UNITED	STATES DIS	STRICT	COURT
CENTRAL	DISTRICT (OF CAL	IFORNIA
(WESTERN	DIVISION -	- LOS Z	ANGELES

) CASE NO: 2:22-cv-08357-DOC-KS JEFFREY POWERS, ET AL,) Plaintiffs, CIVIL))) Los Angeles, California vs. DENIS RICHARD MCDONOUGH, Friday, October 25, 2024 ET AL, (8:19 a.m. to 9:37 a.m.) (11:43 a.m. to 12:06 a.m.)) Defendants. (12:18 p.m. to 12:32 p.m.)

HEARING RE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE PAGE 2

Court Reporter: Recorded; CourtSmart

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 8365

Corpus Christi, TX 78468

361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs: ROMAN M. SILBERFELD, ESQ.

Robins Kaplan

2121 Avenue of the Stars

Suite 2800

Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-552-0130

MARK ROSENBAUM, ESQ.

Public Counsel

610 S. Ardmore Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90005

213-385-2977

For Defendants: BRAD P. ROSENBERG, ESQ.

CODY T. KNAPP, ESQ. TAYLOR PITZ, ESQ.

U.S. Department of Justice

1100 L Street NW Washington, DC 2005

202-514-3374

Also present: CHELSEA BLACK

RAYMOND CARDOZO CASEY CURTIS

TOBIN DALE

DONALD DERMIT KELLY FARRELL JOHN HUESTON RANDY JOHNSON

JOHN KUHN

JONATHAN SANDLER STEVE SOBOROFF

```
5
1
    work with you on that.
 2
              MR. ROSENBERG:
                              Yes --
 3
              THE COURT: And you know that now.
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- I appreciate that --
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 6
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- and I just want to be up front
 7
    with the Court about, you know, where we anticipate --
 8
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 9
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- this going.
10
              THE COURT: We'll have a side conversation, so it's
11
    not part of the record.
12
              Well it's as simple as this, are we moving forward on
13
    these modulars or not? It's a very simple question. Right now
14
    I haven't granted a stay, and I can't anticipate what I would
15
    do, but you might think if I've already declared an emergency
16
    what might the judge do?
17
              MR. ROSENBERG: So, Judge --
18
              THE COURT:
                           If I do this as an emergency what might
19
    my ruling -- and I'm just kidding you for a moment, but I'm
20
    not -- what would a Court normally say if I believe that this
21
    is a true emergency about a further stay?
22
              MR. ROSENBERG: Well I think where we are is that we
23
    do intend to seek a stay of that aspect of the Court's orders,
24
    and if the Court does not grant the stay --
25
              THE COURT:
                           Exactly.
```

MR. ROSENBERG: -- then we would seek a stay from the Ninth Circuit, and we do need to allow enough time for the Ninth Circuit to be able to reach a decision before we reach a point of irreparable harm. So we --

THE COURT: Here's what I going to do. I truly believe that this is an emergency, I believe the inclement weather is coming, and I think that veterans are going to not only suffer, have hardships, and potentially die.

Until I get a stay from the Ninth Circuit this case goes forward, because I have jurisdiction at the present time. So maybe we're wasting a couple days, maybe we'll get a stay, but right now I have no stay from the Ninth Circuit, we go forward. This is an emergency.

Okay, now we have all sorts of problems that are occurring, but Ms. Black, I'm really dependent upon you, you're the person on the front line.

One of the issues concerns the infrastructure and what isn't -- is not known about this site, but at the same token I've always wondered why we couldn't work on parallel tracks at the same time. Why when we were looking at the infrastructure on magenta B, 7-4A, and remember 4A is only chosen by the Court because all of you agreed that 5 on the north campus was unacceptable, otherwise I would have chosen 5. So 4A is really by agreement of all of you.

Why can't we work in parallel? In other words, why

that

```
10
1
    in America, and we want to keep going.
 2
              THE COURT: Well you got to the parties and to the
    Circuit --
 3
 4
              MR. SOBOROFF: Okay.
 5
              THE COURT: -- and this matter so far we're going
 6
    forward.
 7
              MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, there's two other areas that we
    need to continue to make process on, and I think that Kelley
 8
    from Gensler can talk basically --
10
              THE COURT: Okay., but I want to take -- excuse me --
11
    I want to take them one at a time.
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yeah, that's right. The first part is
12
13
    the --
14
              THE COURT: Specifications for RV modular units that
15
    would help inform the VA procurement process.
16
              MR. SOBOROFF: She'll go through that process, that
17
    was done collaboratively with the VA and the results are
18
    phenomenal.
19
              THE COURT: Okay.
20
              MR. SOBOROFF: Kelley?
21
              THE COURT: And what is missing here?
22
              MS. FARRELL: We're -- we've asked for and --
23
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Introduce your --
24
              MS. FARRELL: -- we should have it by the end of
25
    today --
```

```
1 MS. FARRELL: We are getting that done today.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Now hold on, I'm going put -- got 3 done today. And we have an afternoon hearing on a different

4 matter, but trust me, I'll break into that hearing --

MS. FARRELL: Right.

2.3

THE COURT: -- this is important.

The preferred vendor, Cavco, was to be contacted to determine its capacity to deliver 50 to 100 modular units. And remember I didn't put that requirement on you, I anticipated that we might have different manufacturers, but I had hoped that we would have like the same manufacturer on the same site, so whether it was 4A, but you don't have the requirement of offering the same vendor. So where do we stand with the preferred vendor, Cavco, or should be contacted to determine its capacity to deliver 50 to 100 modular units?

MS. FARRELL: The vendors confirm their capacity to deliver 50 units, and they are scheduling their capacity to deliver the complete 100, and I believe you guys had a conversation with them as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, give me a time frame. Like the 50 units -- the first 50 units -- I'm going the repeat back to you -- they can deliver 50 units and they need some additional time for the additional 50 units.

MS. FARRELL: Yeah, they can deliver the first 50 units readily within the 90-day time frame.

```
1
   go to the yard and start manufacturing.
```

2 MS. BLACK: Three weeks is already a very aggressive 3 timeline to get contracting.

THE COURT: I know that, that's not my -- I'm going 4 5

> MS. BLACK: Uh-huh.

repeat it like a broken record.

THE COURT: You need that three weeks.

MS. BLACK: We need the three weeks.

THE COURT: All right, okay.

Develop and share cost estimates for decking and trenching as site preparation options. What's that?

12 MS. FARRELL: So two -- two things need to happen.

13 Not only do we need the units, but we also need utilities,

14 sanitation, water to the units for them to be operational.

We are investigating two solutions. One the approximate cost to trench and put in utilities at the site, and the other to put a deck that runs above utilities laid on the ground so that the units have water, sanitary, and

electric. 19

6

7

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

We got that request on Wednesday evening, we have a team coming out to the site on Monday, and we're scheduling time with Andrew to get a collaborative team there.

THE COURT: I tell you from both you I'm baffled, and I represent to you that I've literally watched two congregate shelters with the same problem, and one similar shelter to use

