

## **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE GAYLEY TOWERS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

**State Clearinghouse No. 2023060256**

### **I. ADOPTION OF THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15074(b), The Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) prepared for the proposed Gayley Towers Redevelopment Project (the “Project”). In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Guidelines Section 15074, The Regents, as Lead Agency for the Project, find that:

- (1) The MND and supporting Initial Study (IS), together with all comments received during the public review process and responses to these comments, have been considered by The Regents;
- (2) Based on the whole record before The Regents, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment;
- (3) The IS/MND reflects The Regents’ independent judgment and analysis.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Project Findings are based are held by the custodian of these documents, which is UCLA Capital Programs, located at 1060 Veteran Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90095. This information is provided in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15074(c).

In connection with the adoption of the MND and approval of the Project, The Regents also adopt the associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), which details changes that are either required for the Project or made a condition of Project approval to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects.

### **II. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS**

#### **A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

The Project is located off campus at 565 Gayley Avenue in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, immediately south of the Northwest zone of the UCLA main campus. The Project involves the demolition of an existing University-owned six-level, approximately 57,075 gross square foot (gsf) apartment building on the approximately 20,831 square foot (sf) (0.48 gross acre) Project site, and construction of an eight-story, approximately 112,000-gsf co-living style of housing with communal living and study spaces on each floor. Co-living housing is a hybrid of dorm-style housing with community bathrooms and shared spaces for students to cook, eat, study, and socialize. The Project would provide 187 bedrooms and up to 545 beds in triple-occupancy rooms, of which at least 65 percent (358 beds) would be offered as affordable beds. When compared to the existing building, which includes 51 studio/studio loft units housing 100 student residents, the Project would

result in a net increase of 445 beds (residents), and a net increase of approximately 54,925 gsf of development. The Project would include a central courtyard, which would be enclosed on all sides and open to the sky, and other landscape and hardscape elements would be installed. On-site vehicular parking for residents would not be provided. A service drive/garage accessed from Gayley Avenue, which would be located at the northwest corner of the building, would provide a single parking space for service vehicles and deliveries and allow direct access for trash removal. On-site alternative transportation facilities would include a bike storage room on the ground level, bicycle parking along Gayley Avenue, as well as a designated area for scooter parking. Pedestrian access to the proposed building would be provided from the existing sidewalk on the south side of Gayley Avenue. Utility infrastructure would be installed onsite and would connect to existing utility lines in Gayley Avenue to serve the proposed development. Construction of Project would begin in 2024 with estimated completion in 2026.

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

The University prepared a Draft IS/MND (State Clearinghouse No. 2023060256) for the Project in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.), and the University of California Procedures for the Implementation of CEQA. The Draft IS/MND analyzed the Project's potential impacts with regard to the following environmental topics: (1) aesthetics; (2) agriculture and forestry resources; (3) air quality; (4) biological resources; (5) cultural resources; (6) energy; (7) geology and soils; (8) greenhouse gas emissions; (9) hazards and hazardous materials; (10) hydrology and water quality; (11) land use and planning; (12) mineral resources; (13) noise; (14) population and housing; (15) public services; (16) recreation; (17) transportation; (18) tribal cultural resources; (19) utilities and services systems; and (20) wildfire.

Because the Project is located off campus, the Draft IS/MND was not tiered from the UCLA Long Range Development Plan Amendment (2017) and Student Housing Projects Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("LRDP Final SEIR") (State Clearinghouse No. 2017051024), which was certified by The Regents in January 2018. However, pursuant to Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, the LRDP Final SEIR is incorporated by reference. Further, the Project, as analyzed in the Draft IS/MND, incorporates all relevant adopted mitigation measures (MMs) and programs, practices, and procedures (PPs) identified in the previously adopted Long Range Development Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (LRDP MMRP) for purposes of determining the environmental impacts resulting from Project implementation. In addition, three Project-specific MMs are identified in the Draft IS/MND related to geology and soils (MM Gayley GEO-1) to ensure the incorporation of the site-specific geotechnical recommendations into the final Project design, and noise and vibration (MM Gayley NSE-1 and MM Gayley NSE-2) to reduce noise and vibration impacts during construction. Additionally, the Project incorporates project design feature (PDF) Gayley AQ-1, which identifies the use of Tier IV construction equipment to reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions. Based on the Project-specific analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND, it was determined that the Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact for all environmental issues with the incorporation of the identified Project-specific PDF and MMs and all relevant LRDP MMs and PPs; thus, the Project would not result in any potentially significant impacts.

