Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project

Final Supplemental EIR
SCH No. 2023070306

VOLUME 2
List of Commenters
Responses to Comments
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Lead Agency: University of California
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607

Prepared By: T&B Planning, Inc.
3200 El Camino Real, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92602

February 2024

Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

SCH. No. 2023070306

VOLUME 2

List of Commenters
Responses to Comments
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Lead Agency:

University of California
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607

Prepared by:

T&B Planning, Inc.
3200 El Camino Real, Ste. 100
Irvine, California 92602

February 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

Appendices

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REQUIREMENTS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and University of California (UC) Procedures for Implementation of CEQA, the Lead Agency must prepare and certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for projects within its discretionary approval authority. The University of California, Los Angeles (University or UCLA) through delegated decision-making authority from The Board of Regents of the University of California (Regents) is the Lead Agency for the proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (proposed Project).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the Final EIR shall consist of:

(a) The Draft EIR or a revision of the Draft.
(b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
(c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.
(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This document, in its entirety (Volumes 1 and 2), constitutes the Final Supplemental EIR (SEIR) for the proposed Project. This Final SEIR includes:

Volume 1 Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project Draft SEIR and Technical Appendices (November 2023)

Volume 2 List of Commenters, Responses to Comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (February 2024)

1.2 USE OF THE FINAL SEIR

The Final SEIR will serve as the environmental document that informs the University's consideration of the campus' request for approval of the proposed Project. After completing the Final SEIR, and before approving the proposed Project, the Lead Agency must make the following three certifications, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

- The Final SEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- The Final SEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final SEIR prior to approving the project;
- The Final SEIR reflects the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant environmental effects of a project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings (Findings of Fact)

for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding supported by substantial evidence in the record. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Additionally, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b), when the Lead Agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. A Statement of Overriding Considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record. As the proposed Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to historic resources, the University will be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if it approves the proposed Project.

These certifications, the Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are included in a separate Findings document. Both the Final SEIR (Volumes 1 and 2) and the Findings will be submitted to the University for consideration prior to making a decision on whether to approve the proposed Project.

1.3 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT SEIR

The University used various methods to solicit comments on the Draft SEIR as summarized below.

- The Notice of Completion (NOC), Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft SEIR, Draft SEIR, and Draft SEIR technical appendices (including the Initial Study tiered from the Long Range Development Plan [LRDP] EIRs, which are incorporated by reference[1]) were posted on the SCH CEQAnet Web Portal on November 8, 2023.

[1] The UCLA LRDP Amendment (2017) and Student Housing Projects Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (LRDP Final Subsequent EIR) (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2017051024) (UCLA, 2018) was certified by the University of California Board of Regents (The Regents) in January 2018. The LRDP Final Subsequent EIR analyzed the impacts of several student housing projects and was tiered from the UCLA 2008 Northwest Housing Infill Project and Long Range Development Plan Amendment Final Environmental Impact Report (2009 LRDP EIR) (SCH No. 2008051121) (UCLA, 2009), which was certified by The Regents in March 2009 and evaluated construction and operation of the Northwest Housing Infill Project, as well as the remaining buildout of the LRDP as anticipated when the 2009 LRDP EIR was prepared. As the LRDP Final Subsequent EIR incorporates the 2009 LRDP EIR by reference, they collectively serve as the CEQA documentation for construction and operation of development at the UCLA main campus and are referred to herein as the "LRDP EIRs."

- The NOA for the Draft SEIR, along with a weblink to the Draft SEIR and Draft SEIR technical appendices, as well as the LRDP EIRs, was circulated to 31 relevant public agencies, campus and community organizations, and interested parties for a public review and comment period of not less than 45 days. The comment period began on November 8, 2023 and ended on January 3, 2024.
- During the public review period, the Draft SEIR documents were available for review at the following locations:
    - UCLA Capital Programs building located at 1060 Veteran Avenue, Los Angeles, California, during regular business hours.
    - Charles E. Young Research Library located at 280 Charles E. Young Drive North, Los Angeles (at UCLA).
    - Online at: https://www.capitalprograms.ucla.edu/EnvironmentalReview/ProjectsUnderEnvironmentalReview
- During the public review period, a virtual public meeting was held on December 4, 2023 to receive oral comments regarding the Draft SEIR. The virtual public meeting was attended by five members of the public. One student attendee asked about access to Sunset Canyon Recreation Center (Sunset Rec) facilities during construction, and two student attendees indicated their support for the proposed Project. No comments regarding the analysis presented in the Draft SEIR were provided. A transcript of the public meeting is provided in Appendix B of this Final SEIR (Volume 2).
- UCLA received one comment letter from a public agency, in which the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reiterated the need for safe and convenient multimodal travel options, as well as a Caltrans transportation permit for any oversized transport vehicles on State highways; and recommended that electric vehicle chargers be added where possible and that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods. A copy of the comment letter is provided in Appendix A of this Final SEIR (Volume 2).

1.4 LIST OF SEIR COMMENTERS

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the following list identifies the public agency and individuals that commented on the Draft SEIR. Responses to comments received are provided in Section 2 of this Final SEIR (Volume 2).

Comment Letter Received	**Date**
1. Caltrans	December 27, 2023
Public Meeting Commenters	December 4, 2023
2. Liam Jenny	
3. Rohan Abraham	
4. Mikayla Sullivan	

1.5 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The University will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed Project, as required for compliance with California Public Resources Code Sections 21081(a) and 21081.6. The proposed MMRP is included in its entirety in Section 3 of this Final SEIR (Volume 2).

SECTION 2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that the Lead Agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. This section contains all comments received on the Draft SEIR during the public review period, as well as the University's responses to these comments. Where a comment does not raise a significant environmental issue or where it expresses the subjective opinion of the commenter, the comment is noted, but no response is provided. The University will consider all comments when making a decision on the proposed Project.

2.1 RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTER RECEIVED

As previously indicated, UCLA received one comment letter from Caltrans. This section is organized such that each individual comment in the letter from Caltrans is followed immediately by a corresponding University response. The Caltrans comment letter is provided in Appendix A of this Final SEIR.

Comment Letter 1 - California Department of Transportation

Comment 1-1: Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The Proposed Project would consist of the development of a new two-story (plus rooftop deck), student-oriented, multi-purpose building at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center (Sunset Rec) within the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) campus. The new building would replace a series of seven existing buildings set for demolition at Sunset Rec, which is located in an area with hillside topography, undeveloped open space areas, and numerous mature trees within and surrounding the area. In 2014 and 2021, structural evaluations were conducted to provide seismic ratings for the buildings at the Sunset Rec complex. Results identified several structural features with severe distress and loss of structural integrity, and a further study indicated that the buildings do not meet current requirements for energy efficiency, accessibility, or general safety.

Vehicular access to the proposed building would remain the same as under existing conditions from Easton Drive. The existing vehicular turnaround adjacent to the main entrance to Sunset Rec would also remain unchanged. Parking would continue to be provided at the three-story Sunset Rec (SR) parking structure, and the proposed Project does not include the addition or removal of parking spaces. During construction, the SR parking structure would remain available for Sunset Rec users.