```
1 | go up in 30 days with these same problems, and that's why I'm
```

- 2 baffled, okay? If I hadn't seen it I wouldn't say it, and if I
- 3 | got Michelle Martinez down here she could describe how that was
- 4 | done or Anaheim. So that's my baffling of this. I'm really
- 5 baffled by it. All right?
- 6 First of all we can truck in showers, we can truck in
- 7 toilets, we can get sewage over land, you don't have to trench,
- 8 | you can trench later on, this is an emergency, you've already
- 9 got lighting at the stadium for god sakes, go out and look at
- 10 | it again. This is not hard.
- Okay, so what do we need to do for our decking? And
- 12 | I'm not going to require trenching, that's something that we
- 13 can come back and do.
- 14 MS. FARRELL: Great.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Okay?
- 16 MS. FARRELL: And as I said, we have teams that are
- 17 | going to be there on Monday so that we can expedite that.
- 18 THE COURT: Okay, then I'm back in session on Monday
- 19 and all of you folks are back, so.
- 20 MS. FARRELL: I'll be walking the site.
- 21 **THE COURT:** All right. Develop and share -- so
- 22 Monday -- now, do we need to order or can we get or are you
- 23 | working so well together that we can get the engineers in here?
- 24 Because my guess is you really don't know a lot about that
- 25 parking lot except it's paved, you've got lighting nearby,

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MS. BLACK:
                     I'm just answering the question in terms
of what I asked the plaintiffs to produce. In terms of their
specifications they -- they expressed that they had some
particular items that they would like to include in a scope for
the utilities and site prep, I've asked --
          THE COURT: Just one moment --
                     -- that they provide that to us.
          MS. BLACK:
          THE COURT:
                     What are those? I want specificity.
          MS. FARRELL:
                        The specificity is capacity of water,
sewer, and power. Those are the items that we looked for in
the site prep, and also confirmation of the soils that we don't
have any environmental hazards or any liquefaction in the soil.
         MS. BLACK: And one note on that, I'd also like to
see what we're asking these particular consultants to do,
because as part of what I read in that order it's asking the VA
to allow for these consultants to excavate, so we need to
understand what the scope of work is going to be.
          MS. FARRELL:
                        Yeah.
          THE COURT: I'm going repeat back to both of you. I
don't want perfect, I want good.
          MS. FARRELL: Agreed.
          THE COURT: And I don't want perfect standing in the
way of good. This is an emergency.
          So you can take out the trenching, you can take out
all the bells, lights, and windows (sic), I want these modulars
```

up, because we're trying to get veterans out of inclement
weather.

So knowing that, how are we going to focus on this meeting without all these side, you know, wonderful bells, lights, and whistles, we can come back and trench frankly. We can get generators put there if you wanted to quite frankly, and you don't even need to go overhead. You don't know this, but another job I used to have was climbing power polls, okay? Yeah. So I know this can be done.

MS. FARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: You can run generators out there if you 12 want to.

MS. FARRELL: So You Honor, yes, the reason for the site walk on Monday is to literally get the right people on the ground so that we can move at pace.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Black, I don't want to waste your time. You're going to give them specifics today that you absolutely need, and they're going to work with you cooperative as they have, and that way I'm not running you back and forth, and that way we'll know what you're asking of the engineering.

And you have to decide what you're going to do. If you're going demand trenching or you want trenching, fine. How much longer is that going to take? If you're going to run this over land, Ms. Black needs to know, okay?

Now, what about are we going to run into any

4

5

6

8

9

17

25

```
1
    surprises out there? Because I thought we had all of these
    environmental reports, we certainly put in a baseball stadium
 3
    out there, what's the potential hazard of that parking lot
    either magenta B or 7? Any prior studies on it?
              MR. JOHNSON:
                           No, but we want to confirm that.
              THE COURT: And how do you do that?
 7
              MR. JOHNSON: We have an environmental engineer, you
    know, look at the contaminants of what's been listed in the
    area, then we look at a methane engineer also.
10
    environmental engineer could -- he could probably do both.
11
              THE COURT: Do we put a monitor on the property of
12
    some kind?
13
              MR. JOHNSON: Well they'll figure out if there's an
14
    issue to be addressed, but it gets a little bit into soil
15
    testing, you know --
16
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. JOHNSON: -- so there's going to be the need to
18
    do some borings. We just don't want a surprise, Judge.
19
              THE COURT: Well and I don't want blod (sic) wordage
20
    from now on, I want to know absolutely specifics what the VA
21
    needs, otherwise you're going to be here a long time.
22
              MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Judge, can I mention one thing
23
    if we can go backwards just to the units themselves and the
24
    purchase order?
```

Uh-huh.

THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

arguments on Wednesday.

```
MR. JOHNSON: Cavco is willing to do a purchase order
and get started on this, but if the -- they're going to want
ironclad quarantees that the appeal is not going to risk their
payment for these units.
          THE COURT: But Brad said that they'd pay for it.
          MR. JOHNSON: Okay.
          THE COURT: So Brad, you going back on your word or
you're going keep your word?
          MR. ROSENBERG:
                         That's a mischaracterization of what
I said. What I said was that the VA will make every effort to
comply with this Court's orders, but we intend to file a motion
to a stay pending appeal. We cannot obviously grant ourselves
a stay, that's a decision for you as the judge to make or for
the Nineth Circuit to make.
          One of the issues that we're going to raise is that
paying for these units would constitute an irreparable harm to
VA because of the other cuts and impacts on the budget that it
will have.
          THE COURT: Your arguments going to be with $360
billion or $407 billion that this is irreparable harm, the cost
you can't even equate?
          MR. ROSENBERG: We'll submit our motion --
          THE COURT: Which have to be de minimis.
          MR. ROSENBERG: We'll submit our motion detailing our
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: I really want to understand this. For
modular homes and you've already purchased tiny homes, so
you're certainly not even in the same debate of whether these
are permanent or not. Okay. Well that's your choice.
     (Pause)
          THE COURT: What about the RV ownership? You go over
to page 3, and I was caught by surprise on lines 4 through 11.
A discussion of the following topics to be completed by the VA.
Research requirements related to RV ownership re: licensing,
registration, motor home vehicles at DMV. What's that all
about? That has nothing to do emergency modular homes.
          MS. BLACK: You want to take that?
          So we were informed that the modular structures from
Cavco require registration with the DMV, and so we need to
understand how to implement that.
          THE COURT: My apologies, that was a great education
for me. DMV now has to register these?
                     That is correct, that's what we
          MS. BLACK:
understand, so we're going to work through and understand how
that's accomplished.
          THE COURT: Do we have any understanding how that's
accomplished?
         MS. FARRELL: Seems pretty procedural, and the
manufacturer can be a part of getting that done with us.
                                                         It's
```

a form that gets filled out and submitted.

```
Share information re: vendor registration
1
              THE COURT:
 2
    and VA tungsten system. Help me, what's that?
 3
              MS. FARRELL: Already shared, and that's their
 4
    SAM.gov registration information.
 5
              MS. BLACK:
                          It is with an added component. Cavco
    needs to get into the VA tungsten system, and that's required
 6
 7
    to issue them payment. That's not insurmountable.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
 9
              Finish research on any additional modular unit
10
    vendors and incorporate research and do draft scope of work for
11
    VA procurement process. Help me.
12
              MS. BLACK: So the VA team is continuing to also vet
13
    vendors, again, trying to fill the gap of the specifications to
14
    be included in the procurement package. That's our action.
15
              THE COURT: And what do you need, anything?
16
              MS. BLACK: We continue to put together the
17
    procurement package for these units, and as we discussed
18
    before, the plaintiffs' team will provide that information.
19
              I think the added caveat before coming here is the
20
    understanding if Cavco can deliver the entire 100 units, if not
21
    then we need to source additional vendors.
22
              MS. FARRELL: We believe they'll be able to supply
23
    the 100 units. I'm happy to go check in on their process this
24
    morning and report back.
```

And continue to refine the scope

Okay.

