLA campus, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and energy consumption.
- Develop on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus.
- Accommodate a proportion of enrollment growth by utilizing existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer, thereby minimizing capacity impacts to student services, housing, parking, and traffic, and limiting population growth in the regular session when campus activity is highest.

For these reasons, the development of future facilities on a site other than the main campus is undesirable and impractical. The general impacts of pursuing such an alternative on instructional and research program objectives, together with the potential for increased operational costs, weighs decisively against the establishment of a satellite campus.

Construction air quality and traffic impacts resulting from the Off-Site Alternative would be greater than under the 2002 LRDP, due to a need to construct additional infrastructure at the Off-site location. The Off-Site Alternative would also create a significant and unavoidable

aesthetic impact as a result of changes to the current visual character of the site, compared to the less-than significant impact associated with the 2002 LRDP. Operational air quality impacts would be similar under both the Off-Site Alternative and the 2002 LRDP. Operational traffic impacts would be slightly less under the Off-Site Alternative as a result of conditions at the off-site location, but would be significant and unavoidable under both scenarios.

FINDING: Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* §21081(a)(3) and *CEQA Guidelines* §15091(a)(3) The Board of Regents finds that the Off-Site Alternative is inferior to the Project because it does not eliminate or reduce any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to below a level of significance, and increases impacts to air quality and traffic during construction as well as aesthetic impacts. Moreover, this Alternative cannot attain the University's objectives to the same extent as the Project, and would result in a substantial negative impact on the University's ability to further its academic, research and public services missions, as indicated above.

c. Alternative 3 – Regular Session Growth Only.

Alternative 3 assumes that all enrollment growth would be accommodated in the regular session, and no enrollment growth would occur in the summer session.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would allow the same level of development as envisioned under the 2002 LRDP and would accommodate the projected increase in 4,000 FTE students. This alternative would be consistent with LRDP objectives to maintain the campus parking and vehicle trip caps. However, this alternative would not achieve the project objective that strives to accommodate a significant portion of the enrollment by utilizing existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer and limiting the headcount growth in the regular session to minimize capacity impacts on student services, housing, parking, and traffic (when campus activity is higher). In addition, this alternative would limit the campus ability to achieve goals of the Student Housing Master Plan, which include housing 58 percent of student enrollment and continuing the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus, by creating an additional demand for an already limited supply of on-campus housing. This alternative, through its inability to utilize existing campus facilities more

intensively during the summer, would inhibit achievement of the academic objectives outlined in the 2002 LRDP. Increased enrollment during the regular session would make it more difficult for the campus to develop an academic, administrative, and physical environment that supports outstanding research and creative activity, for example, or ensure student access while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program. This alternative would result in impediments to achieving the academic, physical, and operational objectives set forth in the 2002 LRDP.

Specifically, the following 2002 LRDP objectives would not be met:

- Create an environment for student life that fosters students' academic, personal, and social development.
- Develop on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus.
- Accommodate a proportion of enrollment growth by utilizing existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer, thereby minimizing capacity impacts to student services, housing, parking, and traffic, and limiting population growth in the regular session when campus activity is highest.
- Plan, design, and implement the proposed project within the practical constraints of available funding sources.

Air quality, noise and traffic impacts resulting from construction under the Regular Session Growth Only Alternative (Alternative 3) would be the same as under the 2002 LRDP, although the significant and unavoidable operational impact from summer session traffic of the 2002 LRDP would be reduced to below a level of significance under Alternative 3 because the summer campus population growth under the 2002 LRDP would not occur under this alternative. The Regular Session Growth Only Alternative would result in greater impacts on operational traffic during the regular session than the 2002 LRDP, due to increased campus population.

FINDING: Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* §21081(a)(3) and *CEQA Guidelines* §15091(a)(3) The Board of Regents finds that the Regular Session Growth Only Alternative is inferior to the Project because, while it reduces one of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts (on operational air quality during the summer session), it increases regular session traffic impacts. Moreover, this Alternative cannot attain the University's objectives to the same extent as the Project, and would result in a substantial negative

impact on the University's ability to further its academic, research and public services missions, as indicated above.