Response 1-1: This comment accurately summarizes the proposed Project and does not pertain to the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft SEIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment 1-2: Regarding active transportation, the previous comments from Caltrans are included in Section 3.0 of the SEIR and Section V.17 of the Initial Study. They are still relevant and address the concerns regarding active transportation. Implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies can promote safe and convenient multimodal travel options for students, faculty, and visitors. Existing bicycle facilities at Sunset Rec should be preserved; at least one pedestrian path should be maintained through the construction phase; and pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicles should be reduced. Furthermore, it is critical to include ADA elements in all new pedestrian facilities, such as curb ramps, and use high visibility elements for both bike and pedestrian facilities. High visibility elements may include usage of green paint for bicycle markings on the street, installing light posts, or incorporating continental striping.

Response 1-2: This comment acknowledges that Caltrans' previous comments addressing active transportation (provided in response to the Notice of Preparation of the Draft SEIR), were addressed in the Draft SEIR and Initial Study and remain relevant. As discussed in the Transportation section of the Initial Study included in Appendix A of the Draft SEIR, UCLA's TDM program is a comprehensive program that offers a broad range of services to encourage and assist UCLA commuters in utilizing alternatives to the single-occupancy vehicle. UCLA students, faculty and staff using Sunset Rec would have access to a full range of existing campus TDM programs required by LRDP programs, practices, and procedures (PP) 4.13-1(d), including, but not limited to: campus transit; accommodations for the use of other modes of transportation, including walking, bicycles, motorcycles, and scooters; on-campus car share program; zip cars; public transit incentives; and use of UCLA's Commuter's Guide. Continued implementation of the campus TDM program would reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles as suggested by Caltrans.

With respect to bicycle facilities, as identified in Draft SEIR Section 3.5.2, Circulation and Parking, Sunset Rec currently provides shower facilities, bike racks, and a repair stand with a bike pump. Some of these existing facilities are located within the construction area of the proposed Project and therefore would be replaced in kind as part of the proposed Project.

With respect to access during construction, as identified in the Initial Study and/or Draft SEIR Section 3.5.6, Construction Activities, there are existing sidewalks located along each side of Easton Drive, including the roundabout at its terminus, and along the west side of De Neve Drive near the Project site. To avoid conflicts or potential hazards to pedestrians during construction, the section of sidewalk along Easton Drive's roundabout adjacent to the Project site would be closed during portions of the construction period. However, full pedestrian access from the SR Parking Structure to the Sunset Rec entry kiosk would be maintained. Safe pedestrian movement within and around the Project site and access to Sunset Rec uses that would remain operational during construction would likewise be maintained as efficiently as possible. The existing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramp located behind the existing buildings onsite would be closed during Project construction, and UCLA Rec would provide shuttle service

between the lower and upper levels/facilities, as needed. To maintain access between the upper and lower pools, a protected pedestrian path would be provided; this path would also serve students needing access between the lower pool and the nearby Hedrick Summit residence hall. Activities located on the upper lawn would continue to be accessed from De Neve Drive, adjacent to the amphitheater. The proposed Project also incorporates LRDP PP 4.13-6, which requires appropriate signage of alternate pedestrian routes around the Project construction area. The proposed Project would not interfere with or require closure of existing on-road bicycle facilities. As such, there would be less than significant impacts related to pedestrian and bicyclist hazards along roadways during construction.

With respect to circulation and access during operation, UCLA's on-campus circulation system is organized to facilitate on campus travel, separating vehicles from pedestrians and bicyclists as much as possible. There are no roadways within Sunset Rec and vehicular access to the proposed building would be the same as under existing conditions (from Easton Drive). Sunset Rec was originally constructed in 1966 and does not fully meet current ADA requirements. Therefore, as identified in Draft SEIR Section 3.4, Project Objectives, one of the Project objectives is to "[s]upport inclusive programming and address existing accessibility deficiencies by providing a recreational facility that meets current ADA requirements and improves overall site accessibility, including connectivity between buildings/uses." Primary ADA access between the two pool levels at Sunset Rec would be provided via the new building elevator, and the existing wheelchair ramp behind the proposed building would remain in place as well. Exterior lighting would be provided for pedestrian safety and site security.

Therefore, the proposed Project would promote safe and efficient active transportation and ADA access consistent with this comment.

Comment 1-3: As the SEIR does not state any additions to parking spaces provided, the proposed Project would likely not result in a significant increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). However, the project does retain an auto-oriented use. Wherever possible, adding electrical car charging spaces would encourage the usage of plug-in hybrid vehicles (PHEVs) or fully electric vehicles (BEVs), which can help to reduce tailpipe emissions, minimize reliance on fuel, and direct resources towards alternative forms of transportation. Caltrans' targets of tripling trips made by bicycle, doubling trips made by walking and public transit, and a 15% reduction in statewide VMT can be achieved through collaborative improvements to the state-wide transportation network.

Response 1-3: As discussed in the Transportation section of the Initial Study, the proposed Project would not change the nature of recreational programming at Sunset Rec, would not affect the campus population, and would not result in additional daily traffic generation during operation. Further, as described in Draft SEIR Section 3.5.2, Circulation and Parking, parking for Sunset Rec with implementation of the proposed Project would continue to be provided at the SR parking structure, and no new parking or change to the existing parking configuration is required or

proposed. Therefore, there would be no increase in VMT as a result of the proposed Project. With respect to the addition of electric car charging spaces, as identified in the Draft SEIR, while electric vehicle (EV) chargers are not currently available at the SR parking structure, both Level 1 and Level 2 EV chargers are available at the nearby Sunset Village parking structure, which is an approximately 6.5-minute walk from Sunset Rec. UCLA continues to expand its EV charging infrastructure throughout the campus in accordance with goals identified in the UCLA EV Readiness Plan, and EV charging may be available at Sunset Rec in the future, but is not required for the proposed Project.

Comment 1-4: Additionally, any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will need a Caltrans transportation permit. Caltrans recommends large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

Response 1-4: This comment addresses use of State highways during construction. Draft SEIR Section 3.7, Anticipated Discretionary Approvals, acknowledges that UCLA, or its designee, would be required to obtain a transportation permit(s), as needed, if any oversized transport vehicle would require travel on a State highway. Further, LRDP PP 4.13-2, which is incorporated into the proposed Project, requires UCLA Capital Programs to adjust construction schedules, work hours, or access routes to the extent feasible to reduce construction-related traffic congestion.

2.2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS MADE AT THE DECEMBER 4, 2023 PUBLIC MEETING

This section includes the responses to comments provided verbally or in writing at the Draft SEIR virtual public meeting on December 4, 2023. The transcript of the public meeting, which includes the University's presentation of Project information, an overview of the CEQA process and the results of the environmental analysis presented in the Draft SEIR, and the public comments, is provided in Appendix B of this Final SEIR (Volume 2). The comments/questions received at the public meeting did not question the general content, analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft SEIR; rather the individuals in attendance had comments/questions regarding the Project itself, as identified below.

Commenter 2 – Liam Jenny

Comment 2-1 Hi there. Thank you for hosting this. I was just curious: as a student, how will this impact my access to the rec center during the years of construction?