THE COURT:

of work for site operations, including transitional housing services, security grounds, and custodial services, food services.

I'd always assumed that the food would be prepared by the VA. I'd always assumed that the security would be obviously supplied by the VA. I know that there was a representation you had 89 officers, but you really needed 119 or something, I forget the figures, but you needed more. I didn't see that as holding up the actual on-site preparation and installation of the modular units. These are also services that shouldn't be sequential, they should be worked out as we build these.

MS. BLACK: It's a concurrent action being taken by the VA to secure contracts for supportive services for the site, and security is provided via contract, meals are provided via contract, janitorial monitor services and clinical care as well, and that needs to be a concurrent action, because those services need to be in place once those modular units are in place and opened.

THE COURT: Now, does this appeal have any effect on Brentwood? I want to think through this for a moment.

Remember, Brentwood is not a party, they're not an intervenor, and when you take an appeal -- and I've got a representative of Brentwood here, so come on up, this might be of interest to you -- we worked out what we think the veterans are very

pleased with and Brentwood is very pleased with, and once you take this appeal, does that put Brentwood then in the position, since you are the representative here, you are the party, of not being able to go forward with the settlement that they've worked out?

Let's think through that for a moment, okay? And I'm just going the remain silent, Brentwood is here and just make your -- I want to know if this is going to affect what I think the veterans want and what Brentwood wants and the Court has already given preliminary approval about. Because it's the VA here whose the party, and once they appeal I would imagine that they're appealing on behalf of Brentwood, city parking, and UCLA, because I have not allowed intervention by UCLA. So I'd kind of like to have an answer to that.

MR. ROSENBERG: So this is Brad Rosenberg from the Department of Justice.

As I mentioned previously, we'll be filing our stay motion by Wednesday of next week, and that will set forth the elements of the Court's decisions that we are seeking to stay.

At a high level the Government does intend to seek a stay on both the housing and the land use claims. We do not intend to seek a stay of this Court's invalidation of the leases, but we do intend to seek a stay of this court's injunction precluding VA from renegotiating those leases.

THE COURT: I thought that my order was clear that I

```
31
1
    was precluding you from renegotiating ten-year leases, that
 2
    there's every probability and possibility of one-year leases if
    we aren't using for instance or don't need a particular parcel
 3
 4
    or in UCLA's case we'll discuss that later today. Is UCLA
 5
    present?
 6
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Are they here?
              MR. ROSENBERG:
                               No.
 9
              MR. SILBERFELD:
                              No.
10
              THE COURT: All right. So what does that mean in
11
    plain language?
12
              MR. ROSENBERG: I think I explained --
13
              THE COURT: No, you didn't.
14
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- in as plain language as I could.
              THE COURT: You talk like a lawyer, now we're going
15
16
    to talk like the public for a moment.
17
              MR. ROSENBERG: It could -- I mean it could --
18
                          Are you going to allow this settlement to
              THE COURT:
19
    go forward with Brentwood?
20
              MR. ROSENBERG: As I indicated during the last couple
21
    of hearings we objected to that settlement, including in
22
    particular the requirement and this Court's injunction that VA
2.3
    enter into a new lease with Brentwood.
24
              THE COURT: Of one year. And why? Do you want a
25
    multi-year lease?
```

And that way it's not -- you know, maybe

```
1
    you two have can an discussion and help the Court with this,
 2
    because there's also been threatened litigation by Brentwood
    against the VA, and that's going to get very interesting as
 3
    this spirals up if we don't have a settlement.
                                                     Which is the
 4
 5
    very thing by the way that the VA apparently Mr. McKendrick
     (phonetic) feared along the way was getting sued, which led to
 6
 7
    some of these absurd leases. Okay.
          (Pause)
                          First of all we're back on the record,
10
    and I'm going to refer you back to the transcript of October
11
    18th, pages 41 and 42, and in a discussion with the Court, with
12
    all counsel present at the table, VA representatives present,
13
    starting at line 5.
14
              And so I think that in the long run Mr. Soboroff you
    may be right and we may have to or want to add to it, but maybe
15
16
    that's the family situation with 56 of these a year or two from
17
    now set aside for families. I haven't made a ruling, but I'd
18
    encourage you two to come to a compromise, and once again I'm
19
    going to ask because I didn't get an answer, is the VA going to
20
    pay for this?
21
              Ms. Black, I believe we're going to find the funding,
22
    we want to do this.
23
              The Court, fair enough.
24
              And Ms. Black, and we want to move forward if
```

possible.

The Court, tremendous, thank you.

If you say that isn't a representation of funding, if you want to put lawyer like words around it, but I believe with you sitting there, Brad, that that's a representation that you're going to fund it.

MR. ROSENBERG: I don't dispute that that's in the transcript. Whether the VA will comply with this Court's orders, which of course as I've repeatedly said it will make every effort to do, is a different question from this harm that will befall VA if it finds that funding, what services will need to be cut, what other sacrifices will need to be made that could impact veterans.

THE COURT: I also thought we had an agreement initially of about 230 units. In other words, we went through and talked about doing these sequentially because I was concerned in case the Court was overbuilding in terms of the temporary. And I'll go back in the transcript and pull it for you again, but I believe that there was if not an implicit but certainly overt agreement that we were going to make an attempt at -- by 230 units.

Now after that this emergency came into play and the Court wanted another 56 additionally, plus 50, and that's when we got into a discussion of magenta B, parcel 7, and then the Court wanted to go to 5 and all you convinced me that the domiciliary was close by and that left no option and the last

1 paved parking lot of going to 4A.

Now, I'm going to pull those transcripts for you later today, you can pull them yourselves, but from the Court's perspective this is representation by the VA. So I understand your position legally, but in terms of moving forward I intend to hold you to this unless the Circuit stays this matter and we're going move forward.

So what's going to happen though to Brentwood? I'm really curious, because I know that behind the scenes there's threatened litigation, you suing the VA in case this settled. I wanted to head that off quite frankly. And also I really believed in preliminarily approving the settlement that this was a real benefit to the veterans and a real benefit for Brentwood.