A Notice of Intent to Adopt an MND (NOI) along with the Draft IS/MND were released on June 8, 2023 for a 30-day public review period that concluded on July 10, 2023. The NOI and Draft IS/MND were posted on the Governor's Office of Planning and Research CEQAnet Web Portal for review by State agencies and were distributed directly to 29 public agencies, community organizations, and interested individuals. The NOI and Draft IS/MND were also made available on the UCLA Capital Programs website and at the Charles E. Young Research Library on the UCLA campus. The NOI was also posted at the Project site and in the UCLA Daily Bruin (both print and online editions) on June 8, 2023. No written comments on the Draft IS/MND were received by the University.

A virtual public hearing was held on June 26, 2023, during which the public was given the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Project and the Draft IS/MND. The public hearing was attended by 25 individuals, including UCLA staff and other consultants affiliated with the Project; seven of these attendees provided oral comments at the hearing. The transcript of the public hearing is provided in Attachment A of the Final IS/MND, and responses to comments received at the public hearing are provided in Section 2.0.

It should be noted that subsequent to publication of the Draft Initial Study/MND, supplemental exploration of on-site soils was conducted based on updated Project plans to confirm site conditions and recommendations incorporated into the site-specific Geotechnical Investigation. The supplemental exploration included an 8-inch diameter boring to a depth of 71 feet below the ground surface near the north end of the Project site. Based on the supplemental exploration conducted, the Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Gayley Towers Redevelopment Project was revised and is included as Appendix H of the revised Draft IS/MND, which is included in Attachment B of the Final IS/MND. Corresponding minor revisions to the Draft IS/MND related to the additional boring, depth of groundwater, and soil conditions have also been made and are reflected in Attachment B.

Additionally, in response to comments received during the public hearing, updated conceptual building renderings have been provided in the revised Draft IS/MND to reflect the latest conceptual architectural design concept for the proposed building (refer to revised Figures 9a, 9b and 9c in Attachment B of the Final IS/MND).

Finally, it is noted that on July 13, 2023, subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft IS/MND, the University of California adopted revisions to the University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices. Among other requirements, the revised Policy on Sustainable Practices requires that new buildings on UC property achieve a minimum standard of a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold rating. As identified in Section II.5 of the Draft IS/MND included in Attachment B of the Final IS/MND, the Project has been designed to achieve a minimum LEED Gold rating consistent with the revised Policy on Sustainable Practices, and no changes to the Project are required in order to comply. References within the Draft IS/MND to the requirements of the previous Policy on Sustainable Practices are hereby superseded by the revised policy.

Based on these limited, insubstantial revisions, there would be no new significant effects, and no additional mitigation measures are required or proposed based on the minor revisions; therefore, recirculation of the Draft IS/MND or preparation of an environmental impact report is not required.

## **C. FINDINGS**

The following sections summarize the environmental evaluation provided in the IS/MND for the Project. The impact conclusions are based on incorporation of the LRDP PPs and MMs, and the Project-specific PDF and MMs, as identified. Based on all evidence in the record, The Regents find that the Gayley Towers Redevelopment Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact for all environmental issues with the incorporation of the Project-specific PDF and MMs as well as all relevant LRDP PPs and MMs, as described below. It is noted that the relevant LRDP MMs would be implemented as part of the Project, even for impacts that would be less than significant without such mitigation.

### **1. Less Than Significant Impacts With Project-Specific Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

#### **a. Geology and Soils (Seismic Ground Shaking and Unstable Soils)**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see pages 78 and 81),<sup>1</sup> with implementation of Project-specific MM Gayley GEO-1 (requiring verification of final design and incorporation of recommendations from the site-specific Geotechnical Investigation by a qualified Engineer), and LRDP PP 4.5-1(a), PP 4.5-1(c), and PP 4.5-1(d), the Project would have a less than significant impact related to hazards due to strong seismic ground shaking and unstable geologic units or soils. Therefore, through implementation of the Project-specific MM, there would be less than significant impacts related to ground shaking and unstable soils.