[Chat comment: Thank you!]

Response 2-1: During construction, only a portion of Sunset Rec would be fenced off to prevent access to the replacement building construction site. This would be similar to existing conditions where access to existing buildings that have been red-tagged is currently restricted by fencing. However, the fenceline would be expanded to include the construction site.

Please also refer to Response 1-2.

Commenter 3 – Rohan Abraham

Comment 3-1: Hi, I'm a student here at UCLA and I personally haven't been here in the time when any of these buildings were actually open, but I've been walked past them many times going to the pool and they really did seem like they were falling apart, and I always figured they were slated for demolition. So, I think it's really good that UCLA is working to build a better, more usable recreation facility for future students.

[Chat comment: Thank you!]

Response 3-1: This comment indicates support for the proposed Project and does not pertain to the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft SEIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Commenter 4 – Mikayla Sullivan

Chat Comment 4-1: Thank you! Very excited to see the project underway.

Response 4-1: This comment indicates support for the proposed Project and does not pertain to the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft SEIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

SECTION 3.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires a Lead Agency to adopt a "reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a) requires a public agency to adopt a program for monitoring or reporting mitigation measures and project revisions that it has required to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects.

The Draft SEIR for the proposed Sunset Recreation Replacement Building Project (SCH No. 2023070306) analyzes the impacts of the proposed Project and incorporates all relevant mitigation measures (MMs) and programs, practices, and procedures PPs carried forward from the LRDP MMRP. This Project-specific MMRP identifies the LRDP MMs and PPs incorporated into the proposed Project, Project-specific MMs related to historic resources and geology and soils, and obligates the University to implement the identified PPs and MMs. The MMRP will be reviewed by the University as part of its consideration of Project approval, and the MMRP will be formally adopted in conjunction with adoption of the Final SEIR.

3.1.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this MMRP is to ensure compliance with all PPs and MMs to avoid or reduce adverse environmental impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed Sunset Recreation Replacement Building Project, which were identified in the Draft SEIR and the supporting tiered Initial Study. Implementation of the applicable PPs and MMs shall be performed by the University, consulting architects, contractors, and appropriate agencies during the following:

- Development of Project design
- Preparation of construction contracts
- Construction phase
- Project operation

3.1.2 MONITORING PROCEDURES

The project manager from the University's Capital Programs, Design and Construction Division, shall be responsible for ensuring that all design and construction contracts contain the relevant MMs and PPs adopted in the Final SEIR and that these are implemented during the design, construction and operational phases of the Project, as specified herein.

In general, monitoring will consist of demonstrating that MMs and PPs were implemented and that the responsible parties monitored or documented the implementation of the measures. Monitoring will consist of determining whether the following occurred:

- Specific issues were considered in the design development phase
- Construction contracts included the specified provisions

- Certain actions occurred prior to or during construction
- The required measures were acknowledged and implemented during construction of the Project
- Certain actions occurred prior to or during operation

3.1.3 REPORTING PROCEDURES

Monitoring of LRDP PPs and MMs included as part of the proposed Project as well as the Project-specific PDF and MMs will be reported in conjunction with the LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Status Report prepared annually by UCLA Capital Programs. This annual report will identify the Project's PPs and MMs and describe their implementation status for each phase of project development, including design, construction (including landscaping) and operation.

3.2 LIST OF CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1 lists the MMs and PPs from the LRDP Final SEIR relevant to and included as part of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project, as well as the Project-specific MMs identified in the Final SEIR. Note that there are four Project-specific MMs, which are presented in **bold** text. Table 1 also identifies the timing of each measure by indicating the phase of Project development during which implementation would occur.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT
APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
Aesthetics		
PP 4.1-1(a)	Design	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.
PP 4.1-2(b)	Design	The architectural and landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character shall be respected and reinforced.
PP 4.1-2(c)	Design and Construction	Projects proposed under the 2002 LRDP as amended shall include landscaping.
MM 4.1-3(a)	Design	Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured non reflective exterior surfaces and non-reflective glass.
MM 4.1-3(b)	Design	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.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
MM 4.1-3(c)	Design	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.
Air Quality		
PP 4.2-2(a)	Construction	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 may be quantified in the CalEEMod program: • Minimize land disturbance to the extent feasible. • 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). • Apply water three times daily to all active disturbed areas. • 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.
PP 4.2-2(b)	Pre-construction and Construction	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.
PP 4.2-2(c)	Pre-construction and Construction	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.
PP 4.2-2(d)	Construction	The campus shall purchase and apply ultra-low VOC architectural coatings with reactivity-adjusted VOC content that meets or exceeds the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 1113, thereby ensuring the limitation of VOCs during construction.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
MM 4.2-2(a)	Pre-construction and Construction	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.
MM 4.2-2(b)	Pre-construction and Construction	The campus shall encourage contractors to utilize alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and low-NOx fuel) to the extent that the equipment is reasonably commercially available and cost effective
MM 4.2-2(c)	Pre-construction and Construction	The campus shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment used on site and for on-road export of soil meet USEPA Tier III certification requirements, as feasible.
Biological Resources		
PP 4.3-1(a)	Construction	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.
PP 4.3-1(b)	Pre-construction	Trees shall be examined by an arborist and trimmed, if appropriate, prior to the start of construction.
PP 4.3-1(c)	Pre-construction and Construction	Construction contract specifications shall include the provision for temporary irrigation/watering and feeding of these trees during construction, as recommended by the designated arborist.
PP 4.3-1(d)	Pre-construction and Construction	Construction contract specifications shall require that no building material, parked equipment, or vehicles shall be stored within the fence line of any tree.
PP 4.3-1(e)	Construction	Examination of these trees by an arborist shall be performed monthly during construction to ensure that they are being adequately maintained.
MM 4.3-1(a)	Pre-construction	Prior to the onset of construction activities that occur between March and mid-August (February 1 through June 30 for raptors), surveys for nesting special status avian species and raptors shall be conducted on the affected portion of the campus following USFWS and/or CDFW guidelines. If no active avian nests are identified on or within 250 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary.
MM 4.3-1(b)	Pre-construction and Construction	If active nests for avian species of concern or raptor nests are found within the construction footprint or within a 250-foot buffer zone around the construction site, 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 CDFW.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
MM 4.3-1(c)	Design	In conjunction with CEQA documentation required for each project under the 2002 LRDP, as amended, that would result in the removal of one or more mature trees, the project will include a tree replacement plan with a 1:1 tree replacement ratio at the development site where feasible and/or elsewhere within the project boundaries where feasible. If it is not feasible to plant replacement trees at a 1:1 ratio within the campus boundaries, the tree replacement plan will include the planting of native shrubs in ecologically appropriate areas within the campus boundaries that would provide nesting, foraging or roosting habitat for birds so that the replacement number of trees and shrubs will result in a 1:1 replacement ratio.
MM 4.3-4	Design and Construction	UCLA shall replace protected trees removed for construction of projects under the 2002 LRDP, as amended, with protected trees of the same species at a 2:1 ratio as presented in the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (Ordinance Number 177404). Protected trees are defined as coast live oak, valley oak, western sycamore, Southern California black walnut, and California bay laurel.
Cultural Resources		
PP 4.4-1(a)	CEQA Documentation and Design	Structures outside the campus Historic Core that appear to have historic significance, or are over 45 years old, that may be directly or indirectly impacted by a proposed development project shall be reviewed by the campus and a qualified architectural historian or historic architect for eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. If a structure is identified as eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and it is determined that the project could have a significant adverse impact on the structure, the campus and a qualified historic architect shall consider design modifications, mitigation measures and/or alternatives that could minimize, avoid or substantially reduce the impacts, and consider whether and to what extent the project could comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).
PP 4.4-5	Construction	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 Public Resources Code Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary.
MM 4.4-2(a)	Pre-construction	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.
MM 4.4-2(b)	Construction	Should archaeological resources be found during ground disturbing activities for any project, a qualified Archaeologist shall first determine whether an archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to Section 21083.2(g) of the Public Resources Code or a "historical resource" pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
		Guidelines. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a "unique archaeological resource" or a "historical resource," the Archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the campus that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 and 15064.5. If the Archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a "unique archaeological resource" or "historical resource," s/he may record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System at the 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 at the South-Central Coastal Information Center.
MM 4.4-2(c)	Pre-construction	Prior to initiation of construction activities for projects that require disturbance of native sediments/soils (as identified through site-specific geotechnical analyses), the campus shall retain a qualified non-University Archaeologist to observe grading activities and recover, catalogue, analyze, and report archaeological resources as necessary. The qualified Archaeologist shall submit to the Capital Programs University Representative, a written plan with procedures for archaeological resource monitoring. This plan shall include procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the resources as appropriate. This plan shall also identify procedures for notification of the appropriate Native American Tribe if potential Native American artifacts are encountered. The Native American Monitor shall assist in the analysis of any Native American artifacts for identification as everyday life and/or religious or sacred items, cultural affiliation, temporal placement and function, as much as possible. The significance of Native American resources shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and shall consider the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the affected tribes. All items found in association with Native American human remains shall be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling.
MM Sunset HIST-1	**Pre-construction**	**Prior to the start of demolition, the UCLA Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic Resource Technical Report, prepared by Page & Turnbull (October 2023) and included in Appendix B of the Draft SEIR, shall be submitted to UCLA Library Special Collections to accompany prior photo-documentation of Sunset Rec. Following coordination with UCLA Library Special Collections, the report shall be submitted in their preferred format (e.g., printed on archival paper, in digital format, etc.). The drawing sets associated with the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center in the possession of UCLA Capital Programs from circa 1963 through 2023 shall also be organized by project and date and submitted digitally to UCLA Library Special Collections in an archival format.**

