November 13, 2023

Darnell Hunt
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Re: Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion JTF - Final Report

Dear Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Hunt,

At the November 9, 2023, meeting of the Executive Board, Members reviewed the final report of the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion Joint Task Force and the feedback of divisional Academic Senate committees and councils. Members voted unanimously in favor of a motion to share the following feedback: they expressed great appreciation to the task force for their work and found that the proposed campus theme of sustainability and the environment is powerful. Members realized the current constraints in selling the property, however they indicated that a sale of the property is the preferred and mostly likely outcome. Further, they advised the Administration to follow the Academic Senate’s principles for campus expansion, which includes not draining resources from the Westwood campus, take appropriate measures to keep the sale an open option, and to regularly update the Senate.

To fulfill its role in meaningful consultation of the Academic Senate in shared governance, it is particularly important for Administration to consult with the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) about operating expenses, opportunity costs, implementation, and associated considerations of ways to minimize costs. Members suggested that the implementation task force provide regular progress updates and requests for consultation to the Senate including CPB, the Executive Board, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, and Council on Research as appropriate.

Members noted that without a huge investment, the South Bay campus is not a promising academic site. Given its inherent constraints and limited university resources, it does not seem worth the investment.

The Academic Senate appreciates the opportunity to advise on this important report.

Sincerely,

Andrea Kasko
Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.
Cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
    Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
October 26, 2023

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
From: Catherine Sugar, Chair, Undergraduate Council
Re: Joint Task Force Report on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion

At its meeting on October 20, 2023, the Undergraduate Council reviewed and discussed the report from the Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion.

Members appreciated the information presented in the report, while observing the low response rate to the survey among faculty. Members noted that the South Bay campus location and lack of public transportation will pose significant access barriers for commuting students, faculty, and staff. Several members also pointed out a disconnect in integrating the South Bay buildings and classrooms with UCLA’s existing academic activities, underscoring fit-for-use challenges that may be hard to overcome.

While acknowledging such constraints, some members also emphasized the site’s potential to enable innovative educational experiences and curricular approaches that differ from the comprehensive 4-year residential model of the Westwood campus. Some members suggested leveraging the South Bay campus for shorter-term research-based programs, e.g., for graduate students writing dissertations in residence or for advanced undergraduates working on senior thesis projects following the completion of general education requirements (along the lines of the College of Creative Studies at UC Santa Barbara). Members underscored questions of equity and accessibility for any future academic programming at the UCLA South Bay campus.

The Undergraduate Council appreciates the opportunity to comment on the report and welcomes continued discussions on academic planning for UCLA campus expansion. If you have any questions, please contact me via the Undergraduate Council analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
    Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
    Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate
October 24, 2023

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Final Report-Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion

Dear Chair Kasko,

At its meeting on October 3, 2023, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) discussed the Academic Senate’s request for the Final Report-Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion. Members offered the following comments.

FWC members noted that Marymount California University was purchased without input from the faculty or any UCLA community stakeholders. Eighty percent of the faculty surveyed were either not interested or only modestly interested in teaching on this campus (Appendix IV). There are many challenges with integrating this campus into UCLA, including its location in Rancho Palos Verdes (RPV), up to a 1.5-hour one-way drive from UCLA’s Westwood campus. This distance makes travel between Westwood and RPV campuses utterly impractical daily. Second, there are no existing research facilities, and third, the residential facilities are in poor condition, such that they do not have the necessary amenities to support our student body.

There was modest enthusiasm for converting this campus into a state-of-the-art facility to study sustainability/environmental concerns significantly as they impact the LA basin/ocean or a center for low-cost conferences, retreats, or even vacations for the entire campus community. There was no enthusiasm for the other concepts, including using the campus for a Spanish/indigenous immersion program.

However, overall, FWC members were very skeptical of the entire project. It will take a massive investment of financial resources to transform this campus into a research facility or conference center. These resources would be better deployed supporting ongoing initiatives at UCLA, such as rethinking the future of graduate education. Moreover, FWC members found no demonstrated need for any concepts suggested to the Joint Task Force or, indeed, a need for the whole campus. We thus consider it a mistake to have bought the campus in the first place and urge leadership to sell the campus and cut our losses now.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our recommendation. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at butlersj@ucla.edu or via the Committee analyst, Renee Rouzan-Kay, at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,
Samantha Butler, Chair  
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/ Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Renee Rouzan-Kay, Senior Policy Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee  
Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
October 18, 2023

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Brooke Scelza, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Joint Report – Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion

At its meeting on October 13, 2023, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the report from the Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion. Members present offered the following observations for the Executive Board’s consideration:

- Members noted that the report did not address how the recommendations would directly affect graduate education and students.
- Members raised questions on whether the residential college courses would include teaching assistants and were concerned about equity for graduate students with teaching assignments at the South Bay campus. Some members noted that a TA position at the South Bay campus should not be considered functionally equivalent to a position on campus.
- Members noted the survey’s low response rate and the demographics of the respondents.
- Members were interested in the costs of upgrading the buildings for proposed short-term and long-term opportunities.

Members recommend that the Graduate Council is consulted for any proposed projects that may impact graduate students, including research and employment opportunities at the South Bay campus.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our views on this matter. If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council Analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
At its meeting on October 11, 2023, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CR&J) discussed the final report of the Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion.

Members thank the task force for the thorough report, and appreciated the Concerns and the Final Recommendations, including “the JTF encourages UCLA to consider whether this investment is still right in both the short term and long term, given financial pressures.”

Members requested clarification on how the Academic Senate was consulted during the acquisition of the new campus. In fulfillment of its role in shared governance, and per UC Regents Bylaw 40.1, the Los Angeles Division reviews and comments on campus and systemwide items. Members inquired why Senate committees and councils, such as the Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Council on Planning and Budget, and Council on Research, were not involved earlier during the acquisition process.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at snwhite@dentistry.ucla.edu or via the Committee’s analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Lori Ishimaru, Senior Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Members of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
October 12, 2023

Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of the UCLA Campus Expansion Final Report

Dear Chair Kasko,

At its meeting on October 4, 2023, the Council on Research (COR) reviewed and discussed the report from the Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of the UCLA Campus Expansion. Members offered the following comments.

Members recommended establishing another committee to explore and provide input in research areas while assessing its efficacy. They recommended more oversight as the programmatic agenda for the campus is developed. Members underscored the importance of integrating the campus activities throughout the year and more especially during the summer. This could serve as a good space to house summer students. Finally, members inquired whether UCPD would have jurisdiction on that campus and whether there were any safety risks.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at asampath@jsei.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Alapakkam Sampath, Chair
Council on Research

cc: Kathy Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Research
October 10, 2023

Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Joint Task Force Report on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion

Dear Chair Kasko,

At its meeting on October 2, 2023, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed and discussed the report from the Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of the UCLA Campus Expansion. Members offered the following comments.

1. Members noted the survey’s low response rate, and that a disproportionate number of those who did respond lived near the South Bay campus. They raised concerns regarding the potential drain of resources from the main (Westwood) campus and competition for donor funds. It remains uncertain whether development of the new campus might compromise the University’s academic mission.

2. Members raised questions about the efficiency of addressing enrollment growth with a campus located so far from Westwood.

3. Members remarked that given the skepticism and even resistance many faculty feel to what are sometimes perceived as flashy real estate purchases, UCLA campus administration needs to prioritize its financial allocations very carefully and exercise great caution in undertaking significant projects. They suggested that clear messaging about real estate issues and the potential benefits of expansion is essential.

4. Members shared concerns regarding the potential costs, uncertainties, environmental issues, and South Bay community concerns associated with this project.

5. Members also acknowledged that this acquisition occurs amid a backdrop of austerity measures and annual budget cuts across the board. Questions were raised about the level of trust the administration aims to build, given these circumstances.