I think it allowed your school in a since to go forward, facilities, these would be the last touched, and I thought that this was so beneficial for both parties that in reality, without making representation, that there's a good chance we would never touch these facilities.

I only insisted on the year because if something was going wrong we could readjust that, but I think we were all in good faith.

Now if the VA is appealing you are not a party in a sense, they represent you, and so now up an appeal we go, and so Brad, what's your position, are you -- once again I'd love

1 to hear this.

MR. ROSENBERG: Well we don't represent Brentwood, I

want to be clear about that, the Department of Justice

represents the interests of the United States.

In terms of the impact on the proposed settlement between plaintiffs and Brentwood to which VA, as the Court knows, is not a party, the Government --

THE COURT: Are you going to be objecting to it?

MR. ROSENBERG: We objected to it. We did object to it on the record.

THE COURT: And so on final settlement I can anticipate you'll be objecting to it also.

MR. ROSENBERG: I mean well the Court will be holding a fairness hearing, you know, at the preliminary fairness hearing I believe I reiterated the Government's prior objections to the injunction that the Court was entering in conjunction with the settlement agreement, that among other things, would require VA to negotiate a lease under the settlement agreement's terms with the Brentwood school, and it also contained, among other things, various provisions involving this Court's oversight of this litigation in a manner that was far beyond what was in the Court's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and final opinion. And I noted at the time that that would have been an error because the injunctive relief that the Court was entering regarding the issue of the

```
Brentwood school was far broader than necessary to address the issues relating to the Brentwood school.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn to Brentwood or to the plaintiffs for any additional comments, and then see if the special master has any thoughts.

MR. SILBERFELD: So very plainly, Your Honor, the appeal and the stay motion that the Government intending to file from a discussion we had, will definitely impact the future of the Brentwood settlement, and that's about as much as we know not having seen the stay motion yet, but the representation is that it will -- the stay motion will cover and the appeal that's been filed will cover the Brentwood settlement and its future procedural and substantive outcome.

THE COURT: Let me turn to Brentwood school. If you have thoughts, so be it, if not then we'll move on.

MR. SANDLER: Just for a moment, Your Honor. And obviously this is coming at all of us at the last minute and very quick.

Number 1, as far as Brentwood is concerned we have a settlement in place, there's a class settlement, its reached preliminary approval. I understand the VA is going file an appeal -- or has filed an appeal and we'll seek stay.

Brentwood is going to move forward right now as if the settlement is --

THE COURT: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

do this.

```
MR. SANDLER: -- going to go forward on November --
and be approved by this Court on November 13th, that is our
hope, that is our plan, that's what we want, we think it's in
the best interest of the veterans and of the school.
          THE COURT:
                     Okay, let's do this then, let's leave
this waiting for the emergency stay requested by the VA.
it's granted that resolves it, if it's not granted by the Court
then we'll move towards that fairness hearing. The VA can then
decide if they're going to take the same position opposing this
as they previously did. Okay? I think it's about the best all
of us could do today, but let's move forward. Okay, all right.
     (Pause)
          THE COURT: You know I'm required, John, do you have
any thoughts, Mr. Hueston?
          MR. HUESTON: I have nothing to add.
          THE COURT: Okay. What time would you like the Court
to reconvene so that you can make these calls, you know, to
Gensler, et cetera? I'm in session this afternoon starting
about 1:00 or 1:30, but I'll break in briefly as long as I can,
but we're back now, we're going to sit here until we get this
moving and get these answers.
          MR. SILBERFELD: How is 11:30 this morning, Your
Honor?
```

I've got CourtSmart, I'm going to send my staff to

THE COURT:

11:30 sounds perfect. Now, why don't I

```
1
    lunch, but I can work through the lunch hour, so that way
 2
    you're not, if we can accomplish something quickly before the
 3
    afternoon hearing that way those parties aren't inconvenienced
    and you folks aren't inconvenienced, okay? But you will be
 4
 5
    back in this court on Monday at 3 o'clock.
 6
              MR. SILBERFELD: 3 p.m.
 7
              THE COURT: That's an order of all parties.
                                                            I'm
    going to cancel some other things I had planned. And I'd
 8
 9
    encourage you to get that request to the Court as quickly as
10
    possible, because you're going to be here until I get that
11
    emergency stay request. So if you can get it to me Monday, so
12
    be it, if you can get it to my Tuesday I think I need to
13
    resolve that as quickly as possible, but we'll be in session
14
    now because we're now in continuous session until we get this
15
    thing moving. Okay? So I'll see you at 11:30.
16
                         I'm sorry, Judge, you said Monday at what
              THE CLERK:
17
    time?
18
              THE COURT:
                          3 o'clock. Now, if UCLA -- Brad, stick
19
    around for just a second, counsel stick around. Is UCLA here?
20
              MR. SILBERFELD:
21
              MR. ROSENBERG:
                             No.
22
              THE COURT: Okay. They've been invited to attend.
23
    You've seen my ruling concerning the client, their request for
24
    intervention, but also I'm encouraging their participation, and
25
    I want to talk out with you the following.
```

```
41
1
    record reflect I've got the finest counsel in the world
 2
    present.
 3
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One percent.
 4
              THE COURT: One percent, exactly. One percent?
 5
              MR. ROSENBERG: And the record was that --
              THE COURT: A little closer. No, just move -- who
 6
 7
    drafted this? Instead of a bureaucracy, I'd like to know the
 8
    name of the person in the VA who constructed one percent
 9
    inflation rate on a UCLA lease for ten years. Mr. Kuhn, did
10
    you?
11
              MR. KUHN: Come up with the one percent inflation?
12
              THE COURT: Yeah, one percent? You don't like it and
13
    weren't near that, you didn't do that, did you?
14
              MR. KUHN: Not one percent, no.
              THE COURT: No, not one percent, but it's one percent
15
16
    in that lease isn't it? 2016 lease?
17
              MR. KUHN: The lease is long before -- made long
18
    before I got here.
19
              THE COURT: One percent? Who did this, folks? By
20
    name. Not a bureaucracy, who constructed this lease? Now
21
    between 2016 or 2022 do you know what your inflation rate was?
22
    Google it, 19.86 percent.
23
              MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, may I while your folks
24
    are Googling that.
25
              The testimony, as I recall when I was questioning
```

negotiated that very well for UCLA.

Mr. DeFrancisco, was I asked him, has he ever heard anything
like one percent actual, and he said, no, and then I said to
him, well what do you think about that, and he said, somebody

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely, but we don't have that 6 person who negotiated very well.

And what I'm wondering is this, there's fraud taking place in this time period, and that fraud is a person who's being bribed at the VA. That was a sole contractor or sole negotiator at the time on behalf of the VA. Now, he may have already left the employment. Is this the same gentleman who's negotiating the lease with UCLA? Not that UCLA is, you know, liable or implicated in that way, but what's happening here? Do I have a sole negotiator with safe park who's taking bribes and it's the same person negotiating with UCLA or oil or anybody else? I'd like to get that question answered, maybe not.

MR. ROSENBERG: We also don't know if UCLA proposed the one percent and the Government went along for reasons that Your Honor is exploring right now. But I don't think there's a person in this room who thinks that that one percent was a reasonable number.

THE COURT: Well so hold up your hand. Put you hand down, Mr. Soboroff, I thought you were going to ask for something else, but anybody think one percent is reasonable,