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
MM Sunset HIST-2	**Pre-construction**	**Prior to the start of demolition, the Project sponsor shall create a salvage plan identifying elements and materials that can be saved and re-used. Salvaged elements shall be reused at the Project site, incorporated into an interpretive display, donated to a local historical society or other owners of Smith and Williams works, and/or be given to an architectural salvage company. The plan shall be developed with the assistance of a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the pendant globe light fixtures, including any intact fixtures previously removed and preserved at the site, shall be salvaged and considered for re-use in the Project or offered to interested parties.**
MM Sunset HIST-3	**Design through construction**	**To commemorate the eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District as a work of Smith and Williams, a publicly accessible interpretive program shall be developed. The public in this case shall be the users of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. The interpretive program shall include descriptions of the architectural design, site planning, and integration of exterior and interior elements, as well as the architects, Smith and Williams.** **Creative solutions regarding the medium and format of the interpretive program are encouraged, but all interpretive materials shall be displayed in a manner that is accessible to the public and appropriate within the context of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. Examples include an exhibit at the UCLA Library Special Collections, a video documentary, an online website, or an on-site display at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. Interpretive media shall include both text and graphics, which may include historic photographs, maps, architectural drawings, or other imagery. The text shall be sufficient to convey the significance of the core recreational buildings as the work of Smith and Williams.** **The interpretative program shall be developed with the assistance of a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. The interpretive program shall be completed and available to the public prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.**
Geology and Soils		
PP 4.5-1(a)	Design	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 in accordance with the requirements of the applicable California Building Code in effect at the time of construction. Recommendations from the site-specific geotechnical study shall be included in the grading plans and/or building design specifications for each project. The study shall follow applicable recommendations of CGS 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,

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
		expansive and compressible soils, land sliding, or other earth movements or soil constraints; • Evaluation of depth to groundwater
PP 4.5-1(b)	Design	The campus shall continue to implement its current seismic upgrade program.
PP 4.5-1(c)	Design and Operation	The campus shall continue to comply with the University Policy on Seismic Safety effective May 19, 2017 or with any subsequent revision to the policy that provides an equivalent or higher level of protection with respect to seismic hazards.[2]
PP 4.5-1(d)	Design	Development projects under the LRDP Amendment shall continue to be subject to structural peer review; following this review, any site specific geotechnical study recommendations, including any recommendations added as a result of the peer review, shall be incorporated in the project design as appropriate.
MM Sunset GEO-1	**Design**	**Prior to building permit issuance for the Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project, a qualified Engineer shall review the final designs and contract specifications to verify that all geotechnical recommendations provided in the site-specific geotechnical investigation(s) for the Project site have been fully and appropriately incorporated. Such recommendations shall comply with applicable provisions and standards set forth in or established by CGS Special Publication 117, the current Uniform Building Code, relevant state and code requirements, and current standards of practice designed to minimize potential geologic, geotechnical, and related impacts. The recommendations for the Project site shall include, but not be limited to, the following geotechnical engineering topics:** • **General Requirements** • **Soil and Excavation Characteristics** • **Minimum Resistivity, pH, and Water-Soluble Sulfate Content** • **Grading** • **Foundation Setback** • **Conventional Foundation Design** • **Foundation Settlement** • **Lateral Design** • **Miscellaneous Foundations** • **Concrete Slabs-on-Grade** • **Preliminary Pavement Recommendations** • **Permeable Pavers** • **Retaining Wall Design** • **Dynamic (Seismic) Lateral Forces** • **Retaining Wall Drainage** • **Elevator Pit Design**