#### **b. Noise (Construction-Related)**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 125), with implementation of Project-specific MM Gayley NSE-1 (requiring mufflers for noisier construction equipment; locating stationary engine-driven or noise-generating construction equipment as far as practical from sensitive receptors; use of electrical power in lieu of internal combustion engines; and a noise barrier where feasible), and incorporation of LRDP PP 4.9-6 (a), PP 4.9-7 (a through c), PP 4.9-8, MM 4.9-2, and MM 4.9-7, the Project would have a less than significant impact related to a substantial adverse change in ambient noise levels during construction. Therefore, through implementation of the Project-specific MM, there would be a less than significant impact related to temporary increases in ambient noise levels during construction.

#### **c. Noise (Construction-Related Vibration)**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 130), with implementation of Project-specific MM Gayley NSE-2 (requiring incorporation of geotechnical recommendations into the final Project design to reduce vibration impacts) and Project-specific MM Gayley GEO-1, as well as incorporation of LRDP PP 4.9-1, PP 4.9-6 (a), PP 4.9-7 (a through c), PP 4.9-8, MM 4.9-2, and MM 4.9-7, the Project would have a less than

---

<sup>1</sup> All Draft IS/MND page references that follow refer to the document provided in Appendix B of the Final IS/MND.

significant impact related to ground borne vibration impacts during construction. Therefore, through implementation of the Project-specific MM, there would be a less than significant impact related to construction-related vibration.

**2. Issues for Which the Project Would Have a Less Than Significant Impact or No Impact**

**a. Aesthetics**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 33) and consistency with the Senate Bill 743 criteria, as well as the incorporation of LRDP PP 4.1-1(a) and MMs 4.1-3 (a through c), the Project would have no impact relative to the following aesthetic issues: substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; degradation of visual character or quality of a public view; creation of a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; and damage of scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

**b. Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 36), there are no farmland or agricultural resources at or near the Project site, and the Project site is not zoned for such resources. The Project also would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on agriculture or forestry resources.

**c. Air Quality**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 37), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.2-2 (a through d) and MM 4.2-2 (a through c) and Project-specific PDF Gayley AQ-1 (use of Tier IV construction equipment), would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and would have a less than significant impact for the following air quality issues: resulting 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; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or resulting in other emissions, including odor, affecting a substantial number of people.

**d. Biological Resources**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 53), the Project would result in no impacts for the following biological resources issues: substantial adverse effect on special status species, riparian habitat, and wetlands; and conflicts with an adopted habitat conservation plan. The Project incorporates LRDP PP 4.3-1 (a through e) and MM 4.3-1 (a through c) and, accordingly, would have less than significant impacts related to migratory species, wildlife corridors, and conflicts with any policies protecting biological resources.

#### **e. Cultural Resources**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 60), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.4-5 and MM 4.4-2 (a through c), would have less than significant impacts related to an adverse change in the significance of historic and archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and disturbance of human remains.

#### **f. Energy**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 69) the Project, which incorporates LRDP MM 4.2-2 (a through c), PP 4.14-2 (a through d), PP 4.14-3, PP 4.14-9, and PP 4.15-1, would result in a less than significant environmental impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The Project would have no impact related to conflict with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

#### **g. Geology and Soils**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 75), the Project would have no impacts relative to the following geology and soils issues: rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, and landslides. The Project, which incorporates LRDP MM 4.7-1, PP 4.5-1 (a, c, and d), PP 4.7-1, and MM 4.4-3 (a and b), would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion of topsoil and unique paleontological resources or geologic features. The Project would have no impact related to expansive soils or soils incapable of supporting a septic tank.

#### **h. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 84), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.15-1, would have a less than significant impact related to the generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The Project would have no impact related to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

#### **i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 97), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.6-1, PP 4.6-4, PP 4.13-6, and PP 4.13-8, would have a less than significant impact related to the following hazards and hazardous materials issues: routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; release of hazardous materials into the environment; handling hazardous materials within a ¼ mile of a school; safety hazards or excessive noise from airport operations; and implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Project would have no impact related to a location on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and exposure to wildland fires.