```
43
1
    just hold up your hand. Rather ridiculous isn't it? Okay --
 2
              MR. ROSENBERG: And that's built on a foundation
    where for years and years they were paying $56,000 --
 3
              THE COURT: Okay, now watch --
 4
 5
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- which doesn't even get you a
 6
    studio apartment in Brentwood.
 7
              THE COURT: -- UCLA has immediately jumped their
    offer from 300,000 to 600,000, so a Court might think, you
 8
 9
    know, in good faith on their part they're starting to
10
    negotiate, and I don't find by the way that that's the
11
    predominant focus standard that's been met moving from 300,000
12
    to 600,000, because it's the land that may be valuable if
13
    needed for long-term supportive housing, that's the true value,
14
    but still they've come back with an offer.
15
              And what I'm curious about is they want to have
16
    access to the stadium, but hopefully we're going to have
17
    construction taking place. If we're not going to use that
18
    stadium until June or July as they're offering to do, in other
19
    words their offer back to you is, and you're the VA now,
20
    because you're the party that decides this apparently, we're
21
    willing to double the offer from 300,000 to 600,000, we would
22
    like to use it temporarily through June or July, unbeknownst to
23
    them though we have construction taking place around their
24
              Is that a reasonable offer on their part?
    stadium.
```

It's certainly better than what we're

MR. KUHN:

1 getting now.

not finding that that's the predominant focus, but I'm also wondering if we have a lingering asset there that if we're letting \$600,000 go by in this temporary period of time, and in doing that I'm wondering if we're not going to use it -- now if we are that's a different matter, and if you're going to request on the plaintiffs' part that we razz that stadium and spend seven and a half million dollars to do it that's money went spent, then I'd like to hear that, I'm going consider that.

Number 2, I don't want this to go past June or July if access was granted because I don't know what the future need is, which is why I've asked for some sequential input from you about which lot is going to be used next. Because if the UCLA is the last lot of the four or five lots then we're -- we got \$600,000 that we could use.

And how are they going to get egress or access to that in a construction zone, which the VA would have to work out? And I would think many would believe that there'd have to be a liability waive on their part to use it.

I'm not too worried about parking because UCLA parks trucks -- or busses everybody to the Rose Bowl, and frankly they don't have enough fans during regular games at baseball, parking is not an issue, it's right across the street.

And what I was going to ask them today, and maybe John, we could call them again, okay, first of all they got 32

24

```
but I don't like walking away from $600,000. But I'll repeat
that, it's not the predominant focus.
```

And number 2, if it's -- UCLA immediately jumps from 300,000 to \$6,000, that's 300,000, right? Take that over 10 years, is the argument or could the argument be that really they owe 3 million additional?

I mean when you move in an offer and double the offer from 300,000 to 600,000 aren't you really saying to everybody here that the land was much more valuable for a long period of time? Now, I'm going take 2016 dollars to be fair and say maybe it was only worth 450,000, but if you check inflation in that period of time it's 19 percent. That value had to be around \$500,000 minimally. So at \$200,000 a year, times 10 years, you got a lot of money that somebody didn't negotiate about with a 1 percent inflation rate.

I'll leave that to you to define what kind of that deal is, but -- so John, could you do me a favor? Could you call UCLA, I'd like them to listen. I haven't let them intervene, but I think as a courtesy, the same courtesy we extended to Brentwood, I want you to talk about that. If you're asking me to raise the stadium, you know, because there's the \$7.5 million, I may do it. So be careful what you say, okay? So if we're going up on appeal we might go up on the whole thing.

```
you've already increased and doubled the offer just by, you
know, the litigation. And also you have the benefit of having
this for one year, not ten.
```

MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, could I comment on that?

THE COURT: Yeah.

2.3

MR. ROSENBERG: Just two points. One is that -- I think even the numbers that Your Honor is stating are gross underestimates.

THE COURT: Oh, I may agree with you, I don't know yet, I'd have to have a hearing.

MR. ROSENBERG: Because part of it is what the value is -- they -- that land is -- belonged to veterans at the VA, that land can't be rented. So when you look at -- you made comparisons with rentals, it's what's called an impossible hypothetical or something like that.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSENBERG: For me the issue is what is that land worth to UCLA? UCLA pays its baseball coach a million dollars and has -- and if you -- you can get lost in their website in terms of how much they extol that program. But I think this is a gross underestimation. And then you put on top of that that they were -- basically their gratis, \$56,000 a year, as I mentioned a few moments ago.

Second point is, and Your Honor referenced this a moment ago, we do have to keep the picture of the Leasing Act

```
1 | want to speak for Mr. Kuhn, but he and I have had discussions.
```

2 As the testimony came in, UCLA has the Luskin school,

3 | which is one of the top social work schools on the planet, and

4 Mr. Kuhn, you correct me if I'm wrong, but they have students

5 there, very talented students there who could be assisting the

6 VA without reach efforts, for example. So I mean we're talking

7 about one of the premier public universities.

8 **THE COURT:** Well is long-term solution a possibility?

Why aren't we talking about long-term veteran student housing,

10 | for instance?

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

11 MR. ROSENBERG: And that's true as well. I mean all

of this is in play in terms of --

13 **THE COURT:** Okay. But short term --

MR. ROSENBERG: -- what the future --

either won't answer the Court's inquiry because of your appeal, but if you're objecting to one year over ten years, you should take it up on appeal because this is -- these are one-year leases at the most until we get this sorted out in terms of our need for property, because if I ever granted you a ten-year

THE COURT: -- I imagine when you talk that you

21 lease and I needed a piece of property, like Barrington for

22 instance or parcel 9 at Brentwood, if I allowed these ten-year

23 leases to continue, or magenta B, there's no way that the Court

could get these structures up working with you cooperatively,

25 | because we'd be tied into ten-year leases.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
So if that's your objection then you're probably
never going to agree to anything that UCLA might offer, because
you would be objecting to your ability to enter into a ten-year
lease when the Court is only allowing you a one-year lease.
understand that. By the same token UCLA might be in the same
position as Brentwood, at least temporarily.
          So would you have that discussion with each other and
with John for a moment and with the VA, and I'd like to sort
that out. And John, would you place a call over the UCLA, just
as a courtesy as we did to Brentwood, okay?
          Counsel, I'm going to be back in about 15 or 20
minutes, okay? All right. Thank you.
     (Recessed at 9:37:12 a.m.; reconvened at 11:43 a.m.)
          THE COURT:
                     The parties are present and I know that
the monitor and counsel for UCLA have had some discussions the
last few days, which may be very helpful for everyone involved.
So I'm going to turn this over to the monitor and counsel. And
counsel, would you -- I certainly know who you are, but would
you just state your name for the record?
          MR. CARDOZO: Sure. Ray Cardozo from Reed Smith,
representing the Regents.
          THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Let me turn this
over to the monitor, Mr. Cardozo.
          MR. HUESTON:
                        Thank you. John Hueston as monitor.
So --
```

for ways we can deliver more benefits to veterans. And one of the things Mr. Rosenbaum told me that is really urgently needed on this campus is more social worker outreach. So we've been digging in to figure out is there ways we could improve the relationship -- that UCLA could facilitate the relationship between its social worker school and getting some of the trainees to come down and help out with the outreach effort that they desperately need down there.