[2] As the UC Seismic Safety Policy was updated on March 19, 2021, the proposed Project would be subject to this revision.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
		• **Elevator Piston** • **Temporary Excavations** • **Shoring (Soldier Pile Design and Installation)** • **Temporary Tie-Back Anchors** • **Anchor Installation** • **Anchor Testing** • **Internal Bracing** • **Surcharge from Adjacent Structures and Improvements** • **Stormwater Infiltration** • **Surface Drainage** • **Plan Review**
MM 4.4-3(a)	Pre-construction	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.
MM 4.4-3(b)	Construction	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) or a “historical resource” under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. If the paleontological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource” or a “historical resource”, the Paleontologist shall formulate a Mitigation Plan in consultation with the campus that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 of the CEQA Statutes. If the Paleontologist determines that the paleontological resource is not a unique resource, s/he 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.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
		Greenhouse Gas Emissions
PP 4.15-1	Design and Operation	The campus shall continue to implement provisions of the UC Policy on Sustainability Practices including, but not limited to: Green Building Design; Clean Energy Standards; Climate Protection Practices; Sustainable Transportation Practices; Sustainable Operations; Recycling and Waste Management; Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Practices; and provisions of the applicable UCLA Climate Action Plan.
		Hazards and Hazardous Materials
PP 4.6-1	Construction and Operation	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, 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, 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.
PP 4.6-4	Construction	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.
		Hydrology and Water Quality
PP 4.7-1	Construction and Operation	Construction and operation of projects on campus shall comply with requirements and water quality standards set forth within current NPDES Permit regulations (Phase I and Phase II) at the time of project approval. Pursuant to Phase I permit requirements, UCLA shall develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) for reducing or eliminating construction-related and post-construction pollutants in site runoff, including but not limited to the BMPs listed in MM 4.7-1.
PP 4.7-5	Design	Site-specific hydrologic evaluation shall be conducted for each proposed development project based on the project-specific grading plan and site design of each individual project. This evaluation shall include, but not be limited to: (1) an assessment of runoff quality, volume and flow rate from the proposed Project site; (2) identification of project specific BMPs (structural and non-structural) to reduce the runoff rate and volume to appropriate levels, including but not limited to the BMPs listed in MM 4.7-1; and (3) identification of the need for new or upgraded storm drain infrastructure (on and off campus) to serve the project.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
		Project design shall include measures to upgrade and expand campus storm drain capacity where necessary, as identified through the project specific hydrologic evaluation. Design of future projects shall include measures to reduce runoff, including, but not limited to, the provision of permeable landscaped areas adjacent to structures to absorb runoff and the use of pervious or semi-pervious paving materials.
MM 4.7-1	Design, Pre-construction and Construction	Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented for individual development projects, to the extent required by State law, to ensure compliance is maintained with all applicable NPDES requirements at the time of project construction. UCLA shall utilize BMPs as appropriate and feasible to comply with and/or exceed the current requirements under the NPDES program. BMPs that may be implemented include, but are not limited to, the following: Non-Structural/Structural • Landscape Maintenance • Catch Basin Stenciling and Clean-out • Efficient Irrigation Practices • Litter Control • Fertilizer Management • Public Education • Efficient Irrigation • Permanent Vegetative Controls • Runoff – Minimizing Landscape Design Treatment Control BMPs (to minimize storm water pollutants of concern for Ballona Creek – Sediment, Bacteria/Viruses, Toxicity, Trash, and Metals): • Vegetated Swale(s) – An open, shallow channel with vegetation covering side slopes and the bottom. • Bioretention – A basin that functions as a soil and plant-based filtration device that removes pollutants through a variety of physical, biological, and chemical treatment processes. • Turf Block – A grass area that has a structural component which allows it to be used in drive aisles and parking lots. • Drain Inserts – A manufactured filter placed in a drop inlet to remove sediment and debris.
Land Use and Planning		
PP 4.8-1(c)	Design	Infill development of the campus shall be continued, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and energy consumption.
PP 4.8-1(d)	Design	New building projects shall be sited to ensure compatibility with existing uses and the height and massing of adjacent facilities.
PP 4.8-1(e)	Design	Facilities shall be sited and designed to enhance spatial development of the campus while maximizing use of limited land resources.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
Noise		
PP 4.9-6(a)	Design	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.
PP 4.9-7(a)	Construction	To the extent feasible, construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM 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.
PP 4.9-7(b)	Construction	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.
PP 4.9-7(c)	Construction	The campus shall continue to require that stationary construction equipment material and vehicle staging be placed to direct noise away from sensitive receptors.
PP 4.9-7(d)	Pre-construction and Construction	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.
PP 4.9-8	Construction	The campus shall continue to conduct meetings, as needed, with off-campus constituents that are affected by campus construction to provide advance 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.
MM 4.9-2	Pre-construction and Construction	The campus shall require by contract specifications that, to the extent feasible, large bulldozers, large heavy trucks, and other similar equipment not be used within 43 feet of occupied residence halls, within 34 feet of non-residential/non-sensitive buildings, and within 135 feet of buildings that house sensitive instrumentation or similar vibration-sensitive equipment or activities. The work shall be done with medium-sized equipment or smaller within these prescribed distances to the extent practicable.
MM 4.9-7	Pre-construction	A solid noise barrier that would break the line of sight between the construction site and a sensitive use area would reduce construction noise by at least 5 dBA. Therefore, when detailed construction plans are complete, the campus shall review the locations of sensitive receptor areas in relation to the construction site. If it is determined that a 12-foot-high barrier would break the line of sight between an 11-foot-high noise source and adjacent sensitive use areas, a temporary barrier shall be erected to the extent practicable. The barrier shall be solid from the ground to the top with no openings, and shall have a weight of at least 3 pounds per square foot, such as plywood that is ½-inch thick.
Public Services		
PP 4.11-1	Design	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.
PP 4.11-2(a)	Design and Operation	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.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
Recreation		
PP 4.12-1(a)	Design and Operation	The campus shall continue to provide, operate, and maintain recreational facilities for students, faculty, and staff on campus.
PP 4.12-1(b)	Design and Operation	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.
Transportation		
PP 4.13-1(a)	Operation	The campus shall continue to maintain the 1990 LRDP vehicle trip cap of 139,500 average daily trips.
PP 4.13-1(b)	Operation	The campus shall continue to maintain the 1990 LRDP parking cap of 25,169 spaces.
PP 4.13-1(d)	Operation	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.
PP 4.13-2	Pre-construction and Construction	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 reduce construction-related traffic congestion.
PP 4.13-5	Construction	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.
PP 4.13-6	Construction	For any construction-related closure of pedestrian routes, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative route and provide curb cuts and street crossings to assure alternate routes are accessible.
PP 4.13-8	Pre-construction and Construction	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.
MM 4.13-11	Pre-construction and Construction	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 and from the remote parking location.
Utilities and Services Systems		
PP 4.14-2(a)	Design	New facilities and renovations (except for patient care facilities in the Medical Center) shall be equipped with low-flow showers, toilets, and urinals
PP 4.14-2(b)	Operation	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.
PP 4.14-2(c)	Operation	The campus shall promptly detect and repair leaks in water and irrigation pipes.
PP 4.14-2(d)	Operation	The campus shall minimize the use of water to clean sidewalks, walkways, driveways and parking areas.

TABLE 1

SUNSET CANYON RECREATION BUILDING REPLACEMENT PROJECT APPLICABLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND CAMPUS PROGRAMS, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

MM and PP Number	Mitigation Timing	Project- and LRDP-level Mitigation Measure(s) (MMs) and LRDP Campus Programs, Practices, and Procedures (PPs)
PP 4.14-2(g)	Operation	The campus shall educate the campus community on the important of water conservation measures.
PP 4.14-3	Operation	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.
PP 4.14-5	Design	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.
PP 4.14-9	Design and Operation	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.