Members recommended the following:

1. More emphasis should be placed on the survey results, with thoughtful consideration of campus utilization. UCLA needs to make decisions on expansion and cost reduction, determining the financial commitment required for each.

2. This report should be treated as a provisional update and not a final document.

3. Other members proposed getting more people to visit the campus and become involved in efforts to develop and integrate it.
4. Members recommended that the task force explore creative ways to make the South Bay campus self-sustaining as a business model. Ideas included finding ways to use it as an event center or opening it to community organizations, thus capitalizing on the purchase and making it productive. Rather than limit the South Bay campus to being an extension of the Westwood campus to which students would commute, it might be best to think of it as serving functions that are new and unique.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the task force’s report. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at emmerich@humnet.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Best regards,

Michael Emmerich, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion
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JULY 2023
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2022, UCLA had the unique opportunity to acquire the campus of Marymount California University, which is located in Rancho Palos Verdes, and its student housing (The Villas), located in San Pedro. At capacity, MCU served approximately 1100 students. The campus consists of 92,268 square feet in 11 buildings with improvements including asphalt paved roads, nine paved parking lots with approximately 463 parking spaces, 4 tennis courts, 2 basketball courts, a swimming pool, concrete curbing, walkways, ramps, stairs, exterior lighting and mature landscaping on almost 13 acres. The property includes 11.6 acres of undeveloped land on the west-facing hillside. This land could be developed in the future for possible faculty housing or other programmatic needs. Located 6.2 miles from the South Bay campus are “the Villas,” the residential auxiliary for the campus. The Villas sit on 11 acres with 17 residential buildings. They consist of 81 units, 27 with 2-bedrooms and 54 with 3-bedrooms. The grounds also include a fitness center, community space, residential advisor office, laundry room, and convenience store, outdoor quad, pavilion, and BBQ, in addition to other program and residential areas. The UCLA South Bay campus is approximately 33 miles from UCLA Westwood and 8 miles from the Port of Los Angeles.

The Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion (JTF) was jointly appointed by Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVC/P) Hunt and Academic Senate Chair Cattelino to consider optimal academic programmatic uses of the newly acquired UCLA campus expansion in Rancho Palos Verdes. The committee (co-chaired by Dean Tina Christie and Academic Senate Vice Chair/Chair-Elect Andrea Kasko) led a process of ideation and consultation to conceptualize an academic program for the campus expansion. Program ideas driven by the academic mission as well as UCLA’s deep commitment to inclusive excellence, the UC 2030 enrollment goals, and financial feasibility were solicited. We also considered broader principles and parameters, anchored in the Academic Senate’s principles and parameters for campus expansion (Appendix II).

The members of the committee included: Scott Cummings, Professor, Law (withdrew); Miguel Garcia-Garibay, Dean, Physical Sciences; Yolanda Gorman, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Chief of Staff; Brian Kite, Interim Dean, Theater, Film & Television; Beth Lazazzera, Associate Professor, Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics; Muriel McClendon, Associate Professor, History; Megan McEvoy, Professor, Institute for Society and Genetics; and Timu Gallien, Associate Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering

Summary of Recommendations

The Joint Task Force can envision the development of the South Bay campus under the theme of sustainability, climate change, and environmental justice, for which it is uniquely positioned. This would require significant long-term investment (including faculty FTEs), especially because the current campus lacks research facilities (of any kind), and campus facilities and services that are currently available to students as part of their UCLA experience. If UCLA has
the resources to upgrade the South Bay campus and to engage in strategic local partnerships without negatively impacting the Westwood campus, a multi-disciplinary cross-cutting curriculum could engage interests from across the professional schools and the college. Doing so would position UCLA to emerge as a national and world leader in sustainable urban ocean studies - and that would advance rigorous teaching, learning, research, and policy on equitable climate solutions.

Actualizing this themed campus is anticipated to take several years. Therefore, the JTF also explored opportunities for shorter term academic programming that require less planning, investment and resources, such as a “study abroad in LA” program and/or a residential college model. Short-term use of the campus could also include offering courses to UCLA students who are already studying or engaged in the South Bay (as part of clinical rotations, for example). This approach may serve to “pay the bills” (so to speak), but is not likely to significantly enhance the impact of UCLA as a top public research university.

The JTF also emphasized the need for ongoing evaluation of program implementation, success, and student experience at the South Bay campus (from the outset of any programming).

Finally, the JTF encourages UCLA to consider whether this investment is still right in both the short term and long term, given financial pressures that emerged after the acquisition.
Process
The JTF commenced in late Winter 2023 and held eight committee meetings between February 14 and June 29. The committee co-chairs held weekly strategy and planning calls to ensure that all work was moving forward. Task force members came together on April 29 for a South Bay campus site visit which included a tour of MCU’s main campus and the Villas.

Data Collection
The JTF used a mixed methods approach to engage the Bruin community. Five public town hall discussions were held during Spring semester. A survey was distributed to all Bruin community members and received over 2100 responses. Lastly, consultations were held with several key stakeholders to get a more in-depth perspective on how to best utilize the South Bay campus. A dedicated email account was opened for the JTF so that the UCLA community could contact the JTF directly.

Town Halls
The task force convened five public discussions (two for faculty, one for staff, one for undergraduate students and one for graduate students) about potential programmatic uses of the newly acquired South Bay campus between April 10 and May 11. In total, 582 UCLA community members registered: 446 staff, 87 faculty, 28 graduate students and 23 undergraduate students. In advance of each town hall, participants were invited to submit ideas for and questions about the campus. Over 180 registrants submitted comments. Many were excited to expand UCLA’s reach to the South Bay - particularly for the staff, faculty and students who live in the area and would no longer need to regularly commute to Westwood. The idea of a sustainable campus that prioritizes applied research and learning that addresses climate change and sustainability was discussed. Participants suggested that there be considerations of weekend and summer experiential learning programs, such as summer bridge programs for students from surrounding local public schools and community colleges, and there was also interest in developing a “cost effective” conference venue for use by the campus and potentially other education and community-based organizations. Lastly, participants suggested that we use the campus to create greater collaboration with partners in the South Bay, such as AltaSea, the Port of Los Angeles, SpaceX, Palos Verdes Land Conservatory, and Apple.

Bruin Community Survey
On May 25, 2023 BruinPost email was sent to the UCLA community with a link to a short online survey to further solicit broad input on the academic program focus for the South Bay campus. A reminder email was sent on May 31 and the survey closed on June 3, 2023. In total, 2141 Bruins responded to the survey. 45% (968) were staff, 37% (784) were students and 18% (389) were faculty. Most respondents were affiliated with Social Sciences (21%, 198), Life Sciences (21%, 190), Humanities (18%, 163), Medicine (13%, 116), Physical Sciences (12%, 115), and
Engineering and Applied Science (12%, 112). Almost a quarter (22%) of survey respondents reported living within 10 miles of South Bay, while 52% reported living within 10 mi of Westwood. Detailed survey findings can be found in Appendix IV.

**Proposal Solicitation**
The JTF also solicited short proposals from Deans and Department chairs, however, unfortunately, we only received a single submission from this group. We suggest that the timing of our solicitation, which was during the last two weeks of the spring quarter, and a lack of understanding about the campus facilities and other pertinent information about the campus, may help to explain the (lack of) response. However, a few enthusiastic faculty submitted proposals for use of the new campus. These proposals can be found in Appendix V.

**Consultations**
In addition to town halls and surveys targeting faculty, staff and students, the JTF consulted with key stakeholders from across campus. Alexandra Minna Stern, Dean of Humanities, was invited to a JTF meeting early in the process to better engage the ways in which the humanities might engage with an academic program for the campus, as the JTF lacked representation from the humanities. The JTF also invited Kelly Schmader, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management, to a meeting to discuss operational issues, and included Steve Yu in JTF meetings following his appointment as the COO/CFO of the UCLA South Bay Campus. Co-chairs Christie and Kasko met with Roger Wakimoto, Vice Chancellor for Research and Creative Activities, to discuss integration of research and creative activities at the South Bay Campus, with Michael Beck, Administrative Vice Chancellor, to further discuss operational issues that could affect academic programming, and with Terry Tamminen, President/CEO of AltaSea.