And what we're learning is that the ability to move more certified, experienced people, get them there for supervision is kind of the holdup why, like a lot of these trainees, that would unlock maybe and get more people there. So we're pushing to figure out if there are ways we can make that happen as something we would put into the settlement.

And then another piece that we were trying to explore is as an alternative to the parking lot that Your Honor is discussing putting temporary housing on, we understand there's another parking lot nearby and we wanted to just explore a little bit if it's feasible that baseball folks could use that while the lot that's currently used for parking is being used for temporary housing. So those are two of the pieces we wanted to explore in this settlement.

And as soon as we can get a proposal out to everyone, you know, if we need to go to mediation, et cetera, we'd be happy to do that. We'd want to get this situation solved as

soon as possible, which brings me to my other request.

Our request to modify the injunction in the short term while we're doing all this, we'd still reiterate that, you know, there's an ability to open the stadium through the end of the baseball season while we're pushing hard on the settlement and all those fronts. We understand it's still today not being used for any other purpose or for any veterans purpose. We think that could happen today and that would really help this process of getting us to a settlement.

MR. HUESTON: Yeah, if I can just add a couple of comments. So Mr. Cardozo, you also, I think, suggested that you would be discussing with UCLA the possibility of some concessions in the area of student veteran housing as well, which --

MR. CARDOZO: Yes, and I left that out. That was a good reminder. Yes, if there's, for example, discounts they could provide on housing or preferences, you know, there's a kind of a competitive situation for access to housing among students. If they can give either benefits, either preferences or discounts, that's one of the reasons it takes time is these things have these established processes that you need to work through. And some of this, there's legal constraints on whether you can give preferences. So that's all happening as we speak. I don't have an answer as to whether we should do that or not, but that's being pressed through.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could join us.

```
MR. HUESTON:
                       Okay. And the one other thing that we
discussed is rather than trying to proceed first with
mediation, which takes time to set up, can be cumbersome, that
I'm available to help work through a potential settlement in
expedited fashion at any time with you and the other parties.
          MR. CARDOZO: Yes, and our -- you know, the whole --
I couldn't agree with that more. You know, we don't need time
or process to get to solutions, but all I'm saying is we're
open to mediation if that would help.
          MR. HUESTON:
                       If it were required.
                       We realize that the first thing we've
          MR. CARDOZO:
got to do is work out whether we can deliver these additional
benefits in student veteran housing and on a social work front.
Because that requires other individuals to make commitments
that we don't have yet, I don't want to represent we can
deliver that, but we're working hard at that. And then that's
what's going to come into the proposal. And then when we get
feedback from the other stakeholders, this is a good proposal,
needs more, et cetera, there may not need to be a mediation, or
maybe we really appreciate Mr. Hueston's involvement and
facilitation here.
          MR. HUESTON:
                        Thank you.
                     Earlier today, because of the information
          THE COURT:
that the monitor, Mr. Hueston, shared with me, I'm pleased you
```

I know that that's been taking place over the

last week. I didn't know some of the particulars.

I'm going to ask the plaintiffs in just a moment what they're actually asking for in terms of the stadium. And let me give you the background. We had four paved lots. One of those is Magenta B, which is that acre and a half lot that is on the street. The other is about an acre, which we're going to call Parcel 7. You're aware of that in back of the stadium. And then there's a large lot that is contiguous to it or part of it.

The Court had already designated those as modular sites, but we came down to a difficult choice between a site on North Campus called Lot 5, but it's near a domiciliary. And because of the substance abuse treatment taking place, et cetera, all parties stipulated that that would not be a wise choice. So now we've had to move in the last paved lot to a lot called 4A. And that lot is on the South Campus, which I think the VA has tried to avoid for a number of reasons.

We then are left with a number of unpaved lots. And those unpaved lots would take longer to develop. And it was represented to me that if the Court had made a decision to raze this stadium, that it would cost a lot of money. That money is better spent in emergency housing or housing at this time. And if we ever reached that decision, it would literally be, I think, because we've just run out of space.

You know, the VA has taken the position that they

1 | don't have any space for temporary or long-term supportive

2 housing. And I've always wondered if we would be in this

3 position with either Brentwood or UCLA if that property, which

the Court believes is available in other locations, was

5 available.

I understand the term you've proposed, and that is that doubling the rental or the lease from 300,000 to 600,000, and also, until I believe it's June or July, and I apologize, Mr. Cardozo, I don't have it right in front of me, June or July. And that would give you access, as I understand it, to 24/7. In other words, it wouldn't be limited hours. But if the Court was going ahead with the two acres that you previously referred to as being seated and the plaintiffs take objection to that word that, you know, being leased, then I assume that these were the only two acres because UCLA has 10 acres, your ballpark is about 7.7 acres. And these were the two locations that you were referring to, I believe; is that correct? When you said seating, two acres.

MR. CARDOZO: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, what I would be concerned about is if this goes forward, I want the players protected going inside and outside the stadium in case we have modulars going on that property. And I would leave that to you to work out some kind of accessibility, both in terms of fans, et cetera. I think we can work with that very easily. But I want

1 to ask in your presence what the plaintiff's position is. I
2 don't know quite when we go through this.

So I want to hear from Mr. Roman for a moment, because I'm a little leery of just walking away from \$600,000, but I want you to know I'm not making a ruling that this is the predominant focus at the present time. This is an effort to get accessibility if we're not using the stadium immediately, and it's an effort, quite frankly, that some compensation or some money is forthcoming. So let me turn to the plaintiffs.

MR. SILBERFELD: Roman Silberfeld, Your Honor.

To achieve the Court's objective of immediate housing in the next 90 to 120 days so we have the emergency dealt with at least as to a small population that we can accommodate, our view is that the parking lot out in front of the stadium has to be used. It will only accommodate 32 units.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SILBERFELD: Lot 7 or parcel 7 has to be used because it only accommodates 24 units.

THE COURT: Unless we get an expansion by the VA into the remaining of that lot because that would contain so much more.

MR. SILBERFELD: Correct. But even an expansion of the Columbarium expansion space will, if we go too far east, infringe on the Court's 500-foot rule because of the existence of the freeway right there. But it's clear that parcel 7 could

be larger than it is today and could accommodate maybe another
another another 48, depending on how large it's made.