3. *Alternatives to the Northwest Housing Infill Project*

The Northwest Housing Infill Project (NHIP) is a project-specific component of the 2002 LRDP, and thus is addressed in the Final EIR as a component of the Project for purposes of analyzing alternatives to the 2002 LRDP. However, Volume 2 of the Final EIR contains additional analysis of alternatives to the NHIP.

a. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative would leave the project site in its present condition. There would be no construction of new residence halls and associated recreation and parking facilities, and no ground-floor renovations to the Hedrick, Rieber, and Sproul residential halls. In addition, the relocation and consolidation of Facilities Management structures and uses would not occur. The 2002 LRDP would be fully implemented, and the 550,000 square feet (sf) proposed under the NHIP would be reallocated among the other campus zones.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The No Project alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. The project would not provide additional on-campus housing to address current and anticipated demand, as specified in the 2001 Student Housing Master Plan (SHMP), or to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus. The No Project alternative would also not meet the objective of reducing the proportion of students who commute to campus, because it would not provide any additional on-campus housing. The No Project alternative would also not provide additional recreational and parking facilities to support the student resident population, and would not utilize the land resources in the Northwest zone as efficiently as possible, pursuant to the physical objectives in the 2002 LRDP.

Air quality and construction vehicle impacts resulting from construction under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than under the NHIP, because a single project the size of the NHIP would not be constructed under this alternative. Impacts from construction noise

under the No Project Alternative would be comparable to the NHIP, because construction could affect other sensitive land uses on campus, including laboratories. The No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts on operational traffic impacts, because this alternative would not result in the reduction in commuter student vehicle trips associated with the NHIP.

FINDING: Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* §21081(a)(3) and *CEQA Guidelines* §15091(a)(3) The Regents finds that the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) is inferior to the NHIP Project because it does not eliminate or reduce any of the NHIP Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to below a level of significance, while increasing significant and unavoidable impacts from vehicle traffic during operation. Moreover, this Alternative cannot attain the University's objectives to the same extent as the Project, and would result in a substantial negative impact on the University's ability to further its academic, research and public services missions, as indicated above.

b. Alternative 2 – Alternative Site

This alternative includes a 2,000-bed housing complex provided on Parking Lot 32, with additional dining and student services facilities instead of recreational facilities, as well as 801 spaces of subterranean parking beneath the development. There would be no first-floor renovations of Hedrick, Rieber, and Sproul Halls, and no relocation and consolidation of Facilities Management structures and uses. Also, no demolition of the Housing Administration Building or surface parking lots would occur.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would meet some of the objectives of the proposed project by (1) providing additional on-campus housing to address current and anticipated demand, as specified in the 2001 Student Housing Master Plan; (2) reducing the proportion of students who commute by increasing the proportion of students who reside on campus; (3) planning, designing, and implementing the alternative within the practical constraints of available funding sources; and (4) providing proximate, convenient parking adjacent to student housing. However, Alternative 2 does not use Northwest zone land resources as efficiently as possible, and is not consistent with the intent of the 2002 LRDP, which anticipates utilizing the Lot 32 site for academic uses. Therefore, project development at this

alternative site would not meet several project objectives and would not be consistent with the intent of the 2002 LRDP.

Air quality and construction vehicle impacts resulting from the Alternative Site would be greater than under the NHIP, due to a need for additional excavation and hauling. Impacts to land use compatibility would be significant and unavoidable under the Alternative Site due to the commercial character of the site, whereas this impact is less than significant under the NHIP. Noise impacts during construction would be less than significant under the Alternative Site due to the absence of residential receptors, compared to the significant and unavoidable impact under the NHIP. Transportation vehicle impacts during operation during the summer session could be slightly less under the Alternative Site, due to a reduction in the number of impacted intersections.

FINDING: Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* §21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3) The Board of Regents finds that the Off-Site Alternative (Alternative 2) is inferior to the NHIP Project because, while it reduces the NHIP's significant and unavoidable impact on construction noise to below a level of significance, it increases the severity of significant and unavoidable impacts to construction air quality and construction traffic, and creates a significant and unavoidable impact on land use compatibility. Moreover, this Alternative cannot attain the University's objectives to the same extent as the NHIP Project, and would result in a substantial negative impact on the University's ability to further its academic, research and public services missions, as indicated above.

4. *Environmentally Superior Alternative*

a. 2002 LRDP

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds that in the short term, the No-Project Alternative to the 2002 LRDP is the environmentally superior alternative because it would not result in any of the impacts identified for the Project; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain, and the No-Project Alternative would not achieve the majority of project objectives.