**Limitations**
Notably, as already mentioned, the JTF lacked representation from the Humanities. To help to address this gap, the JTF invited Dean Alex Stern to their second meeting to discuss ways in which she imagined the humanities could be integrated into South Bay Campus academic programming. Additionally, the JTF completed a careful analysis of survey respondents from the humanities. A total of 163 survey respondents were from the humanities: 113 students and 50 faculty members. From the humanities subsample, 79 respondents said they are “not interested” in affiliating with the South Bay campus, 56 indicated “somewhat interested,” and 28 indicated that they were “extremely interested. For those respondents who indicated interest in the South Bay campus, it was for the smaller-scale campus and smaller classes that should afford an opportunity for more creative instruction. For some, it is also closer to home (24 respondents indicated living within 10 mi of South Bay, 106 live within 10 mi of Westwood) or offers more affordable housing options.

Additionally, one member of the JTF (Prof. Scott Cummings, UCLA Law School) asked to be excused from the committee because of a very active work and travel schedule.
UCLA South Bay Campus Facts and Figures

Instructional capacity
The campus has about 20 classrooms, with capacities ranging from 15-40 students, and includes a chemistry lab and biology lab. There is also an auditorium (capacity ~200), cafeteria with commercial kitchen, library, and the space that was formerly a chapel. At its prime, the campus supported instruction of approximately 1000 full-time students.

Research Space
The campus does not have any appreciable research space beyond the instructional space.

Faculty and administrative offices
While there are many faculty and administrative offices in the central buildings of the campus, questions around their accessibility arose during the tour.

Housing capacity
The Villas are a residential campus on 11 acres with 17 residential buildings. They consist of 81 units, 27 with 2-bedrooms and 54 with 3-bedrooms. Current capacity of the villas is approximately 280 beds, and maximum expected capacity is around 380 students. The grounds also include a fitness center, community space, residential advisor office, laundry room, and convenience store, outdoor quad, pavilion, BBQ in addition to other program and residential areas. Site improvements inclusive of asphalt paved roads, concrete curbs, sidewalks and driveways, basketball court, sand volleyball court, swimming pool, and parking (77 one-car garages, 86 driveway spaces, additional street parking and overflow parking on undeveloped land). The Villas were originally created as housing for the U.S. Navy. When they were acquired by MCU, the Department of Navy, through the Department of Education, placed deed restrictions on the property including, among other things, utilizing it continuously for educational purposes.

Other campus facilities
The South Bay campus has a swimming pool, basketball courts and tennis courts. The campus also has a student commons area. However, the campus does not have a recreational facility, and also lacks a student health center.

More about the campus, including photos, can be found in Appendix III.
Analysis

Key findings of the survey are summarized below. Complete data is available in Appendix IV.

Faculty, students and staff are all somewhat familiar with the South Bay campus. However, most say they are not interested or somewhat interested in attending, teaching or working there. Students report the least interest (53% indicated no interest). Staff are the most interested in working at the South Bay campus.

Over 85% of respondents endorsed a campus theme centered on climate change, sustainability, and environmental justice. When asked what amenities should be offered at the South Bay Campus, all groups (54% faculty, 63% students and 51% staff), identified transportation as a central service for access to the campus. Faculty (41%) and students (39%) also indicated housing as a top priority. Students (30%) and staff (30%) indicated that on campus dining would be important, and faculty (36%) and staff (35%) identified parking as a very important service.

A sample of the specific suggestions for the campus include:

“"As a Marine Biology Major I think it is a great addition especially because we can be near the ocean and conduct labs."

"I could imagine launching a creative writing MFA program housed at the South Bay campus."

"Better affordable housing options as opposed to the price to live in West LA near the main campus. Also, opportunity to be a part of a new venture for UCLA’s growth."

To address the limitation of not having a JTF committee member from the Humanities, we analyzed responses from those who indicated an affiliation with the Humanities. A sample of responses include:

“"How can we experiment with the idea of “lab”? Who and which depts are gifted space and resources, and how can other dept be included who might not utilize lab space in a traditional way but rather push what interdisciplinary research can look like? Arts, art labs, interdisciplinary labs, scholars and artists in residence,”

“Given the size of the campus, it should be focused on providing opportunities and seminars for graduate students and help facilitate faculty and grad student connections, seminars, and opportunities.”

“"I think the campus should be used primarily for programs that would take advantage of the location (i.e. oceanography, etc.). I could also imagine a venue for workshops/conferences that would include housing, food, and spaces for meetings.”
Emergent Themes
Several salient themes emerged across the survey, town halls, and in JTF discussions. *In toto*, there is broad support for a campus focused on sustainability, climate change, and environmental justice. The proximity to the Port of Los Angeles and frontline communities, in addition to the unique urban ocean geographic location, position the campus for unique and rich opportunities for boundary crossing multidisciplinary programming that could involve academic programs and departments from all disciplines. Faculty expressed broad interest in research opportunities at the South Bay campus (although there is currently no research capacity). Many faculty and staff also expressed interest in using the South Bay campus as a place for retreats, conferences and other events, especially if it were to be more economical than Westwood options such as the Luskin Center. Significant interest, especially by staff, was centered on the location of the campus and a potentially shorter commute without regard to unique academic programming. It is also critical that we consider childcare options for those working and living at the South Bay campus.

Concerns
The task force identified a number of concerns about developing the property and the associated residential space for use by UCLA.

Transportation to and from UCLA
Regular and reliable transport between the two campuses will be essential for the success of programs offered at the South Bay campus. 56% of all survey respondents indicated that transportation to and from Westwood is one of the most important campus services for the South Bay campus. This sentiment was shared by town hall participants. Moreover, in-residence South Bay students will require transportation for access to health services, libraries, and other campus activities (e.g., clubs, recreation and sports). Some duplication of services may be required, and health services in particular will be necessary to ensure the safety of our students. Given the small number of students that will be accommodated at this location, the economy of scale may not be realized.

Lack of interest as indicated by the survey
Of the approximately 2100 responses to the survey asking about the South Bay campus and potential uses, 84% indicated they were “somewhat” or “extremely familiar” with the expansion to the South Bay. 45% of respondents indicated they were “not interested” in learning, working, or teaching on this campus. 22% of respondents indicated that they were “very interested” - the majority of these respondents were staff who live closer to South Bay campus than to Westwood (60%).

Extensive renovations are needed
From the tour of the main campus and housing units, the task force noted that significant renovations are needed for the South Bay campus to be in congruity with other UCLA campus spaces. Just by our own visual inspection (understanding that we do not have expertise in facilities), the JTF noted that spaces (mostly office spaces/buildings) may not be ADA
compliant; and that teaching lab spaces are not of the standard of other UCLA lab spaces. For example, the two teaching labs lack vented hoods. Existing self-contained hoods will require an assessment to see if they are compatible with the materials and volumes that are used for any potential laboratory courses. It is very likely that there are other issues that we did not notice on our tour.

**Lack of research space**

There is no research space currently at the UCLA South Bay campus for any STEM fields. Furthermore, the library is small (and not a research library). It is difficult to envision the UCLA South Bay campus, as it currently stands, supporting a UCLA research program in any field. Thus, it is challenging to imagine how this campus helps UCLA faculty, students and staff fulfill our academic mission of teaching, (especially) research, and service, without significant investment and the establishment of partnerships with local entities (for example, AltaSea).

**Location of the campus and housing**

The residential location of the campus and living spaces limits the dining and entertainment opportunities for students without their own transportation. Limited parking in the residential quarters will limit the number of students who can have their own transportation. The task force did not note public transportation options. Food preparation facilities and permits will need to be added to the Villas to provide meal services.

**Lack of student services comparable with the Westwood campus**

In its current state, the UCLA South Bay campus does not have recreational facilities (outside of tennis and basketball courts and swimming pools) comparable to the Westwood campus. There is no student health service. The Villas currently lack the ability for on-site food preparation and service. Furthermore, the Villas are fairly isolated, with no grocery stores, local shopping, or dining available within walking distance.

**Matching students and faculty to the location**

For any program that will take place on this campus, students and faculty that are appropriate to the program will need to participate. Identifying students that are interested in living/studying on this campus may be easier than identifying faculty, since they are fewer in number and must have appropriate expertise for a particular program. Additionally, increasing undergraduate enrollment requires additional faculty FTE lines.

**Financial impact on Westwood campus**

The maximum capacity of the campus indicates that the South Bay campus will not be able to sustain itself financially from tuition and state dollars alone. This means it will draw resources away from the Westwood campus unless the difference comes from development. Drawing resources away from the Westwood campus is in direct conflict with the Academic Senate’s principles and parameters for campus expansion (see Appendix II).
Final Recommendations

This section details the key recommendations of the Joint Task Force. The findings expand on those outlined in the “Executive Summary”. This section concludes with a summary of important considerations and limitations that must be addressed before moving forward.

1. Long term vision: Develop the campus under the theme of sustainability, climate change and environmental justice, for which it is uniquely positioned, with the understanding that this would require significant and long-term investment to achieve.

Despite the significant concerns listed above, the committee does see potential in developing the new campus, although such development will require significant investment. This must include faculty FTEs to support additional students. It is not an ideal time to invest significant resources in a new campus, as it will undoubtedly draw resources away from the Westwood campus (which is in direct conflict with the Academic Senate’s principles and parameters for campus expansion).

The Palos Verdes Peninsula is an ecosystem/habitat that supports unique wildlife, flora and fauna that could present research opportunities to UCLA faculty, staff and students working in geology, evolutionary ecology and biology, environmental science, marine science and other related disciplines. Furthermore, the Palos Verdes Peninsula is the former/unceded homeland of the Tongva people and could present research opportunities to UCLA faculty, staff and students working in American Indian Studies. Its proximity to the Port of Los Angeles connects the campus to the global economy, and labor practices and movements in related economies and could present research opportunities to UCLA faculty, staff and students studying global economies, labor studies, the blue and green economies and related areas. Communities surrounding the Port of Los Angeles are considered frontline communities which may connect to UCLA faculty, staff and student research in climate change policy, and social and environmental justice. The co-location of these intellectual interests with the physical location of the UCLA South Bay campus point to an overall theme of sustainability and environmental justice for the campus.

However, a major limitation of achieving a campus with this theme is the lack of research space. Research is a critical element of our academic mission, and it is difficult to see the value of this campus to UCLA if it cannot be utilized for research, in addition to teaching and service. Although beyond the purview of this joint task force, we did hear of potential opportunities for acquiring access to some research space/facilities via AltaSea and/or the Port of Los Angeles. Notably, USC and Arizona State University both have space at AltaSea.

UCLA has a unique opportunity to develop a world class sustainable urban ocean focused research and teaching program. It should be noted this would be distinct and unique to UCLA.
and the Los Angeles region and is highly complementary to Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) and other UC marine sciences programs (e.g., UCSB, UCD Bodega). LA is one of the only coastal megacities in the US. It is under extraordinarily climate pressures (e.g., sea level rise, intensifying hydrology, fire, urbanization) presenting unique challenges including sustainable ports, decarbonization, mariculture, pollution, urban adaptation, equitable infrastructure, environmental justice, and workforce development. Southern California coastal communities are amongst the most vulnerable in the US to sea level rise impacts because communities have been built around a narrow spring tide range compared to the East and Gulf coast which is storm surge (hurricane) driven. Sea level rise will propagate both water level and wave energy landward resulting in groundwater salinization, erosion, flooding, and deleterious infrastructure interactions (e.g., transportation, utilities, legacy pollutant mobilization).

The port of LA-Long Beach complex is the largest port system in the United States. POLA has identified environmental stewardship as fundamental to port competitiveness. They are particularly interested in partnering with UCLA to research supply chain management, data, energy, and labor relations. UCLA Anderson and HSSEAS represent key potential partnerships to conduct transformative research in collaboration with the port complex.

The UCLA South Bay campus and AltaSea are extraordinarily located in an area critical to urban sustainability. The Palos Verdes peninsula is exposed to dynamic oceanic and meteorological processes. Ocean energy presents exceptional opportunities in wave, tide and wind energy. The San Pedro shelf has been identified as an area for aquaculture development. There is currently active research at AltaSea for ocean decarbonization. The San Pedro shelf has been exposed to extensive pollution and chemical dumping. The area surrounding the UCLA South Bay campus is shaped by unique coastal, geological and geotechnical processes.

If a California student is interested in pursuing education focused in coastal engineering, sustainability or resilience, there is only limited fractured coursework at UCB, UCLA, UCSB, UCSD, Stanford and USC. There is no unified urban coastal sustainability and resilience education at any UC campus. SIO is focused on ocean going science, oceanography, biogeochemical processes, climate change and polar environments. Federal agencies (e.g., USACE) and private practice cannot meet their technically trained coastal science staffing requirements (Elko et al., 2018). The National Academies of Engineering identified five fundamental needs in coastal engineering (NRC, 1999):

1. Reducing impacts and risks with coastal hazards
2. Restoring sediment supply to coastal zones
3. Develop sufficient and balanced information of shoreline decisions
4. Modernize ports to economic competitiveness and environmental quality
5. Ensure long term coastal solutions maximize environmental enhancement

Coastal sustainability focused funding has been increasing and is of great interest to science and mission driven agencies. Recent funding calls have come from USCRP, NSF, NOAA, SERDP, DoE, DoN, California Parks, and the California Coastal Commission. USACE is interested in supporting a West Coast focused Coastal Engineering, Sustainability and
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Resilience program. UCLA South Bay in partnership with AltaSea would present a unique opportunity to develop a unified urban coastal resilience program that leverages historical UC-wide excellence in engineering, oceanography and marine sciences while connecting to the unmatched strength of UCLA’s arts, humanities and management schools.

AltaSea and the Port of Los Angeles have expressed considerable interest in partnering with UCLA in scientific and workforce development areas. There is a long history with AltaSea. A donor was previously interested in funding a campus building at AltaSea. AltaSea is a 35 acre campus, with 250K sq. ft. warehouse space. 180K sq. ft. are currently being renovated (60% has been leased), with tenants including a USC kelp lab, and for-profit companies sourcing and growing sustainable seafood, and a research incubator(?). AltaSea is currently raising funds to renovate an additional 45K sq. ft. into climate controlled labs and classrooms. 15 acres are currently undeveloped (undergoing remediation as it is a former oil rig site) and could be used for additional buildings. AltaSea currently has 2.2 MW solar capacity, more than they are consuming or plan to consume. However, they lack battery storage for this energy and need to increase capacity.

More recently, the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) and UCLA discussed the possibility of partnering on sustainable supply chain management, environmental justice, labor relations, and blue economy education and workforce development. UCLA South Bay, AltaSea and POLA could develop world class sustainability research, education and workforce development focusing on the urban coastal economic zone. AltaSea is particularly interested in sustainable aqua/ mariculture, coastal resilience, coastal engineering, subsea robotics, decarbonization, ocean energy, and blue economy related research. The POLA is striving to become carbon neutral and is particularly interested in environmental stewardship, sustainable supply chains, energy and data.