APPENDIX A

COMMENT LETTER FROM CALTRANS

COMMENT LETTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 269-1124
FAX (213) 897-1337
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life

December 26, 2023

Ashley Rogers, Assistant Director, Environmental Planning
University of California, Los Angeles
UCLA Capital Programs
1060 Veteran Avenue Box 951365
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1365

RE: Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building – Supplemental EIR (SEIR)
SCH #2023070306
GTS #07-LA-2023-04363
Vic. LA-405/PM 32.59

Dear Ashley Rogers,

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The Proposed Project would consist of the development of a new two-story (plus rooftop deck), student-oriented, multi-purpose building at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center (Sunset Rec) within the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) campus. The new building would replace a series of seven existing buildings set for demolition at Sunset Rec, which is located in an area with hillside topography, undeveloped open space areas, and numerous mature trees within and surrounding the area. In 2014 and 2021, structural evaluations were conducted to provide seismic ratings for the buildings at the Sunset Rec complex. Results identified several structural features with severe distress and loss of structural integrity, and a further study indicated that the buildings do not meet current requirements for energy efficiency, accessibility, or general safety.

Vehicular access to the proposed building would remain the same as under existing conditions from Easton Drive. The existing vehicular turnaround adjacent to the main entrance to Sunset Rec would also remain unchanged. Parking would continue to be provided at the three-story Sunset Rec (SR) parking structure, and the Proposed Project does not include the addition or removal of parking spaces. During construction, the SR parking structure would remain available for Sunset Rec users.

1-1

After reviewing the SEIR, Caltrans has the following comments:

Regarding active transportation, the previous comments from Caltrans are included in Section 3.0 of the SEIR and Section V.17 of the Initial Study. They are still relevant and address the concerns regarding active transportation. Implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies can promote safe and convenient multimodal travel options for students, faculty, and visitors. Existing bicycle facilities at Sunset Rec should be preserved; at least one pedestrian path should be maintained through the construction phase; and pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicles should be reduced. Furthermore, it is critical to include ADA elements in all new pedestrian facilities, such as curb ramps, and use high visibility elements for both bike and pedestrian facilities. High visibility elements may include usage of green paint for bicycle markings on the street, installing light posts, or incorporating continental striping. 1-2

As the SEIR does not state any additions to parking spaces provided, the Proposed Project would likely not result in a significant increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). However, the project does retain an auto-oriented use. Wherever possible, adding electrical car charging spaces would encourage the usage of plug-in hybrid vehicles (PHEVs) or fully electric vehicles (BEVs), which can help to reduce tailpipe emissions, minimize reliance on fuel, and direct resources towards alternative forms of transportation. Caltrans' targets of tripling trips made by bicycle, doubling trips made by walking and public transit, and a 15% reduction in statewide VMT can be achieved through collaborative improvements to the state-wide transportation network. 1-3

Additionally, any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will need a Caltrans transportation permit. Caltrans recommends large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods. 1-4

If you have any questions, please contact project coordinator Anthony Higgins, at anthony.higgins@dot.ca.gov and refer to GTS #07-LA-2023-04363.

Sincerely,

Karen Herrera for

Frances Duong
Acting LDR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: State Clearinghouse

APPENDIX B

DECEMBER 4, 2023 PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT

_____:

IN RE: :

:

SUNSET CANYON

RECREATION REPLACEMENT :

BUILDING PROJECT

:

:

:

_____:

DRAFT SEIR PUBLIC MEETING

12.4.2023

ASHLEY ROGERS

Assistant Director of Environmental Planning, UCLA Capital Programs

ERINN MCMAHAN

Executive Director of UCLA Recreation

CHRIS BALLENTINE

Principal project manager, Capital Programs Design & Construction Group

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION
SAMANDA J. RIOS, COURT REPORTER

TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S DISCLAIMER:

Speaker identifications contained herein have been done to the best of my ability. Misidentification of speakers may occur due to things beyond my control, e.g., similar voice tones, poor audio quality, overspeaking, overlapping room noises, etc. Likewise, use of quotation marks is to help with clarity of context, but may not necessarily reflect a direct quote.

ASHLEY ROGERS: All right. We're going to go ahead and get started. All right. Can everyone see my presentation? Yes? Thumbs up. Okay. Great.

Hello and welcome to this public meeting for UCLA's Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building project.

My name is Ashley Rogers, and I'm the Assistant Director of Environmental Planning with UCLA Capital Programs. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive public comments on the project and the environmental analysis prepared for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA.

I'm going to start with a few brief introductions, and then we'll have a presentation regarding the project, the CEQA analysis and next steps followed by time for members of the public to provide comments.

If you'd like to speak tonight, please indicate that in the chat or use the raised hand function and we'll call on you after the presentation. Written comments may also be submitted in the chat.

Please note that in general we will not respond to comments this evening. All comments will be addressed in the final EIR that will be prepared after the current draft EIR public review period ends on January 3rd. This meeting is being recorded, including all comments in the chat.

We have a number of UCLA and University of California representatives here tonight. I'd first like to introduce Erinn McMahan, Executive Director of UCLA Recreation, representing the project sponsor. You want to say -- give a little hello.

ERINN MCMAHAN: Hello. Thanks.

ASHLEY ROGERS: And Chris

Ballentine, Principal Project Manager in our Capital Programs Design & Construction Group, who is serving as the project manager.

CHRIS BALLENTINE: Hello, everyone.

ASHLEY ROGERS: And now I'll turn things over to Erinn.

ERINN MCMAHAN: Thank you, Ashley.

As I understand it the original motivation to build the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center was two-fold. The first was very practical to consolidate swimming pools and leisure space in one place, as opposed to individual spaces at each of the residence halls. And the second still resonates today to build community outside the classroom and in the words of then associate dean of students Norman Miller, who championed the project to reduce the impersonal nature of a large urban university.

And now back to the present. The current condition of the buildings has become the limiting factor to building community and to meeting the well-being and recreational needs of students. Sunset Canyon was completed in 1966 and despite its condition, the buildings are eligible for historic listing.

Consistent with what's to be expected of a wooden structure after almost 60 years, we've seen deterioration overtime. That deterioration has been accelerated by termites and dry rot. We even had a lightning strike in 2019. The main buildings were red-tagged and vacated in 2020, which meant we lost access to the offices, Vista and Santa Fe multi-purpose rooms and the restrooms in the tower.

Although the buildings were unoccupied by that time, the seismic evaluation completed in 2021 confirmed

the decision to vacate. Mold and water intrusion issues also forced the closure of the mezzanine offices, which were used by our youth and family program staff.

And finally, there are building code and safety requirements that are not met. In line with the condition of the buildings, some of which currently have a seismic rating of 7, the primary funding source for this building's replacement will be provided from the student seismic fee.

In terms of design and programming for the replacement building, we go back to that original vision building community. We've kept the following in mind while planning the future of the site.

First, that our student community has grown both the residential community which surrounds the site as well as the university's enrollment. With that growth, the site

has seen greater utilization.

And second, the current site has accessibility challenges, which creates barriers and doesn't align with our vision.

Third, consistent with the original design, which the LA Times referred to at the time as emphasis on non-emphasis to make something people could shape to their own needs. The students of today need multi-purpose spaces that can fill a variety of roles, including those for activity, dance, arts, and student meetings. The original Sunset had those spaces and we need them back.