3 And so from our perspective, the expansion of parcel

7, if we can work this out with the Cemetery Association folks and do so quickly, is a preferred option to tearing up some or all of the baseball field at the moment. Because there are no

7 other paved parcels that we've identified that we can find,

8 | that's kind of our view at the moment.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But as to the rest of the proposal that Mr. Cardozo sort of softly outlined, you know, as we did with Brentwood and with the Court's guidance and assistance and the monitors, we would really want to see a full, detailed proposal before we could agree to it, obviously. And we'd need to talk to clients and the class representatives about that as well. And we obviously haven't done that. But that's our view at the moment.

THE COURT: Okay. Any comments or thoughts by the VA?

MR. ROSENBERG: I'll just note that I was not aware that conversations were taking place between UCLA and the Court's monitor, so this is the first that we're hearing of any of this. To the extent that the parties are contemplating some sort of agreement that does not involve the VA directly, we would object as we did regarding the Brentwood agreement.

And we'll also note that to the extent that the Court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
is contemplating entering any form of injunctive relief that is
beyond the scope of the injunctive relief that it currently
has, the Court may not have jurisdiction to enter any of that
relief due to the filing of the Notice of Appeal.
          And finally, due to the filing of the Notice of
Appeal, again, I just reiterate that what we anticipate is that
we would be seeking to stay the Court's rulings in their
entirety, except as to the Court's judgment voiding the
individual land use agreements. And so at some point, the
intersection between, you know, that stay motion and any
potential stay that is issued either by this Court or by the
Ninth Circuit, you know, could impact the discussions that the
parties are having with UCLA.
          THE COURT: We've got 18 months concerning temporary
housing. Are we realistically going to get -- to considering
the UCLA stadium and that -- strike that -- in the next period
of time up to June or July that Mr. Cardozo suggests in his
proposal? In other words, if we're not going to be using it,
then we've got $600,000, quite frankly, and it seems like a
wasted asset not to give accessibility.
          MR. SILBERFELD: The answer is to that --
          THE COURT: To the stadium -- to the stadium.
                       If I could comment on both what the
         MR. CARDOZO:
VA's counsel and the plaintiff's counsel said.
```

I think the beauty of the -- this temporary solution

```
1
    modifying the injunction is you can grab the additional
 2
    consideration, allow the use that's not, you know, as you said,
    a wasted asset. And then all of the concerns that were
 3
    expressed can be accommodated in the contemplated ongoing
 4
 5
    resolution discussions.
 6
              THE COURT: Okay.
 7
              MR. CARDOZO: Because to take the VA, for example,
    any agreements that had kind of what -- this is what the land
 8
 9
    use is going to be going forward. Yes, they're the lessor.
10
    They probably need to sign on, but that's what you would work
11
    out in the next round of the proposal.
12
              And then all of the concerns Mr. Silberfeld
13
    expressed, they of course would have the crack at that in the
14
    negotiations. And so the proposal wouldn't work unless it
15
    worked for them. So -- but we could get a temporary solution
16
    while we do that.
17
              THE COURT: John, it would seem to me --
18
                            The temporary solution, I think, is a
              MR. CARDOZO:
19
    win/win.
20
              THE COURT: It seemed to me, Mr. Cardozo, to make
21
    this work because the VA is taking a contrary position that I
22
    would make this order and put that in the form of injunctive
23
    relief that the VA is ordered to carry out. In other words,
24
    that could be implemented quickly. They can take that up on
```

frankly. I don't know how we would reach a resolution getting
you accessibility that you want immediately for the UCLA team.

And I've done that in the past with Brentwood School, by the way, order the VA to carry out the settlement that's been reached in the form of injunctive relief because they've been opposed.

MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, and that's the other advantage of this kind of temporary, provisional relief concept that I'm talking about is you, of course, have that equitable jurisdiction to do that. It's just a way we're going to live while they pursue their appeal or so on. It's not the permanent outcome of anything. It's this is what we're going to do for the next 12 months, and then their appeal will get heard and so on. But it -- I think it presents everyone's options and accomplishes a win/win for everyone. So --

THE COURT: I'm going to ask again of the plaintiffs because if you're opposed, I need to hear that. If you believe that we're going to use that stadium up to the June or July proposal, I need to hear that. If we're not, then I think I'm prepared to make a ruling at this time orally and hand down that in written form shortly.

MR. SILBERFELD: So our perspective is and has been that the goal is to get 100 units soon.

THE COURT: And it would be, by the way, on those particular lots because they are the most available, most

economical.

MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

THE COURT: By the same token, this would give UCLA access to that stadium, let the team practice, et cetera, and would give some monies, quite frankly, that we would be not absorbing. And I think that, Mr. Cardozo, between you and Mr. Hueston's efforts, not that you'll eventually reach a holistic settlement, but I want both of you to hear that the Court is certainly encouraging that, and I think that this is an encouraging start. Now whether that ends up in a holistic settlement, we don't know, but particularly in the opportunity, possibly to explore with UCLA student veteran housing. UCLA desperately needs housing.

No representation on your part, but hopefully it will be raised by you. And I know Mr. Hueston and you have been talking, so no promises, et cetera, but that would be a huge boon. UCLA, I know, is basically out of space. They're always looking for housing out there, and if it was veteran student housing and we could work out something, you know, on the VA property, maybe that would be a great resolution.

There's also some property up in Palos Verdes that you're aware of, about 32 acres. I understand that that's a long ways from UCLA. I'm not suggesting a trade, but at least the discussion seems to be open now, and I want to encourage that and thank both you and Mr. Houston publicly for entering

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And

```
Mr. Cardozo, let us get back to you right now, sir,
so you can communicate back to UCLA. If I make that oral
ruling now, I'll follow that with a written ruling by Monday,
but then you can go in good faith, okay?
          MR. CARDOZO: Thank you very much.
          THE COURT: Just a moment. Stay with us a moment
there. They're all talking at these different tables.
                                                       You
can't see that for a moment, so bear with us.
          MR. CARDOZO: And I appreciate you hearing me
remotely, Judge. I have -- unfortunately I have a hearing this
afternoon up north. So that's why we --
          THE COURT: Well, quite the opposite. Thank you for
joining us.
          This last conversation, the last three or four days
with you and Mr. Hueston has caused, I think, just a reflection
on the Court's part about what might be possible here. And
maybe this is a good beginning, okay?
          MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, I want to thank Mr. Hueston while
I've got him for his very diligent outreach, you know,
available by phone constantly, quickly, really kept this
moving.
          THE COURT: Let me talk to the plaintiff as you're
talking. This does not involve the two parking lots.
goes ahead unless the circuit stays with me, okay? This
```

involves the stadium itself, accessibility to the stadium.

- 1 | if you're going to use it the next six, nine months, tell me.
- 2 And if you're not, then let's get \$600,000. And --
- 3 MR. SILBERFELD: Right. Can we answer that question
- 4 on Monday afternoon?
- 5 **THE COURT:** No. And we'll spend all afternoon if you
- 6 | want to, okay? Now, let's make some decisions now.
- 7 Mr. Cardozo, bear with us one moment. They want to
- 8 talk to their clients, okay? Yeah, as a courtesy.
- 9 And, Mr. Cardozo, I'm going to leave the bench for
- 10 | just a moment to talk to Mr. Hueston, so please bear with us
- 11 for a moment, okay? I'll be right back.
- (Recessed at 12:06 p.m.; to reconvene at 12:18 p.m.)
- 13 **THE COURT:** We'll go back on the record. Mr. Cardozo
- 14 has an appearance this afternoon.
- We're back on the record. All counsel are present
- 16 and, John, do you want to lead off with any statement or do you
- 17 | want the Court to? Counsel?
- 18 MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, there have been discussions
- 19 with plaintiff and I think we have, after additional
- 20 discussions, we thought it was prudent and it's my
- 21 recommendation to the Court that they have until Monday so they
- 22 can fully consult with their client representatives.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Their clients? Okay, 3 o'clock then, so
- 24 | we're not making multiple appearances because you'll be out at
- 25 | the site. So our understanding is the \$600,000, the June or