The Environmental Justice Law Program, part of the Law School, may have a potential role in supporting the work of the South Bay campus, although this would need to be discussed further with an implementation committee.

2. Opportunities for short term development with less investment include a study abroad in LA program and/or a residential college model, and offering courses to UCLA students already located in the South Bay (as part of clinical rotations, for example).

**Study-abroad in LA program or residential college model**

An intriguing opportunity offered by the South Bay campus is the potential to provide our students with a residential college experience (multiple proposals, Appendix V). During discussions, the committee and surveyed stakeholders proposed self-contained experiences as a means to distinguish the campus and envision it as more than just a tool for expanding space. The committee deliberated on how to create unique experiences within this intimate setting that can only be realized within a smaller community. At various points in the discussion, this concept was likened to a "Travel Abroad in LA" program (Proposal 2, Appendix
V). This possibility presents the new campus as something distinctive and daring, capable of attracting students for a quarter or a full year. For instance, examples could include a language immersion campus (Proposal 1, Appendix V) where all courses are taught in Spanish, or a leadership program that combines a leadership academy with regular academics. Another idea is an arts immersion program that approaches all subjects from an artistic perspective, allowing creative projects to serve as the foundation for extended learning. Although this approach did not emerge as a primary recommendation, the committee believed it was valuable to have this option on the table, especially while considering long-term models.

Courses for local students
As many Westwood students disperse for the summer, there is an opportunity to offer summer session courses at the UCLA South Bay campus that can serve students who are more local to this campus. For example, students in the School of Nursing (SON) may be assigned to clinical rotations in the South Bay area, and would benefit from local course offerings. The proximity to frontline communities may also offer opportunities to students across many disciplines, including Public Health. Proximity to the POLA may be beneficial for those in the Labor Studies program. It may also serve local high school students interested in summer college courses.

Other interim measures
Other potential uses include space for faculty/department and other retreats, workspace for those living in the South Bay area, and co-working spaces for those who might wish to work there on a temporary or ad hoc basis. The JTF also heard, anecdotally, that there may be plans to hold a student leadership academy at the UCLA South Bay campus this summer or fall. While all of these measures may financially support the acquisition of the South Bay campus, the JTF warns of drift away from the academic mission. That is, the South Bay campus is not simply extra space, but rather should be used for unique programs that serve the academic mission that are not possible on the Westwood campus.

3) Ongoing evaluation of program success and student experience at the South Bay campus is critical

A committee should be established to review proposals for new academic programs at the South Bay campus. This committee should determine criteria for proposal selection, centering criteria on the academic mission. Furthermore, academic programs offered at the South Bay campus should be subject to periodic review. Evaluation of the success of the programs offered by the campus is critical for future planning and to ensure that the programs are not disadvantageous to students. Academic programs offered at the South Bay campus should be required to have a plan to evaluate their programs with respect to student outcomes, satisfaction of faculty, staff and students, and costs of implementation. These reports could be evaluated by an appointed committee or other experts if necessary (perhaps similar to program review). By reviewing applications for academic programming for the South Bay campus, the committee would be in an excellent position to report as to whether we were falling short of
maximizing student capacity at this campus and whether there is a need to offer incentives for faculty to teach at this campus. The JTF heard that there will be a student leadership academy held at the South Bay campus in August. Beginning evaluation with this academy may help to understand student experience at the new campus and inform future planning for it.

There is the possibility of the programs for the South Bay Campus falling short, either in terms of student satisfaction and success and/or of faculty being able to envision educational programs for this campus, or financial impacts. This makes clear that it will be necessary to ensure that the programs offered by the South Bay campus align with the future vision of UCLA. This will include assessing for the types of facilities needed on this campus and the level of renovations and investments needed to continue to develop programs on this campus.

4) **Consider whether this investment is still right for UCLA in both the short term and long term, given new financial pressures that emerged after the acquisition.**

Given the concerns noted above, combined with expected state fiscal challenges, increasing campus budget pressures resulting from the new UAW contracts, the limited capacity of the Villas, limited expressed interest from the UCLA community, the need for investment to bring the SouthBay campus into compliance (ADA), improve the properties so they are comparable to the UCLA Westwood campus, and the low probability of establishing a fully sustainable/zero carbon campus, it is worth considering whether this property serves UCLA in the way initially envisioned when purchased. We must seriously consider whether UCLA has the resources to develop this campus in a way that will serve the academic mission. the UCLA South Bay campus has the potential to redirect limited resources away from UCLA Westwood and adversely impact students, faculty and staff on both campuses.

---

**Important considerations**

*Regardless of the short and long-term plans, UCLA faculty, students, and staff need access to the South Bay campus in order to envision and develop programs.*

To realize the full potential of the South Bay campus, faculty, staff, and students need to be interested in and enthusiastic about how the South Bay campus might best serve the UCLA community and enhance our impact. Furthermore, the academic programs offered at the South Bay campus should be distinguished from those on the Westwood campus, and thus would entice the UCLA community to be engaged at the South Bay campus. As the primary driver of successful academic program, innovation and implementation, faculty should be appropriately incentivized to develop programs and teach at the campus. Neither the Joint Task Force nor UCLA administration are well-positioned to articulate the specific programs to be offered at the South Bay campus. Programs developed through a faculty generated and engaged process will have greater buy-in and success.
This Joint-Task Force envisions four key elements that are essential for development of education programs at the South Bay campus:

1. Provide faculty with the opportunity to visit the campus so that they can better envision academic uses for the campus.
2. Appoint a diverse committee representing a range of interested campus groups to review applications for educational programs for the campus. This committee would evaluate the strength and feasibility of the programs and how well the proposed program relates to campus themes.
3. Evaluate the effect of programs offered at the South Bay campus on students, faculty, and staff.
4. Assess the level of renovations and addition of facilities and partnerships required to successfully offer educational programs that align with UCLA’s mission, vision, and impact as a top public research university.

_The Joint Task Force is only the first step in determining academic programming for the UCLA South Bay Campus._

A new committee should be appointed to determine the specific set of academic programs for the new campus, and program capacity of the campus at various points in the academic and calendar year. We suggest that this committee solicit proposals from faculty, departments and other academic units for academic programs to be offered at the South Bay campus. This committee can determine which academic programs most align with the theme of the campus, and how programs from multiple disciplines might be woven together for a unified campus focus. The committee would develop and vet criteria to rate program feasibility, such as information on target student population and capacity. Programs will also determine students’ program of study that coordinates and compliments the UCLA South Bay campus program offerings and how courses for the full program of study would be accessed by students. Other criteria could include the length of the program (one quarter, one year, etc.) and the frequency at which program components would be offered.

_Regular transportation between the campuses is necessary_

UCLA faculty, students, and staff repeatedly voiced concerns to the JTF related to transportation between the South Bay and Westwood campuses. It is clear that the South Bay campus can accommodate more students than the Villas can house, and it is also clear that students who reside in the Villas will also need access to the Westwood campus. Transportation between the campuses needs to be provided daily, so that UCLA South Bay students can access Westwood as needed, and UCLA Westwood students have opportunities to learn and research at UCLA South Bay.