And Sunset has always been our hub for supporting students with dependents and campus families. The site accessibility improvements and multipurpose spaces that we've envisioned will allow us to continue doing that.

On the left, we see the

project site relative to the boundaries of campus. On the right, the project site relative to the grounds of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. On the left, the original site plan with buildings and pools labeled A through P. And on the right, the existing site plan. On the left, some of the notable spaces mentioned earlier.

And here we see detail on the deterioration of the building, which is clearly quite significant. At several points prior to the closure of some of the buildings in 2020, support beams were added for shoring and lattice work was added to bring reliance into code compliance. This slide shows the spaces to be removed in this project and their square footage. Note that there was originally some significant covered unenclosed space, and that's an element that we will continue to include given how important it is to blend indoor and outdoor

space.

Here, we see some of the key features in the conceptual plan and I'd like to highlight a few. As I mentioned on the previous slide, the covered unenclosed space will be an important element of the project and of the future programming. And we're focusing on multi-purpose rooms, as I mentioned earlier, of which there are three. And the elevator will greatly aid with site accessibility and inclusivity will be improved with the all gender restrooms and lactation space.

Here, we see the floor plans. Level 1 has the two multi-purpose rooms, all gender restrooms and staff offices. Level 2, a large multi-purpose room, kitchen. And then the roof deck that significant covered unenclosed space, which will be a great asset to the project into the campus.

Here, we see the building

elevations. On the top left you can see how the building is built into the hillside. The building sections. And here, we get to my favorite part, the renderings. The architects have done such an amazing job from the very beginning we've just naturally been on the same page with the vision for Sunset Canyon and these renderings show that.

We really wanted to pull the look and feel of the original buildings through to the new one, namely the look of the wood finishes and the connection to nature and the outdoor environment. Again, note the contours of the building and how it maps to the hillside.

Now, back to that original vision of Sunset, creating community and an escape from an urban environment. And again, really you can see here how the building just blends so well into the hillside.

Here, we see the accessibility of the second level and how it flows smoothly through to the family pool.

Now Ashley, back to you.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Thank you, Erinn.

So what is CEQA?

Regarding the environmental review for the project CEQA requires the lead agency, in this case UCLA, acting on behalf of the University of California, to evaluate the potential environmental impacts that may result from a new project. If there are significant impacts, the lead agency is required to identify Mitigation Measures or alternatives to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible.

If any significant impacts cannot be fully mitigated, then an environmental impact report or EIR is required. I'll summarize the CEQA process for this project in a moment,

but first I'll explain that the environmental analysis for this project is based on, or tiered from, the previously certified EIR's prepared for UCLA's Long Range Development Plan, or LRDP, which guides campus growth and development over time.

The LRDP EIRs were program level EIRs from which future project specific analysis of proposed campus development can be tiered. UCLA previously determined that a Supplemental EIR would be the appropriate CEQA document for this project.

The Supplemental EIR we've prepared is referred to as a focused EIR, meaning that it evaluates only those impacts that were not previously identified in the LRDP EIRs. In this case most environmental topics were screened out of further analysis and the only topic fully addressed in the Supplemental EIR is historic resources.

The general process for our Supplemental EIR is shown here. As you may know, earlier this year we prepared an Initial Study for the Sunset Rec project, which determined that for all environmental topics except historic resources, the project's impacts would be less than or equivalent to the impacts previously identified in the LRDP EIRs, and therefore would be consistent with the LRDP EIRs.

However, since those EIRs did not identify any significant impacts to historic resources, that issue needed to be addressed in our Supplemental EIR. On July 17th, we published the projects Notice of Preparation of an EIR or NOP, and during the 30-day public review period that followed, we held a public scoping meeting on August 1st. As mentioned at that meeting, all public comments received at the scoping meeting and during the NOP review period have been

included and addressed in our EIR.

On November 8th, we published the Draft Supplemental EIR and we are currently in the middle of its public review period that will extend until January 3rd. This community meeting is another opportunity for public input during the CEQA process.

In January, we'll prepare the Final Supplemental EIR, which will include responses to any public comments on the draft and will also include the mitigation, monitoring and reporting program or MMRP, which ensures implementation of all LRDP programs, practices and procedures, or PPs and Mitigation Measures or MMS.

As a standard practice, UCLA implements all of the applicable LRDP, PPs and MMs for all of its projects in addition to any relevant project specific mitigation.

Ultimately, all of this

CEQA documentation will be taken into consideration by the Chancellor in deciding whether to approve this project.

As part of our EIR, a historic analysis was prepared by independent consultants at Page & Turnbull, whose staff meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Architecture, Architectural History or History.

The first step was to evaluate the built environment at Sunset Rec to determine its eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and/or the National Register of Historic Place.

The area on this map within the red dotted line is the generally intact extent of the original development designed by Smith & Williams as the Canyon Recreation Center project dating from 1963 to

1964.

This area and most of the improvements within it represent a culmination of the firm's signature aesthetic and design approach in a single mature work. Most notably in its post and beam design with Japanese influences the seamless interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences, and the architects inventive navigation of the sites difficult topography through integrated built elements such as the stair tower.

As a result, this area of Sunset Rec and its resources are considered eligible for listing in the California Register as a historic district. According to the California Office of Historic Preservation, historic districts are unified and defined geographic areas, which contain a concentration of historic buildings, structures or sites united, historically, culturally or

architecturally.

The components or contributors within a historic district may be individually undistinguished, but collectively significant. Despite the deteriorated conditions of several of the buildings at Sunset Rec, Page & Turnbull found the complex eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant representation of the work of important creative individuals, namely the architecture firm of Smith & Williams.

However, due to the material loss and alterations overtime that have compromised the design and feeling at Sunset Rec, including some of the code compliant upgrades, the historic district is not eligible for listing in the National Register in its current condition. The identified district includes 10 contributors, including six core recreation buildings, the main swimming pool,

known as the park pool, two pool support buildings, and the overall unifying landscape and site elements, such as the layout and spatial relationships between buildings, the cascading stairways at the center of the complex, and a hexagonal motif and patterned exhibited in certain building footprints, pavers and planters.

The second step of the historic analysis was to determine the project's impact on the historic district. The project will necessitate the removal of 6 of the 10 district contributors, including the three multi-purpose rooms, the Vista Room, Buenos Aires Room and Santa Fe Room, each of which is located in a separate building. The Stair Tower, the Office Center and the remaining roof structure of what is today a small lifeguard station.

Additionally, some of the associated landscape and site elements

would be removed. These removals would cause the historic district to no longer be recognizable or able to convey its significance as the work of Smith & Williams, which is the integrity threshold for California Register eligibility.

The remaining contributors to the eligible historic district, specifically the Park Pool, the pool, support buildings and other aspects of the landscape and site elements, are not sufficient on their own to meaningfully represent the work of Smith & Williams. This loss of the eligible historic district would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in the CEQA Guidelines, thus resulting in a significant impact.

CEQA requires projects to incorporate feasible Mitigation Measures that can avoid or substantially reduce a projects

significant environmental impacts. Mitigation for impacts to historic resources are typically developed on a case by case basis providing the opportunity to tailor measures to the characteristics and the significance of an affected resource and the impacts to it.

Common Mitigation Measures for the demolition of historic resources consist of documentation of the resource, typically to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey, or HABS, preparation of a salvage plan for significant architectural features and materials, and a commemorative plaque or an interpretive display, all of which collectively is exactly what has been proposed for this project in Mitigation Measures 1 through 3 summarized here.

However, these project specific Mitigation Measures would not be sufficient to fully reduce the

project's historic impact to a less than significant level, as the loss of the eligible historic district would still represent a loss of character and collective history. Therefore, the impact is concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

As the decision-making body, UCLA will need to make a determination based on substantial evidence in the record that the project benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effect, which will be formalized in a Statement of Overriding Considerations and considered in whether to approve the project.

Beyond our EIR's analysis of historic resources, this list shows all of the topics required to be analyzed under CEQA. As I indicated earlier, the Initial Study analysis determined that nearly all project impacts would be less than or

equivalent to those previously identified in the LRDP EIRs. Therefore, further analysis of those issues in the Supplemental EIR was not necessary.

Note here that even for those topics where impacts were determined to be less than significant, UCLA's standard PPPs and MMs from the Long Range Development Plan have been incorporated into the project. As you can see, the only significant and unavoidable impact is the historic impact just discussed.

Before I pass things over to our Project Manager, I'll quickly mention the various project alternatives that are evaluated in our Supplemental EIR. CEQA requires the identification of alternatives to a project that can reduce or avoid any identified significant impacts. Specifically, an EIR must, "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the

project or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and then evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

In the course of project planning and environmental review, UCLA identified a wide range of potential alternatives, several of which were rejected from full evaluation due to their inability to substantially reduce the project's impact or to meet the project's underlying purpose and objectives.

The alternatives ultimately selected for full analysis include a CEQA required No Project Alternative in this case in which no new project development would occur and the vacated buildings would be preserved or mothballed in their current condition,

as well as two project variations that would involve rehabilitation of most or all of the existing buildings, including seismic updates, building code upgrades, and accessibility improvements.

For both of these latter alternatives, site challenges would remain, certain buildings would remain inaccessible or restricted in use, and there would not be an equivalent capacity for recreational programming to that historically available at Sunset Rec. Thus, while these two build alternatives would avoid, to varying degrees, the project's significant and unavoidable impact to a historic resource, and thus would retain the historic districts eligibility for the California Register, the project's underlying purpose and objectives would not be fully met.

Now, I'm going to turn

things over to Chris Ballentine, who will talk about the projects milestones and next steps.

CHRIS BALLENTINE: Thank you, Ashley.

So this last year the project team finished a really rigorous process, I guess to develop kind of a detailed project program and we completed essentially the conceptual design documents, the documents that you all have seen here tonight. We are looking to have UCLA Chancellor project approval and CEQA certification in early 2024, early next year.

All of this work that you've seen and what we're going to be doing is going to be combined and essentially put into a package that will go out to bid for the selection of a construction manager, and that will help the team with the development of the kind of detailed project requirements for the design development

phase. This will take place the spring of 2024. Detailed design will then continue and proceed through the winter of 2024. And the project will be kind of prepared and put together and the project will go out to bid.

The anticipated start for the first part of construction is the building demolition and site utilities portion and that is going to happen in early 2025. Building construction will start in the spring of 2025. And we're looking at completing construction in the fall of 2026.

So about a little less than a two-year construction process is what we're planning for. The expectation and hope is that everything will go well and that we will be moving our occupants into the building at the end of 2026.

Thank you. I think I'm back to you, Ashley.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Thank you,

Chris.

CHRIS BALLENTINE: Thank you.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Now, we'll move on to public comments. If you would like to speak, please either use the raised hand function or just mention it in the chat. I'll call on names in the order that I see them. Each speaker will have up to three minutes to speak. If you start to go over time, we'll give you a gentle reminder to wrap up.

Please state your name for the record and any group or organization that you're representing or affiliated with. Let's see if we have anyone so far. Let's see if there are any raised hands. No. Would anyone like to provide public comments?

Oh, Jenny. Liam, Jenny, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Yeah. Hi, there. Thank you for hosting this. I

2-1

was just curious as a student, how will this impact my access to the rec center during the years of construction?

ASHLEY ROGERS: So in general we're not responding to comments, but I think that's an easy one to address right now. And, Erinn, I don't know if you want to take it.

But access to the pools will still be available, there's just going to be a portion of Sunset Rec that would be fenced off.

CHRIS BALLENTINE: Yeah, that's -- that's about it. The building is currently fenced off so that's not much of a change there. I mean, I think that fence line might expand a bit during the project and that would be, I mean, Chris could speak to. But in general, the site will still be accessible and may have a different entrance at times and maybe some noise and things. But we plan for the site to be open in the

2-1 (CONT.)

construction.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Is there anyone else who'd like to provide comments? Rohan Abraham.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Yeah. Hi, I'm a student here at UCLA and I personally haven't been here in the time when any of these buildings were actually open, but I've walked past them many times going to the pool and they really did seem like they were falling apart, and I always figured they were slated for demolition. So I think it's really good that UCLA is working to build a better, more usable recreation facility for future students.

3-1

ASHLEY ROGERS: Thank you, Rohan.

Is there anyone else who'd like to provide comments tonight? I think that's everyone.

All right. Well, in that case, short and sweet. Thank you

everyone for your comments. The public comment period will continue until January 3rd and written comments can be emailed to me at arogers@capnet.ucla.edu.

Before we close, I'd like to acknowledge a few people. Here tonight from UCLA leadership, we have Monroe Gorden, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs; Mick Deluca, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Life. Sue Santon, Associate Vice Chancellor of Capital Planning and Finance, and Peter Hendrickson, Associate Vice Chancellor of Capital Programs, Design and Construction, as well as our Campus Architect.

We also have our project architects here tonight. Frederik Heuser and Eric Lindebak from Safdie, Rabines, and we'd like to thank them and the entire design team at Safdie Rabines Architects, along with the many consultants and engineers who have

helped to get us to this point. Tina Andersen of T&B Planning, an independent consultant who prepared our CEQA analysis. Flora Chou, our primary historic consultant from Page & Turnbull.

Thank you also to all of our UCLA and UC staff who have worked on and supported this project, especially our recreation team who are our project sponsors. And finally, thank you to our community members, including our students. Thanks for joining us tonight and providing your comments.

Have a nice evening everyone.

CHRIS BALLENTINE: Thank you, Ashley.

ASHLEY ROGERS: Thank you. Goodnight.

- - -

(Recorded meeting concluded.)

- - -

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify that the recorded proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above case, and this copy is a correct transcript of the same.

Samanda J. Rios

Samanda J. Rios
Court Reporter
Notary Public of Pennsylvania

(The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)

PUBLIC MEETING CHAT TRANSCRIPT

Comment 2-1 (Liam Jenny): Thank you!

Comment 3-1 (Rohan Abraham): Thank you!

Comment 4-1 (Mikayla Sullivan): Thank you! Very excited to see the project underway