Although the No Project Alternative would result in a short-term reduction in significant impacts compared to the Project, CEQA Guidelines §15126(e)(2) bars the selection of the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. The Board of Regents further finds that of the other alternatives considered,

Alternative 3 reduces the significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact during the twelve-week summer session to a less-than-significant level, but results in an increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable operational traffic and parking impacts during the regular session. Alternative 3 also results in an increase in student housing demand during the regular session compared to the proposed project. However, compared to Alternative 2 overall, Alternative 3 would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

b. NHIP

FINDING: The Board of Regents finds, based upon the Final EIR, that neither the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) nor the Alternative Site (Alternative 2) would be environmentally superior to the NHIP, and neither alternative is consistent with the policies and goals of the 2002 LRDP, nor does either alternative achieve the majority of project objectives.

Although the No Project Alternative would result in a short-term reduction in significant impacts compared to the Project, CEQA Guidelines §15126(e)(2) bars the selection of the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. While the impacts of both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would be greater than the project, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in severity of fewer of the project-identified impacts in comparison to Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 2 could be considered the environmentally superior alternative when compared to Alternative 1. However, although not fully analyzed, the Reduced Project alternative described in Section 6.2.2 of the Final EIR, while not meeting the project objectives to the same degree as Alternative 2, would be considered environmentally superior to either the Project or Alternative 2 due to an incremental reduction in significant and unavoidable impacts. However, while the Reduced Project alternative could result in a marginal reduction of the project's significant environmental effects, these effects would still remain significant and unavoidable.

5. *Alternatives Rejected From Further Consideration*

a. 2002 LRDP

During the scoping process for the 2002 LRDP Draft EIR, other alternatives were also considered, but were found to be infeasible, as described in Section 6.2 of Volume 1 of the Draft EIR.

(i) *Phased Construction Alternative*

Under this alternative, only one project would be constructed at a time to reduce overall construction impacts associated with the 2002 LRDP. However, this alternative is infeasible because projects are constructed as the program needs become clear and the funding becomes available. Under the Phased Construction Alternative, projects would be constructed well after the need is identified, which would not support (even in part) the campus academic objectives that relate to recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty of the highest quality; attracting, developing, educating, and graduating a diverse population of students of the highest quality; developing an academic, administrative, and physical environment that supports outstanding research and creative activity; and creating a physical and social environment that fosters the academic and personal development of students. Therefore, while this alternative might reduce impacts from construction activities, this alternative does not satisfy the project objectives and was rejected as infeasible.

(ii) *Xeriscapic Landscaping Alternative*

This alternative consists of development of the remaining 1.71 million gsf previously allocated under the 1990 LRDP; however, this alternative would employ increased water conservation practices through utilization of landscaping techniques such as limitation of the size of lawn areas and replacement of current landscaping with native grasses and xeric plants on hot, dry south- and west-facing slopes and walls in order to reduce water consumption, which was a significant impact in the 1990 LRDP. Since the campus is known for its aesthetic landscaping, the employment of xeriscapic landscaping would not support the campus objective that relates to respecting and reinforcing the landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character. In

addition, because some of the existing campus trees would be replaced by xeric landscaping, either through removal and replacement or attrition, existing habitat that could support migratory birds and raptors would be reduced. In addition, the use of landscaping (primarily trees) as screening for adjacent uses, such as provided along the northern boundary of the campus along Sunset Boulevard, would also be reduced, which would conflict with the campus objective that strives to provide a landscaped buffer along the western, northern, and eastern edges of the main campus. Therefore, while this alternative might reduce water consumption, it was rejected as infeasible due to impacts associated with visual and biological resources, and does not reduce a significant and unavoidable impact associated with implementation of the 2002 LRDP.

(iii) Full Implementation of the 1990 LRDP by 2005–06

This alternative includes development of the remaining 1.71 million gsf previously allocated under the 1990 LRDP by 2005–06, which is the horizon year for the 1990 LRDP. However, this alternative was rejected as infeasible because the level of project planning and funding necessary to construct and occupy 1.71 million gsf of development at the UCLA campus cannot and will not occur within the next three years. This alternative would also not achieve a reduction in any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. However, Alternative 1 extends the horizon year for the 1990 LRDP to 2010–11 and, therefore, is analyzed as a project alternative in Section 6.3 (Analysis of Alternatives to the Proposed Project).

(iv) No Project/Reduced Enrollment Alternative

Under this alternative, development and population growth would be limited to that which had occurred as of 2001–02, including development that was either under construction or previously approved. However, UCLA would not accommodate any increased enrollment beyond the levels that had already occurred as of academic year 2001–02. Under this alternative, the construction of Seismic Replacement Building 3 analyzed in the AHCFRP Final EIR, as well as Phase II of the Southwest Campus Housing and Parking Project analyzed in the Southwest Campus

Housing and Parking Final EIR, would not occur. The campus regular session population would remain at 54,355 and the average weekday regular session population would remain at 56,668. The summer session population would remain at 27,715 and the average weekday summer session population would remain at 34,127.

While this alternative could result in fewer impacts as compared to the 2002 LRDP due to a reduction in both development and population levels, this alternative is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons. This alternative assumes that UCLA would not accommodate any increased enrollment beyond the levels that had already occurred as of academic year 2001–02. By limiting campus population growth to existing levels, including the student population, the University would not achieve the project objective that seeks to ensure student access in a manner consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program and meeting the suggested enrollment growth target to accommodate an additional 4,000 FTE students at UCLA by 2010–11.

In addition, along with limiting campus population growth to existing levels, several projects that have been analyzed in an environmental document prepared in accordance with CEQA, but not yet approved, would not be constructed. For example, Phase II of the Southwest Housing Project consists of 638 graduate student beds and an accompanying 638 parking spaces. If this phase of development were not to proceed, the goals of the 1990 or 2001 Student Housing Master Plan would not be met with respect to the percentage of students housed in University-owned or private-sector housing (within walking distance to campus). In addition, the Southwest Housing Project was included as a mitigation measure in the 1990 LRDP EIR as one component of the campus Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. Therefore, if Phase II of this project were not constructed, the estimated reduction in vehicle trips to campus by graduate students that could be housed on campus would not occur, and full compliance with the 1990 LRDP EIR mitigation measure would not be achieved.

Therefore, while this alternative might reduce certain environmental impacts, it is rejected as infeasible because of the programmatic and planning limitations described above.

b. Northwest Housing Infill Project

(i) **Extended Construction Period Alternative**

This alternative proposed to construct the project in the form proposed, but to extend construction in order to reduce construction impacts to air quality. However, this alternative is infeasible because projects are constructed as the program needs become clear and the funding becomes available. Under the Extended Construction alternative, the project would be constructed well after the need is identified, which would not support (even in part) the campus institutional objectives that relate to developing an academic, administrative, and physical environment that supports outstanding research and creative activity; and creating a physical and social environment that fosters the academic and personal development of students. Further, although construction-related emissions could be reduced on a daily basis, emissions would still be significant over the long-term, and no substantial benefit would be gained. In addition, traffic and noise impacts associated with construction would be exacerbated by their extension over a longer period, possibly twice as long as the Project, depending upon the emissions associated with specific construction activities. Therefore, this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

(ii) **Reduced Project Alternative**

This alternative consists of development of 1,600 beds, a 20 percent reduction in beds proposed under the NHIP. The reduction in beds would allow a reduction in height of the proposed structures. However, because building height under the Project would not result in significant impacts with respect to aesthetics, no substantial aesthetic benefit would be gained with structures of reduced height under this Alternative. Further, the project would not attain the 2002 LRDP objective of maximizing use of limited land resources and would not meet, to the same degree as the proposed project, the objective of developing on-

campus housing to continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus. The project would also not meet the project objectives of providing additional on-campus housing to address current and anticipated demand, as specified in the SHMP; or using Northwest zone land use resources as efficiently as possible.

In addition to the fact that this alternative would not meet the primary objectives of the proposed project, no substantial environmental benefit would be gained with this alternative. A 20 percent reduction in the project would not substantially reduce or shorten construction activities, and only incremental decreases in construction-related traffic would occur. Also, because the types of construction activities—and the types of construction equipment necessary—would not fundamentally change with respect to the proposed project, no substantial reduction in construction noise could be achieved, other than a very slight reduction in the duration of these activities. The amount of reduction necessary in the size of the project to substantially reduce these construction-related effects would render the project infeasible, and would also increase regular-session operational traffic impacts, which were not significant under the proposed project, as fewer beds would be provided to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled by students. Although the proposed project would result in significant operational traffic impacts during the summer session, a slight reduction in the provision of housing would not substantially reduce the number of conference attendees anticipated with the proposed project, and no substantial reduction in the significance of the operational traffic impact of the project during the twelve-week summer session would occur. Therefore, for all of the above reasons, this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

(iii) Increased Housing Alternative

This alternative would dedicate a higher proportion of the remaining development allocation under the 2002 LRDP to student housing. The provision of an increase in student housing is intended to eliminate or reduce significant related traffic impacts at affected intersections. One of the primary methods of reducing such intersection impacts is the provision of additional on-campus housing. In fact, the 1990 LRDP and the 2002 LRDP include

housing as a component of the campus Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to limit vehicle trips to and from the campus. Significant impacts would occur under the proposed project at four intersections during the summer session; however, housing is currently underutilized by students during the summer. Therefore, the provision of additional housing beyond that proposed under the NHIP would not result in any significant reduction in summer traffic impacts and could exacerbate them, as additional conference attendees (which are assumed under the project traffic analysis) could be drawn during the summer. Instead, it would merely result in an increase in a housing supply that is currently under-utilized, and would not have any effect upon traffic conditions in the vicinity of the campus during the summer.

c. Alternatives Suggested by Comments on the Draft EIR.

In the comments on the Draft EIR, a number of alternatives to the 2002 LRDP, the NHIP, and to various components of each, were suggested by several commenters. With respect to the alternatives that were proposed in the comments, and not further analyzed by the Final EIR, the responses to comments in the Final EIR explain why the proposed alternatives are infeasible. The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the response to comments contained in the Final EIR as its grounds for rejecting further analysis or adoption of these proposed alternatives.

G. Statement of Overriding Considerations

1. *Impacts That Remain Significant*

As discussed above, the Board of Regents has found that the following impacts of the 2002 LRDP remain significant, either in whole or in part, after adoption and implementation of all the mitigation measures provided in the Final EIR:

LRDP:

Number	Impact
LRDP 4.2-2	Peak daily emissions of NO _x resulting from construction.
LRDP 4.2-4	Peak daily emissions of CO, VOC, and NO _x resulting from daily operations during the twelve-week summer session.
LRDP 4.9-2	Groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impacts to on-campus uses resulting from construction.
LRDP 4.9-8	Increase in on-campus ambient noise levels resulting from construction.
LRDP 4.9-9	Increase in off-campus ambient noise levels resulting from construction.
LRDP 4.13-1	Operational impacts resulting from an exceedance of the applicable LOS criteria for vehicle trips during the regular session.
LRDP 4.13-2	Operational impacts resulting from an exceedance of the applicable LOS criteria for vehicle trips during the twelve-week summer session.
LDRP 4.13-3	Traffic impacts resulting from construction vehicle activity.
	Exceedance of the applicable LOS criteria would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on local streets and intersections resulting from project operation during both the regular and summer sessions.
	Construction vehicle activity would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on local streets and intersections for both the regular and summer sessions during project construction.
	Air emissions impacts would make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative significant impacts on regional air quality from daily emissions of criteria pollutants during project construction.

Northwest Housing Infill Project:

Number	Impact
NHIP 4.2-1	Construction activities for the NHIP could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
NHIP 4.9-2	Groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impacts to on-campus uses resulting from construction.
NHIP 4.9-8	Increase in on- campus ambient noise levels resulting from construction.
NHIP 4.9-9	Increase in off-campus ambient noise levels resulting from construction.
NHIP 4.13-2	Operational impacts resulting from an exceedance of the applicable LOS criteria for vehicle trips during the twelve-week summer session.
NHIP 4.13-3	Traffic impacts resulting from construction vehicle activity.

2. *Overriding Considerations*

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Board of Regents has, in determining whether or not to approve the 2002 LRDP, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the 2002 LRDP against its unavoidable environmental risks, and has found that benefits of the 2002 LRDP outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the Board of Regents' review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, including but not limited to the 2002 LRDP. The Board of Regents hereby finds that each of the reasons stated below constitutes a separate and independent basis of justification for the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and each is able to independently support the Statement of Overriding Considerations and override the 2002 LRDP's significant and unavoidable environmental effects. In addition, each reason is independently supported by substantial evidence contained in the administrative record.

- A. The University is charged, under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, with providing the opportunity for undergraduate education to those Californians who graduate in the top 12.5 percent of their high school class. The University is also charged with admitting those students who complete coursework in the lower division transfer curriculum at community colleges and who meet minimum grade point average requirements. The University serves as the state's primary research agency and is the primary public institution in the state offering doctoral

and certain professional degrees. Current projections indicate that the number of students seeking admission to college in California will grow by approximately 30% by the year 2010. This increased demand will require the University to accommodate an additional 63,000± students for the period 1998-99 to 2010-11. Accordingly, the 2002 LRDP will help provide the additional capacity necessary to accommodate expected increases in student demand, to 2010 and beyond.

- B. The 2002 LRDP will advance California's economic, social and cultural development, which depends upon broad access to an educational system that prepares all of the state's inhabitants for responsible citizenship and meaningful careers.
- C. The 2002 LRDP supports the campus in achieving its academic goals, including achieving prominence in scholarship, educational leadership, and technological advancement by providing the very highest quality teaching and research, professional preparation and public service for the vital and diverse population the campus serves.
- D. The 2002 LRDP will allow the campus to recruit and retain a diverse faculty of the highest quality, remain competitive with the very best research universities in the nation in recruiting and enrolling excellent graduate students; create on the UCLA campus an intellectual milieu and shared ethic that fosters excellence and a sense of community; continue the diversification of all aspects of campus life; and facilitate the development and management of interdepartmental and interdisciplinary instruction and research.
- E. The 2002 LRDP will allow for the development of approximately 1.71 million square feet of academic, research, administrative and residential facilities to remedy existing and future space shortages, correct deficiencies and technological obsolescence in existing facilities, accommodate planned program direction in instruction, research and public service functions, and provide capacity for future program requirements.
- F. The 2002 LRDP will provide approximately 550,000 square feet of housing facilities to provide on-campus accommodations for an additional 1,675 undergraduate students, improving the ability of the campus to attain the goals of the Student Housing Master Plan, to recruit and retain students of the highest quality, to enhance the sense of community on campus, and to reduce the number of student commute trips to campus.

- G. The 2002 LRDP will constitute a significant economic benefit to the Los Angeles County area. UCLA has a significant economic impact on the area's economy, since most of the campus' operating and capital budgets are spent in the local area. The total economic impact of UCLA in Los Angeles County is much greater than the sum of the direct expenditures made by UCLA and its affiliated organizations and populations. Each dollar spent locally by UCLA cycles through the area economy, generating additional income and employment.
- H. UCLA provides many direct services for both on-campus and off-campus users, including but not limited to: police protection and rescue services; clinical, emergency and outpatient health and mental health services; library services; parks and recreation services; and other academic and support services. As the 2002 LRDP is implemented, the level of these services will grow.
- I. UCLA provides many indirect community contributions in the form of education, artistic, and cultural enrichment to residents of Los Angeles County through such functions and events as extension courses, lectures, theater productions, art exhibits, sporting events, conferences and workshops. As the 2002 LRDP is implemented and the UCLA campus further matures, the level of these indirect services can be expected to be enhanced.
- J. UCLA provides a stable source of employment for many Los Angeles County residents. This is particularly significant because of the quality and diversity of new jobs which are related to the implementation of the 2002 LRDP.
- K. The increased economic activity resulting from campus growth is also expected to result in secondary growth in non-University business in the Los Angeles County area. Implementation of the 2002 LRDP will also provide construction employment as individual building projects are developed.
- L. When compared to the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative), the 2002 LRDP provides the best available balance between maximizing attainment of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts.

H. Administrative Record

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which The Regents bases their Findings and decisions contained herein. Most documents related to the Final EIR are located in the Capital Programs Office, located in the Capital Programs Building, 1060 Veteran Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90095. Some documents included in the record of proceedings may also be located at other offices at the Los Angeles Campus (including on-campus libraries), at the University's Office of the President, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA 94607, and/or at the offices of consultants retained by the University for this project. The custodian for the record of the proceedings is the Administrative Vice Chancellor, Los Angeles Campus.

I. Summary

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Board of Regents has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant environmental effects of the Project identified in the Final EIR:

a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.

b. Those changes or alterations are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.

c. Specific economic, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR that would otherwise avoid or substantially lessen the identified significant environmental effects of the Project.

2. Based on the foregoing Findings and information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

a. All significant effects on the environment due to approval of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section G, above.

III. APPROVALS

The Board of Regents hereby takes the following actions:

- A. The Board of Regents has certified the Final EIR for the Project in Section I, above.
- B. The Board of Regents hereby adopts and incorporates into the Project all Mitigation Measures and Programs & Procedures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University as discussed in the Findings, Sections II(B) through II(D), above.
- C. The Board of Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 2002 LRDP and NHIP attached hereto and discussed in the Findings, Section II(E), above.
- D. The Board of Regents hereby adopts these Findings in their entirety, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the Project, and adopted the Findings (including the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth therein), the Board of Regents hereby approves the 2002 Long Range Development Plan and the design of the Northwest Campus Undergraduate Student Housing and Dykstra Parking Structure components of the NHIP for the UCLA Campus.