Furthermore, transportation between the Villas and the surrounding area also needs to be considered. At this time, the Villas are not permitted to provide hot food service. The area surrounding the Villas also lacks the amenities that UCLA students are used to. It is important to consider how students will access grocery stores, health care, gyms and other amenities similar to those provided on or available close to the Westwood campus.
Evaluation of the UCLA South Bay Acquisition and JTF process

Because the acquisition of the UCLA South Bay Campus was the first major expansion purchase for UCLA, the JTF recommends an evaluation of the acquisition process to inform planning for future UCLA campus expansion, including for how the newly purchased UCLA DTLA building will be utilized. A clear recommendation that flows from the work of the JTF, is that the academic planning for any new campus sites should be strategically planned prior to purchase, rather than after UCLA has acquired the property. While the UCLA South Bay campus has considerable potential for development for UCLA to emerge as a national and world leader in a sustainable urban ocean studies program that would advance rigorous teaching, learning, research, and policy on equitable climate solutions, there are many operational concerns about the campus and how it will best serve our campus community, most notably the lack of research space that is critical for a world-class research-intensive public university. Indeed, the significant investment required to achieve the long term vision was a critical concern for both the JTF and the UCLA community. Without the necessary fiscal resources, it is difficult to reconcile how to best use the campus to achieve an impactful academic program, as many interim solutions do not offer a unique, coherent, and coordinated academic focus and mostly contradict with the Academic Senate’s principles and parameters for campus expansion (Appendix II).
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Appendix I: Joint Task Force on the Academic Mission of UCLA Campus Expansion Charge

January 2023

This task force, jointly appointed by Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP) Hunt and Academic Senate Chair Cattelino, will consider optimal academic programmatic uses of the newly acquired UCLA campus expansion in Rancho Palos Verdes. The committee will lead a process of ideation and consultation to conceptualize an academic program for the campus expansion. Program ideas must be driven by the academic mission as well as UCLA's deep commitment to inclusive excellence, the UC 2030 enrollment goals, and financial feasibility. It will also consider broader principles and parameters, anchored in the Academic Senate's principles and parameters, for campus expansion. The committee’s work will culminate in a recommendation for long-term use of the campus to the Chancellor, EVCP, and Academic Senate Chair by the end of the 2022-23 Academic Year.

Membership:

Co-chairs:
Dean Tina Christie, Education & Information Studies
Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate

Members:
Scott Cummings, Professor, Law
Miguel Garcia-Garibay, Dean, Physical Sciences
Yolanda Gorman, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Chief of Staff
Brian Kite, Interim Dean, Theater, Film & Television
Beth Lazazzera, Associate Professor, Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics and former chair, Undergraduate Council
Muriel McClendon, Associate Professor, History
Megan McEvoy, Professor, Institute for Society and Genetics
Tina Treude, Professor, Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences & Atmospheric Oceanic Sciences
Appendix II: Campus Expansion Parameters and Principles

August 19, 2022

- **Academic focus.** Any campus expansion and related programs must serve the academic mission, and its direction and focus must be driven by the academic mission.

- **Ladder faculty hiring.** The hiring of additional ladder faculty will accompany any increase in student enrollment, not only to keep pace but also to restore the student-to-faculty ratio. Faculty hiring must be used to increase faculty diversity.

- **Equity and inclusion.** DEI principles and practices must be maintained in all aspects of campus expansion, including in determining access to programs and opportunities for students and instructors, and in relations with neighbors of new sites.

- **Shared governance.** The campus expansion process as well as any resulting sites and programs will be governed by the principles, policies, and practices of shared governance, subject to Academic Senate authority, and informed by the Academic Senate’s advisory role.

- **Continuity of education.** Education at an expansion site must be compatible with general education requirements and other requirements for teaching and learning.

- **Residency requirements.** As a residential university, UCLA will maintain residency requirements and determine how residence in Westwood relates to residence in an expansion site. This will preserve an equitable student experience.

- **Time at expanded campus.** Students will spend no more than one year at any campus expansion site.

- **Sustainability.** Whatever the thematic focus of a campus expansion, the development of a physical site should conform to UCLA’s sustainability goals, especially in light of the ongoing climate crisis.

- **Student mix.** A strategic plan will be developed for the mix of undergraduate and graduate students at an expansion site, and for transfer student success, to foster equity of educational opportunity and educational excellence. Graduate students’ participation should enhance their academic training, and not only offer employment as teaching assistants.

- **Support services.** Student and faculty support services (e.g., instructional, information technology, health, and accessibility) must be provided.

- **Public mission, relationship with Los Angeles.** Campus expansion will manifest UCLA’s public mission and strengthen UCLA’s relationship to Los Angeles.

- **A unified UCLA.** We are one faculty and one student body, and campus expansion should be designed to avoid separation or exclusion.

- **Westwood strong.** Campus expansion should not, over the long term, drain the Westwood campus of resources.

- **Build in Assessment.** Any campus expansion plan will include metrics and milestones for review of these metrics to determine whether the expansion meets the principles articulated above.
Appendix III: UCLA Expansion Campus Overview

The majority of the buildings are 1 & 2-story wood frame structures built in the 1950s. Initial assessments suggest that some of the buildings are considered low risk, and do not pose a significant life-safety risk.

Building Profile Summaries:

- Cecilia Hall: 30,252 sf built in 1964. A concrete U-shaped building with a landscaped exterior courtyard. The building has classrooms, a library, student offices, a student center, and renovated biology/chemistry labs. The building has many concrete shear walls, but some of the walls on the downslope side (two-story side) of the building do not align completely. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 836.

- Thomas D. Wood Building (TWD): 17,288 sf built in 1951 and expanded and modernized in 1990. This was the student union, student center, cafeteria/kitchen, conference and meeting room. The structure is two stories on the downslope side and is likely a combination of wood and steel framing. Most likely during the 1990 renovation, TWD incorporated the adjacent one-story wood frame Faculty Offices building (2,400 SF), also built in the 1951. Structurally, these buildings are considered one structure. The structure is supported by a slab-on-grade, rather than a crawl space. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 544.

- Administration Building: 9,450 sf built in 1951-58 with renovations in 1981/82. This housed Admissions, Human Resources, Registrar, Student Financial Services, and operations and IT support. A one-story building supported by a slab-on-grade, the exterior walls are reinforced brick masonry, and the roof is wood framed. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 221.

- The Commons Auditorium: 8,220 sf built in 1958 and renovated in 1989; a pool equipment storage was added in 1963. This building housed a multi-purpose auditorium, fireside room, swimming pool and patio area. This building has a high-bay, long-span auditorium with a stage at one end. The structure is supported by a slab-on-grade, rather than a crawl space. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 731.

- Oceanside Building: 7,346 sf built in 1951 with renovations done in the 1990s. Previously used as a convent, the building was renovated to accommodate faculty offices, conference room, and a computer lab. It is a concrete shear wall building that is two-stories on the downslope side. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 133.

- Chapel: 5,100 sf built in 1951 with renovations in 1959. The structure consists of two offices and a meeting room with the majority of the square footage dedicated to the chapel. A wood frame structure with wood siding, covered with stucco exterior over a partial basement. There are two-story glass windows at the entrance, and unique stained-glass windows with the sanctuary. The chapel has nine rows of stationary oak pews and a second-floor choir loft with additional seating. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 204.
● Athletics Offices and Classrooms: 6,646 sf built in 1956. Structure houses the athletic administrative offices, coaches’ offices, sports information director office, and classrooms. The building is a one-story wood frame structure with a slab-on-grade, rather than a crawl space. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 210.

● Bookstore and Wellness Center: 2,870 sf built in 1956. This structure houses the currently vacant bookstore and Wellness Center for student. The building is a one-story wood frame structure with a slab-on-grade, rather than a crawl space. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 44.

● Maintenance Facility and Athletic Training Room: 2,696 sf built in 1954 with renovations done in 1978 and 1987. The building is a one-story wood frame structure with a slab-on-grade, rather than a crawl space. Based on occupant load factors in CA Building Code Table 1004.5, maximum occupancy is approximately 44.

Current IT Capabilities

1.1 Overview of Services Offered

The following managed services will be provided throughout the student housing complex to both student units and administrative areas:

- Bulk High-Speed Internet: 500M/500M circuit, 3-year agreement
- Student Unit Bandwidth: 100Mbps+ symmetrical service*
- DirecTV Satellite Video: Bulk ENTERTAINMENT Package (see Exhibit C) plus HBO + Cinemax (19 channels), 5-year agreement
- Common Area: Managed Wi-Fi by Pool and Pavilion
- Managed Services: 24/7/365 Help Desk; 24-hour monitoring

* Note – Delivered bandwidth is only guaranteed over wired Ethernet port and subject to network congestion.
Appendix IV: Bruin Community Survey Findings

How familiar are you with the expansion of a new UCLA campus in the South Bay?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>How familiar are you with the expansion of a new UCLA campus in the South Bay?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all familiar (&quot;This is the first I am hearing of it&quot;)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat familiar (&quot;I have heard a little, but don't know much&quot;)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extremely familiar (&quot;I have attended a town hall, read the articles, etc&quot;)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you interested in attending (as a student), teaching (as a faculty or lecturer), or working (as staff) at the South Bay campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Are you interested in attending (as a student), teaching (as a faculty or lecturer), or working (as staff) at the South Bay campus?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremely interested</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

464 people said they are "extremely interested" in attending (as a student), teaching (as a faculty or lecturer), or working (as staff) at the South Bay campus...

- 56% are staff, 25% are students, 20% are faculty
- 35% of staff work at the medical center or hospital
- 22% of students and faculty are from the Social Sciences
- 60% live within 10 mi of South Bay
- 92% think climate change, sustainability and environmental justice should be the theme of the campus.
- Their top 3 amenities for the campus are transportation to westwood (39%), parking (34%), and gym/recreation center (30%)

Quotes:

- As a Marine Biology Major I think it is a great addition specially because we can be near the ocean and conduct labs. - student
- I could imagine launching a creative writing MFA program housed at the South Bay campus. - faculty
I live in RPV and cutting down my commute from the SouthBay to Westwood would be invaluable. As a RPV resident for more than a decade, I know the community and MCU campus very well. - faculty

- Proximity to diverse geographical settings and communities in LA County not well represented by the Westwood campus/nearby communities. - faculty
- Better affordable housing options as opposed to the price to live in West LA near the main campus. Also, opportunity to be a part of a new venture for UCLAs growth. - staff
- Smaller campus, smaller classes, opportunity for more creative instruction. - faculty

Do you currently live within 10 miles of Westwood or South Bay?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Do you currently live within 10 miles of Westwood or South Bay?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, within 10 mi of Westwood</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, within 10 mi of South Bay</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is interest in identifying a theme to define the South Bay campus. Given its proximity to the ocean, the port and Alta Sea, the theme being considered is climate change, sustainability and environmental justice. Do you think this is a good idea to further explore?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>There is interest in identifying a theme to define the South Bay campus. Given its proximity to the ocean, the port and Alta Sea, the theme being considered is climate change, sustainability and environmental justice. Do you think this is a good idea to further explore? - Selected Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No. If no, please explain:</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the following campus amenities, please select the top 3 that you would like the new South Bay campus to offer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Of the following campus amenities, please select the top 3 that you would like the new South Bay campus to offer: - Selected Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On-campus Dining</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lab Space</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gym/recreation center</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transportation to/from Westwood</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student health services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mental health services</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Outdoor community spaces</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Study space</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey demographics:**

Are you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Are you:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty (Department Chair, Professor, Lecturer)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student (Undergraduate, Graduate, Postdoctoral Scholar)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Student only) Please select your student classification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Please select your student classification:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholar</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Student only) What is your anticipated graduation year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>What is your anticipated graduation year?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2028 or later</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Faculty only) Please select your academic appointment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Please select your academic appointment: - Selected Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professor (includes clinical, visiting, and adjunct)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associate Professor (includes clinical, visiting, and adjunct)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (includes clinical, visiting, and adjunct)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Staff only) Which of the following best describes your unit on campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes your unit on campus: - Selected Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic affairs (ex: advising, academic department, library services)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business &amp; administrative services (ex: facilities, human resources, information technology)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medical center or hospital</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>External affairs (ex: public relations, alumni affairs, communications)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Which of the following are you affiliated with: Select all that apply</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Art and Architecture</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education and Information Sciences</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Business &amp; Management</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Theater, Film, and Television</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Continuing Education and UCLA Extension</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: Proposals for Academic Programs at UCLA South Bay

Deans and department chairs were invited to submit ideas for academic programming at UCLA’s newest campus, UCLA South Bay. An email was sent towards the end of May 2023 asking for submissions of innovative programs that foster new collaborations, enhance UCLA’s mission of public service, and bring academic excellence closer to diverse communities. Submissions needed to include creative/innovative ideas, outline academic content, identify target groups and the unique benefits of the proposed program, as well as a general overview for potential implementation. These were not to exceed two pages.

5 proposals were received:

Proposal 1
At last week’s College FEC meeting, former Chair Jeff Lewis was a guest, and members ended up asking him a few questions about plans for the new campus. Over lunch, we continued the conversation, along with Jen Hirashiki, the Academic Coordinator for Shared Governance and Educational Initiatives Undergraduate Education Initiatives (included here).

Part of the discussion involved the kinds of self-contained programs that might benefit from being located at the new campus. I mentioned that it would be interesting to have language immersion programs, similar to Middlebury College, that could train both UCLA students and faculty, but would likely also be popular with non-UCLA students, potentially creating a source of revenue. Jen immediately jumped in, expressing her enthusiasm and excitement about such a program (both Jen and I have backgrounds in second-language teaching).

In addition to providing immersion-based instruction in languages that students and faculty need for their research, or to prepare them for study abroad programs, this could also be a fora for offering Indigenous language classes (a special area of interest for me). This would not only be a way for UCLA to grow its Indigenous language instruction (as it stands now, out of the 52 languages that fulfill the "foreign" language requirement, only 2 are Indigenous languages (Nahuatl and Quechua), meaning that there are no Native North American languages being taught. Offering classes in the languages of Southern California (Tongva, Cahuilla, and Cupeño are especially well-documented), Mesomaerican languages with large populations in SoCal (Zapotec, Mixtec, and Mixe), in addition to languages spoken by Native groups moved to Southern California during the relocation period (Chickasaw, Lakota, and Cherokee are well-represented), would be a tangible way to recognize that UCLA is a land-grant institution, and to expand service to area tribes and peoples.

I recognize that this acquisition may end up serving as an investment property, but the amount of excitement generated during our informal discussion drove me to reach out. If you want to discuss any of this further, please don't hesitate to get in touch!
Proposal 2
Phase I (Short term) – identify simple streams of revenue; generate interest and awareness
- Create a ‘WeWork’-like, remote environment for UCLA students, staff, and faculty, open to all interested students, staff, and faculty. Establish a system to register and reserve workspace. Monitor demand and use, to inform next steps. Offer lab sections or even courses to see uptake and what kind of demand there is.
- Offer UCLA SB housing option to students/grads/postdocs/faculty. Not sure what it is like but schools in the SB are better than in WW and may be attractive to grad families/faculty. Given the separation between the SB campus and housing, may need to treat them as separate entities.
- Reserve 25% of facility for events, conferences, workshops for main campus, overflow, or for rent;
- Create a Grad/Postdoc facility (open to non-UCLA grads too) a la Woods Hole or Scripps with summer research training; teaching options; teacher training; intensive 5 week courses;
- ‘Jump-start’ summer camps for admitted highschoolers/transfers (offer GEs with lab); pair with outside the classroom activities (e.g., surf lessons, food theme tours, LA excursions)

Phase II (Medium term) – identify easy opportunities, reinvest in short term
- Study *abroad* locally: offer experimental/limited time certificates to students to study/live UCLA-SB for 1/2/3 quarters. Requires coordination with academic units to develop such courses and curricula. E.g., Society and AI; The post-pandemic city; Climate crisis, Data Science for XYZ; etc. Offer faculty incentives to develop and teach such courses.
- Create and/or offer 2/3 week intensive, in-residence versions of existing courses to alleviate pressure and reduce time to degree. Offer incentives to develop such courses and pair with outside activity (e.g., food tour, cooking, field trips). Will require rethinking housing options.
- Explore and solicit offers to partner with international institutions or visiting scholars, a ‘flash-campus’ where UCLA partners with another institution to create a limited-time program.

Long term – build upon learnings from Phase I and II
- Identify key ‘sponsoring’ units (e.g., preferably one from north and south campus; e.g., Engineering and Social Science). It cannot be everything to everyone, nor can it fulfill all objectives. Probably better to keep it focused and do a few things very well.
- Society and Innovation Institute; Asian Urbanisms; Center for Climate Crisis; Post-pandemic world
- Develop SSGP/UNEX courses in the evenings: Urban informatics; Sports Analytics; Climate Crisis Analysis; Society and AI certifications
- Create incentives and policy for faculty-in-residence or teaching sabbatical in-residence, work with ORL;
- Create a themed liberal arts-like experience for students to apply to, and for faculty to get involved (e.g., 3 courses about Los Angeles or any other topic in a single quarter or over an AY). Offer incentives to faculty.

Proposal 3
I appreciate the solicitation for feedback and suggestions for how to utilize the new
campus. As the undergraduate vice chair for the mathematics department I am deeply interested in the undergraduate experience at UCLA. At the same time, I think that the campus could provide new professional and graduate opportunities. Two important considerations are that whatever programs are installed at the new campus, will be too far from the main campus for students to take core classes, such as mathematics classes, that are offered on the main campus. So either these core classes need to be recreated on the new campus, or the new teaching program that is run on the new campus must not depend on these core classes. These factors shaped my suggestions, below.

Another note is that one of the challenges of recruiting faculty to UCLA is that faculty with school aged children struggle to find high quality public schools for their children (UCLA reacted to this by opening the Geffen Academy, but I'm not sure this is any kind of solution). Although San Pedro schools are not excellent, the new campus is located between two outstanding school systems (Long Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes), and within easy reach of southern Orange County, where many of our faculty already live. The opportunity to work at the new campus is likely to be highly popular for faculty recruitment and retention.

Three suggestions:
1. A one year residential honors college. I’d additionally propose honors to be interpreted, broadly, and that the college would support not just students with impeccable high school grades, multiple APs and community college classes, but also students with the highest potential who may have faced and overcome situational disadvantages to be admitted to UCLA. The honors college could be staffed by a combination of teaching staff, and main campus faculty with outstanding commitments to undergraduate education, who would do e.g. 3 year stints at the campus.
2. Siting a new program not currently present at the UCLA campus. A good example would be a veterinary school. There are only two veterinary science programs in California, and only one (Davis) within the UC system.
3. We could relocate one of the current professional schools down to the new campus. It would have to be a school that doesn't need the facilities or classes offered at UCLA Westwood: e.g. the Anderson School or the School of Law. Probably the Anderson School's donors would be resistant to the change, having already paid for its buildings.

Proposal 4
With the expansion of the UCLA campus to include the former Loyola Marymount campus, there may be an opportunity for creating an area where “classified” research can be performed. As an industry contract officer in UCLA’s Technology Development Group, we are seeing missed opportunities for UCLA to work with industry and the government due to the fact that there is no classified research space at UCLA. The University of Southern California has been conducting classified research at their ISI center in Marina Del Rey for some time now, and my colleague Sherrie Dennehy has previously worked for USC’s ISI handling their contracts.

Proposal 5
Professors Hinojosa Ojeda and Valenzuela (North American Integration and Development Center, NAID; and Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, IRLE) have been working together over the last three years with the UCLA Grand Challenge project on the
LA 100 Equity Strategies project that focuses helping LADWP design an equitable transition 100% renewable energy effort while enhancing its equity impact in the City of LA and the communities it serves.

We recently completed our technical report that focuses on the large data tracking and modeling of the equitable transition of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), as well as the transitions to a green jobs economy for the City and County of Los Angeles (see report). As a part of the technical report, the team conducted an in-depth community case study of Wilmington, CA. A comprehensive Community Engagement Approach was utilized to identify multiple pathways to community engagement and planning for energy, ecological, and environmental Justice Transitions with a primary focus on jobs and workforce development connected to LADWP investments, policies, and existing programs.

Arising from that interaction with the community, a proactive effort was launched to bring effective change to the community of Wilmington, CA. This effort brought the local Congresswoman Nanette Barragán into collaboration with the community, at which point plans, goals and strategy were established to help bring about effective change to Wilmington. It was collectively decided that a new non-profit be established to catalyze real change and improvement to the lives of the citizens of Wilmington.

This non-profit became known as the “Wilmington Harbor Project.” Arising out of that decision and strategy was the application for and receipt of a $4m grant from the Federal government to provide initial funding for this effort. The goal for the usage of this initial funding is to establish the Wilmington Harbor Project as a non-profit entity which will coordinate and drive planning for substantial job training, urban renewal, air quality monitoring, renewable energy production, citizen education and wellness and the purchase of a permanent community center building, on the East side of Wilmington – which currently has no community facilities, gyms, meeting centers – at all.

Planning is currently underway to develop a Cleantech Job training program (or find existing training programs that can come int Wilmington), micro-hydro power energy generation systems and a collaboration with LACI (https:// laincubator.org/) – to both test and evaluate various LACI incubated cleantech startups and technology.

A key goal for this first tranche of Federal non-profit funding is in the application for and procurement of additional grants and funding that would be utilized in further funding Job training and cleantech evaluation, but also the production of a full fledged Sustainable Digital City project. The Wilmington, CA non-profit could greatly benefit from utilizing some of the facilities at the new UCLA South Bay campus.

According to the C40 agreements established in the Paris Agreement, which was signed by the United Nations in December 2015, Los Angeles and 93 other densely populated cities pledged to take actions to combat climate change by creating sustainable, low-carbon cities. The C40 cities aim to raise climate ambition, influence the global agenda, build a movement, and scale up climate action. Los Angeles has an urgent need to allocate funds effectively while transitioning to a just, sustainable, and equitable distribution for green jobs, to build environmentally friendly green infrastructure, and to move towards 100% renewable energy investment with zero emissions.

UCLA should allocate certain amounts of resources, classroom and meeting space and other benefits associated with the UCLA South Bay campus to the Wilmington Harbor Project.
non-profit to assist the non-profit in achieving its goals.

In addition to the previously stated existing goals of the Program (Cleantech Job Training, LACI collaboration, purchase of a community center building) the Wilmington Harbor Project could vision utilizing the UCLA South Bay campus for the following programs and efforts. These efforts would be entirely executed by the community itself. What UCLA can do – is provide educational space, meeting rooms and support:

- Provide meeting space for regular Community meetings, including fund raising, educational programs and board meetings.
- Development of a wide range of courseware and curriculum – to be utilizing in training local community members
- Computer Lab for community members to gain access to computers and the Internet.
- Execution of extensive training programs; ranging from social media and podcasting to renewable energy rebate training, nutritional and wellness skills development and basic office job skills
- Gig economy support for small businesses; ranging from financial management training, mentoring and fulfillment support.
- Provide a center for micro-mobility deployment and management. Shuttle services, school bus routes and events-oriented carpooling.

In addition to providing access to the physical plant at the UCLA South Bay campus, we envisage a wide range of potential collaborative efforts between UCLA IRLE and NAID centers – and the Wilmington Harbor Project non-profit. In particular - focusing in on various kinds of Research, Teaching and Policy Development could reap huge benefits not only for UCLA, but for the surrounding Wilmington community! As a fair and equitable resolution is reached in alleviating the citizens of Wilmington’s current nightmare, UCLA can find itself right at the fulcrum or nexus of effective change in that area of Los Angeles. We believe that the UCLA South Bay campus can become a valuable asset and center of the Wilmington Harbor Project community.