#### **j. Hydrology and Water Quality**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 105), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.7-1, PP 4.7-5, and MM 4.7-1, would have a less than significant impact for the following hydrology and water quality issues: violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or other degradation of surface or groundwater quality; decrease in groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge; substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in manner that would result in erosion or siltation, result in flooding, exceed the capacity of the drainage system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; and risk of the release of pollutants due to Project inundation. The Project would have no impact related to impeding or redirecting flood flows, and conflicts with or obstruction of the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

#### **k. Land Use and Planning**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 114), which incorporates LRDP PP 4.8-1 (c through e) and PP 4.1-1 (a), the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to conflicts with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Project would result in no impact related to physically dividing an established community.

#### **l. Mineral Resources**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 118), the Project would have no impact on mineral resources.

#### **m. Noise**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 118), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.9-1 and PP 4.9-6 (a), would have a less than significant impact related to the generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and exposure of people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise level from airport uses.

#### **n. Population and Housing**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 132), the Project, which involves redevelopment of the Project site with a new residential building, would have a less than significant impact related to inducing substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. The Project would have no impact related to displacing substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**o. Public Services**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 134), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.11-1, PP 4.11-2 (a and b), and PP 4.12-1 (a and b), would have no physical environmental impacts related to the need for new or altered public facilities and impacts would be less than significant relative to the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities.

**p. Recreation**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 139), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.12-1 (a and b), would have less than significant impacts related to physical impacts resulting from the increased use, construction, or expansion of recreational facilities.

**q. Transportation**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 141), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.13-1 (d), PP 4.13-2, PP 4.13-5, PP 4.13-6, and PP 4.13-8, would have a less than significant impact related to conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system; conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.2(b); increased hazards due to a design feature; and inadequate emergency access.

**r. Tribal Cultural Resources**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 151), the Project, which incorporates LRDP MM 4.4-2 (c), would have a less than significant impact related to the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

**s. Utilities and Service Systems**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft IS/MND (see page 153), the Project, which incorporates LRDP PP 4.14-2 (a through d), PP 4.4-2 (g), PP 4.14-3, PP 4.14-9, PP 4.7-1, PP 4.7-5, PP 4.15-1, and MM 4.7-1 would have a less than significant impact related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; availability of sufficient water supplies; adequate wastewater treatment capacity; solid waste generation in excess of landfill capacity; and compliance with applicable regulations related to solid waste management.

**t. Wildfire**

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft Initial Study (see page 160), the Project site is not located in or near a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, and therefore, the Project would have no impacts related to wildfire.



#### **D. OTHER FINDINGS**

1. These Findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the Draft IS/MND and Final IS/MND prepared for the Gayley Towers Project, and the LRDP MMRP.
2. CEQA Guidelines Section 15074 requires a Lead Agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP that reflects changes to the project which shall be adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. The Gayley Towers Redevelopment Project requires one Project-specific PDF and three Project-specific MMs and incorporates the continued implementation of those PPs and MMs contained in the LRDP MMRP that were determined applicable to the Project, as described above. In this regard, the identified Project-specific PDF Gayley AQ-1, and Project-specific MM Gayley GEO-1, MM Gayley NSE-1, and MM Gayley NSE-2, and applicable LRDP PPs and MMs have been included in the Project-specific MMRP. The MMRP for the proposed Project is included in Section 3.0 of the Final IS/MND.
3. Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which The Regents base its findings and decisions contained herein. Documents related to this Project are located at UCLA Capital Programs, located at 1060 Veteran Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90095.

#### **III. APPROVAL**

Based on the foregoing and having considered all of the information in the record, The Regents intend to take the following actions:

- 1) Adopt the Final IS/MND for the proposed Project as described in Section I, above.
- 2) Adopt the MMRP for the Project.
- 3) Adopt these Findings in their entirety, as set forth herein.
- 4) Having adopted the IS/MND, the MMRP, and the Findings, approve the Project.
- 5) Direct staff to prepare and file a Notice of Determination for the Project.