```
1
    July, I forget which date it was in the proposal.
 2
    accessibility needs to be worked out, but this is access to the
    stadium, that the Court goes forward with the two parking lots
 3
    that are mentioned, unless there's a suitable substitute and I
 4
 5
    can only imagine that that has to be that back lot extending it
    if that's possible through the VA. That this would take the
 6
 7
    form of an agreement between UCLA and the plaintiffs, and this
 8
    would be injunctive relief imposed upon the plaintiff, just
    like I did in Brentwood School, okay?
10
              That's a broad outline of it. Mr. Cardozo, thank you
11
    for your courtesy. Can you be available at 3 o'clock?
12
    we'll have a resolution for you at 3 o'clock Monday.
13
              MR. CARDOZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, I'll be on
14
    the East Coast, so 6 o'clock East Coast time. I'll have to
15
    appear by Zoom.
16
              THE COURT: That's fine.
17
              MR. CARDOZO: And one other question, would it be
18
    possible for the baseball folks to use the parking lot until
19
    the Court and the plaintiffs, the parties, need it?
20
              THE COURT: Yes, in other words, when we don't need
21
    it -- I don't want us wasting assets. So if we're putting
22
    modular units right now on either of those parking lots, if
23
    they're a value to UCLA in the meantime and we're not using it,
    we don't need to look at vacant land. I would expect that you
24
25
    could use it in the meantime.
```

the old chart with the buildings on it? In looking at this master plan, I'm wondering why we are reworking a master plan

24

already in effect. And I'm curious about who makes the decision about which buildings would be refurbished versus which buildings would be torn down.

And so I don't understand that process through the VA and Mr. Soboroff about how that decision is eventually made because right now I see this quagmire potentially of decision making but no decision making.

The second is I'm wondering with the controversy going over the town center and I just saw Dr. Sharon. Yeah, don't go away. Your participation is welcome.

I'm wondering why we don't have a separate master plan for the town center. We're going to get into a problem of the hotel. No hotel. Could alcohol be served? What does the connective tissue look like in building 210? Are we going to have that exclusive building for, you know, the veterans for what I call social purposes or are we going to put some veterans on top of that? Are we going to have a barbershop, a coffee shop?

It seems to me like we're getting involved in an issue of what you view as connective tissue. But my duty is to get people out to the site to have that connective tissue and increase that as quickly as possible to get them off the street and out of the rain. And so I don't want to see the connective tissue part of this town center take precedence over getting folks into housing and shelter.

So I'm suggesting to all of you as we go forward that possibly this is a separate master plan and we're not reworking the initial master plan, that it stays in place. But I need to know who makes the decisions eventually about do we tear it down? Do we refurbish it?

So I'm just curious if at 3 o'clock, you could help me either through you or Rob or somebody go over some of these buildings that are laying vacant out there and give me a kind of a preview of how we break that decision-making process to make the decision. How are we going to do that?

The next thing is tentatively if in a perfect world I would be suggesting to you that parcel 9, the VA property, I'm sorry, Brentwood property and Barrington Plaza are two parcels I would suggest, depending on Mr. Soboroff and you, Ms. Black, or you, Mr. Kuhn, that it should be designated for long-term supportive housing. And the reason for that is we run into problems when we already have an existing building and whether we're going to tear it down, refurbish it, how long it takes. Those two parcels are about 10 acres and about four-and-a-half to five acres. We're not running into tearing down. We're running into two virgin pieces of property that can be developed simultaneously that we didn't have on the books before when I declared the leases void.

all of your input as temporary or short-term.

So I'm not looking at those hypothetically subject to

I'm saying that

we can move simultaneously on 14 acres and what I particularly would suggest that I like about Barrington is that across the street, if you drive out there, there's already three-story condominiums.

Now Mr. Soboroff is not going to build the Taj Mahal. Three stories and the benefit of Barrington is we've already got a parking lot in front of the 10 acres on the Barrington Plaza. Really that parcel is about 12 acres, give or take. So unlike the good homeowners across the street who literally back right up to Barrington, we're providing, if there's a complaint, a setback in the parking lot. We've got parking already, so we're 250 feet back, which they haven't done on the other side of the residential area, and we've got 10 acres. So you've got your parking ready to go.

And what I need is some kind of guesstimate from you folks on the plaintiff's side about what we can put into Barrington Park, those 10 acres. Going three stories high but trying to create a really nice village atmosphere also with some open space like 209, 208, 205. So when people walk out, they've kind of got a garden -- an open space there. And what I'd like to know also is what your guesstimate is about those nine acres because when Skip came in, he and Brentwood readily seated those nine acres. Now that could take three or four years. It could take a long time, but those four acres out at Brentwood was something that Brentwood was going to give up

area in the existing buildings, either being torn down or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
refurbished. So if we had those 400 spaces that you already
were committed to by 2030, to add on to your present building,
you would have met your 1,200. And we've got potentially 800
going up here, plus another 106 on temporary, that could become
permanent, now keep the math going, that's about 900, isn't it?
          Now, I'm also going to give you credit, although you
didn't expect this, if you're expanding the domiciliary and
adding on to it, those are people off the street. And I don't
see why the Court wouldn't count those, 32 or 36, against our
temporary modules.
          In other words, thank you, okay? So I know you
graciously said, Judge, this is in addition, no, I'm going to
count that, that's part of our 750 right there, and it may be
much less. I need to be flexible because I don't want
temporary out there if I can get long term, it's money not
spent.
          So my ultimate goal was this, 2 to 300 because we had
200 and some before. We went into an emergency situation with
another 100, give or take 300, okay?
          In addition to that, we've got 400 that's already
promised, but some place that we're working on, the master
plan, leave that down in your master plan area. Leave the two
virgin properties up there, which I think we can accommodate
about 700. Well, let's take it, we've got, yeah, 233, 233, and
```

```
79
               THE COURT: Okay. Then, if not, have a good day.
 1
    We'll see you on Monday at 3 o'clock. John, thank you.
 2
 3
          (Proceedings concluded at 12:32 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

sin / Julian

October 26, 2024

Signed

Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER