UNITED	STATES D	ISTRICT	COURT
CENTRAL	DISTRICT	OF CAI	JIFORNIA
(WESTERN	DIVISION	- LOS	ANGELES

JEFFREY POWERS, ET AL,) CASE NO: 2:22-cv-08357-DOC-KS
Plaintiffs,) CIVIL
vs.) Los Angeles, California
DENIS RICHARD MCDONOUGH, ET AL,) Friday, October 4, 2024)
Defendants.) (1:42 p.m. to 4:07 p.m.))

HEARING ON 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 D. ROSENBAUM, ESQ.

AMELIA PIAZZA, ESQ.

Public Counsel

610 S. Ardmore Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90005

213-385-2977

For Intervenor ERNEST J. GUADIANA, ESQ.

Plaintiff: SEAN A. MCCORMICK, ESQ.

Elkins Kalt Weintraub, et al.

10345 W. Olympic Boulevard

Los Angeles, CA 90064

310-746-4400

For Defendants: CODY T. KNAPP, ESQ.

BRAD P. ROSENBERG, ESQ. U.S. Department of Justice

1100 L Street NW

Washington, DC 2005

202-514-3374

Also present: JOHN KUHN, VA

CHELSEA BLACK, VA ANDREW STRAIN, VA STEVEN SNORTLAND, VA

ROB MERCHANT, VA

SKIP MILLER

RAYMOND CARDOZO STEVE SOBOROFF RANDY JOHNSON

Andrew Strain, VA.

MR. STRAIN:

MR. ROSENBERG: Monday afternoon.

THE COURT: Wednesday afternoon, okay. Now, I've got a morning calendar and I moved that, which is why I'm asking you, I've got 20 other cases, so I'll start moving that today with Carla and try to get a morning session in and get in the car by noon, get here by 1:30.

MR. SANDLER: I could also do Wednesday, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You tell me. I don't want this back and forth, this is unnecessary. You just told me what days. I get Brad involved because he's out here or flying back and forth and so is Cody and that's not fair to their families. So, Cody, why don't you join them.

And I want to get this resolved, one way or the other. I want to know if there's an obstacle or not.

(Pause)

2.3

THE COURT: Carla, I need my schedule. I need to know when we're back in session on that other matter. If it's October 4th, et cetera. October 8th? Because I don't want it to interfere with this.

MR. ROSENBERG: We're all agreed I think if the Court is agreeable to coming back Wednesday at 10 a.m.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, let me just check, we've got some other --

MR. ROSENBERG: Sure.

THE COURT: -- homeless cases unrelated to you and

MR. SANDLER: Thursday after 1 p.m., Your Honor, would work.

don't want to impose that on you.

23

24

```
13
    afternoon. Let's work through the weekend. Let's get this
1
 2
    into a long form so that if we see there's any wrinkles by
    Monday so kind -- thank you for -- Skip, you're ordered back at
 3
 4
    1:30 Monday, end of discussion. No, no, we're done with it
 5
    now.
 6
              1:30, Monday, you're ordered back. You're going to
 7
    work through the weekend just like I am. We're going to get
 8
    this through a long form with no surprises and we're going to
 9
    stop the time period, okay. That's it. Done with the
10
    discussion. Thank you very much.
11
              All right. Now, here's what I understand, though,
12
    Skip, before you leave I understand from John Hueston that
13
    you've reached the 5 million, let me repeat that back. 3 the
14
    first year --
15
              MR. MILLER: Yes.
16
              THE COURT: -- 2 the second year.
17
              MR. MILLER: Correct.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. You know from the OIG's report
19
    that there's -- the illegality portions that they noted
20
    concerning anti-contributions.
21
              So if these monies are to pass to an entity like the
22
    Chapel, you need to work that out, Roman, so that there's no
23
    violation pursuant to the OIG and they laid out the Code
24
    section specifically. And that's why I was hoping that -- and,
```

in fact, I'm going to ask you to have Steve Peck come in and I

```
value of that is though if we're wrong on those hours, we can readjust them. Maybe the veterans don't need them that long in the first year.
```

And maybe in that second year, if we get to the second year then it should be shortened because we have more school activities, okay. It gives us some flexibility.

The second thing is we're not tearing anything up, but we're keeping the pool, we're keeping the track, we're keeping the weight room in a sense, but that principally once again has to be for the veterans. And right now you've got 233 people out there, so I don't imagine a huge number of veterans using that. But we just had a move in of 74 veterans. 74 coming in January. If we get going with the rest of the housing, you've got about another 300 units in process, so as you build, then the need is going to go up just proportionately of people who would use these facilities.

And parcel 9 is available with 180 days I think you said, Skip, from memory. I'm trying to memorize this.

MR. MILLER: Correct, that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You have the baseball field within 45

22 MR. MILLER: Correct.

days.

THE COURT: I think you're going to be in pretty good shape in a sense for both sides, because as the veteran's needs increase, why are we building out new facilities that the VA

isn't going to pay for, for a pool, you know, a track, you're not going to get them.

And from the young people's perspective, it's pretty traumatic just to -- you know, in the middle of a school year cut them out. And if we're not using them, I think we can use together, there's no reason to cordon off and lock the town facilities, for goodness sakes.

So in giving us parcel 9 I think we can work together and if we can get that long term supportive housing, it may take two, three, four years. Why are we going to padlock that, for goodness sakes, but we have to have that available. You know, we're looking at it.

And remember, all of this has started and I -- we wouldn't be at this point if the VA had or had represented that they had the temporary housing and the 1,800 units on the rest of the campus. It's because it's been represented to the Court that they ran out of land, they were over there looking at UCLA and were over there looking at Brentwood.

Now, I don't know what would have happened with these illegal leases, but I have the question in my own mind, would we be going through all this if we literally had space for 1,800 units and 750 units.

The problem is we started this lawsuit with really a strong representation that the VA didn't have that land. I made a ruling that they do. The problem is where that is. And

so now because of some of the obstacles we've run into we've got to have the greatest amount of land available, but that doesn't mean parcel 9. You know, we're chaining that off or anything of that sort, it doesn't mean that the baseball field can't be used. That's silly. If we can use them, let's use it, okay. And if we can use it for the veterans and the children and work that out.

So I think that from what I've heard from John
Hueston, without knowing any of the particulars, I think I
really want to compliment all of you folks, and I want that
back to your Board and I want the veterans to hear that also.
This is principally for the benefit of the veterans and you
truly believe it, then we've got a home run. Okay.

We've got something we can really build on in the future as our population increases, because I don't know how you get this built from ground up. We're going to have enough trouble with the town center, let alone a swimming pool, and a track, and a weight room that they're willing to keep up. Tennis, I'd like to see it go a little bit to a couple of pickle ball courts because veterans can't move that fast when they get older.

Beyond that, and I just ask the veterans for this, I would appreciate if you continually talk and to be gracious.

You remember, there's a lot of folks out there very angry who are veterans and they feel really wounded by this. But you've

- 1 monetary component also for the benefit of the veterans,
- 2 however the plaintiff veterans and the other, the VA veterans,
- 3 however they tell us, it's there. Brentwood School wants it to
- 4 benefit them.
- 5 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 6 MR. MILLER: And we want to further this relationship
- 7 and take it to a new level.
- 8 THE COURT: I really think you've come a long ways, I
- 9 just want you to hear the Court's compliments. Now, it may not
- 10 | work out with paragraph 3, you know, live 5, I'm just joking,
- 11 | you know, the devil's always in the details. But don't let
- 12 | that hold you up if it's principally for your benefit as
- 13 veterans, but we can also make certain that this land is well
- 14 used, okay. And there's no reason to start chaining this land
- 15 off at the present time.
- 16 Hopefully we just get to parcel 9 in the future.
- 17 Hopefully maybe the baseball field at the most, hopefully these
- 18 | core facilities remain intact, hopefully once again this is
- 19 principally for the benefit of the veterans. And in here we
- 20 look at it, if we need to adjust it, there's our flexibility
- 21 for both sides and be fair.
- 22 So I think you should leave with good faith, although
- 23 | I don't know all of the details when you write this out, I know
- 24 | what you presented to me, but I think we're well on the road to
- 25 | really achieving something beneficial. Okay?

```
21
1
    the weekend, because if there's a surprise, I might as well
 2
    know what that is on Monday.
              MR. ROSENBERG: That's part of why I'm flagging this
 3
    now to the extent that they're -- that they present an
 4
 5
    agreement on Monday we may potentially object to it and would
    be able to identify the basis of those objections.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Now, walk through -- let's assume the
    worst. Skip, come on back for a moment. Let's plan for the
 8
 9
    worst and pray for the best, okay.
              Let's assume that the -- whatever this is and I don't
10
11
    know what this is, whatever this problem is that may arise,
12
    what happens if the VA took a -- took issue with the agreement.
13
    Walk through that process with me, what happens next?
14
              MR. SILBERFELD: So from our perspective, Your Honor,
15
    other than the form of the agreement that VA clearly has an
16
    interest in --
```

17 THE COURT: Uh-huh.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SILBERFELD: -- and we will do everything we can to accommodate the form of the agreement so that the money stays here.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. SILBERFELD: We've talked about this before. Other than that, to the extent VA objects to the terms of the agreement as between the plaintiffs and Brentwood School, my view is that that results in an objection on their part, which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right.

```
we would ask the Court to then overrule or sustain the
objection of, but not that they have a say in what that
agreement looks like because it's an agreement between the
plaintiffs on the one hand and Brentwood School on the other.
          So what we contemplate is that if it turns out to be
the case and I think Brad agrees with us actually, if it turns
out to be the case that they have a substantial objection to,
for example, what happens to the $5 million. If they have an
objection about that, let them state their objection, we'll
state our position and we would ask the Court to rule on that.
          So it's an objection process rather than --
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
          MR. SILBERFELD: -- the deal dies.
                     So hypothetically Brad could be in this
          THE COURT:
position, he may tentatively agree that he would like the money
kept locally, but he may have some folks in D.C. who have a
different viewpoint about how that money is to be delegated.
          MR. SILBERFELD: Correct.
          THE COURT: The problem is in the past, if you look
back historically, there was a problem 2011, 2012 with about
$40 million --
          MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
          THE COURT: -- that the VA couldn't keep track of.
Now, that's Brad. For the record, Cody, that's not you. All
```

But if you look back historically that commingling of

THE COURT: Okav.

MR. ROSENBERG: -- that we're not able to reach an agreement, we would like to be able to create a record on that issue.

THE COURT: Let's do this. Let's just hope for the best, okay. If we get to that point, let's deal with that if we get there, instead of the parade of horribles.

And if the Court's ruling would be dispositive, at least from the Court's position, you'd always have those appellate rights available to you. So in terms of your input, I'll make that record consistently for you. You're not acquiescing to that, you're not agreed to that, you're preserving your appellate rights, I want that clear on the record, but I appreciate your participation because you know DOJ. And I will also state publicly that I hope the money is kept locally because I'm a little concerned historically about the money going into a large coffer across the country and nobody can account for it like that. It's hard to account for it and the VA ran into that problem historically with \$40 million if you look back.

So let's move on on the table, let's go in good faith, Skip. We'll work -- by the way I'm available all weekend. Okay? Call me or call John Hueston or Craig but we're working Saturday and Sunday, so we're around. Okay?

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

17

20

25

the leases are illegal.

```
1
              MR. GUADIANA: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Ernest
    Guadiana on behalf of Bridgeland Resources.
              THE COURT: Nice seeing you.
              MR. GUADIANA: You wanted an update on the measures
    that Bridgeland has taken so far to comply with the order.
              THE COURT: Yeah, with the capping of Sawtel 2.
              MR. GUADIANA: Yes. So at this point, Bridgeland has
 8
    begun the preparation of the notice of intent to abandon, which
 9
    is the document that would be submitted to the California
10
    Geologic Engineering --
11
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. GUADIANA: -- Management Division. Bridgeland
12
13
    does believe that it will be prejudiced as soon as it submits
14
    that notice of intent. And so that we would request either --
15
    we have a motion for stay on the Court's calendar for November
16
    4th. We'd either request that you administratively stay the
    requirement to continue with the abandonment process until that
18
    motion is heard or hear that motion sooner.
19
              THE COURT: Yeah. I haven't signed off on that
    motion yet. I'd like to consider that over the weekend.
21
              MR. GUADIANA:
                             That's fine, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: I'll tell you transparently a couple of
23
    concerns. I've got an OIG report saying that the leases are
24
    illegal. I've got a prior colleague, Judge Otero who said that
```

I've got a congressional report that

```
1
              MR. CARDOZO: And we filed a pile of paper that
 2
    contains not only our modified proposal but also the
    explanation and analysis of why we think it met the standard
 3
    you set out in your injunction, you wanted to see for the
 4
 5
    proposal, which was just to refresh your recollection.
 6
              THE COURT: Well, it was filed last evening.
 7
              MR. CARDOZO: Yeah.
              THE COURT: And we've been a little bit busy, so I
 9
    haven't been able to pay attention to it, nor do I have the
10
    opposition that's been filed.
11
              MR. CARDOZO: Yeah. I understood that, Your Honor,
12
    that's why I assumed you wanted me to walk you through it a
13
    little bit here.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, why don't you tell me your
15
    position in terms of intervention. I know that there's a
16
    request and your substantive arguments so we can just start
17
    that process --
18
              MR. CARDOZO:
                            Yeah.
              THE COURT: -- and I'll work it this weekend.
19
20
              MR. CARDOZO: Yes. And so my only hope for the very
21
    near short term is that we come up with a modified injunction
22
    that will be better for the veterans than the current
23
    injunction.
24
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
25
              MR. CARDOZO:
                             But that won't hold, won't disrupt the
```

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

```
baseball program any further. Because I've got to tell you,
Judge, these last nine days have been really rough on the kids,
their families --
          THE COURT:
                     Yeah.
          MR. CARDOZO: -- the players and the coaches.
the other side of that, while the stadium has been cordoned
off, it doesn't seem like the veterans have gotten any benefit
out of the cordoning off of the stadium. So if we can just get
the kids back in there, what we're offering here is more for
the veterans, so it's better for them without harm to the kids.
That's the idea behind this proposal.
          THE COURT: Just a moment, I've received no input, so
when you say offering more, I know --
          MR. CARDOZO: Yeah.
          THE COURT: -- that there was a discussion that
started at 11 o'clock. I wasn't involved in that.
          MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, so --
          THE COURT: So I have no idea what's being offered.
          MR. CARDOZO: So I'll take you through it and I'll
just start with the language in your injunction that you said
you wanted UCLA to be -- proposes a position on how the 10
acres it currently occupies can be put to a use --
          THE COURT:
                     Uh-huh.
          MR. CARDOZO: -- such the provision of services to
```

veterans is the predominant focus of the activities of the

```
1 regents at the campus.
```

- THE COURT: Uh-huh.
- 3 MR. CARDOZO: And so UCLA's proposing that for the
- 4 | next 12 months it will pay, in addition to the rent of 320,000,
- 5 another 280,000 for those 12 months. And this was styled as
- 6 rent, but if there's a difference between paying rent or
- 7 | specifically earmarking it to a program that the parties prefer
- 8 | would be funded, we can do it. There's 280,000 additional that
- 9 gets put in for the next 12 months.
- The in kind services, that is what Congress said, has
- 11 to do to keep this lease --
- 12 **THE COURT:** Just a moment, as an aside, my apologies.
- 13 Remember with Bridgeland I kept saying 51 percent, you heard
- 14 | that loud and clear? Okay?
- MR. KNAPP: Yes, Your Honor.
- 16 **THE COURT:** One of the things you might think about
- 17 | is this, counsel, I'll be right with you, I apologize.
- 18 MR. CARDOZO: Oh, absolutely, take your time.
- 19 **THE COURT:** There are so many prior rulings by Judge
- 20 Otero and I've not turned a ruling certainly on guidance from
- 21 OIG that this is illegal. The difficulty I'm having is with
- 22 | the percentage that's being offered because at \$80 -- Brad,
- 23 where are we today, do you know? Check it. We're about 70,
- 24 about 76.
- 25 MR. GUADIANA: I want to say we're at like 78 bucks.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It went up, no, it went up a little bit. Check sweet crude for a moment, I think about 76 or 78. when you're doing that, we haven't been at a hundred in a long, long time. So we're still going to be stuck at this percentage in a sec that you're offering and we're never going to get to even 5 percent, probably not even 4 and a half percent. So I don't see any difference in what's occurred previously. The second thing is you know the Court's concern and the Ninth Circuit can reverse me, but I'm really concerned just about the veterans. This generation has had to go through the burn pit disposal in Iraq and Afghanistan. substantially different than Vietnam and Korea. I'm concerned that if there's anything hazardous in the air, when they're handling extraordinary dangerous munitions. Now, the Ninth Circuit may do this just as a monetary sum, but from my perspective there's a health aspect to it. I haven't heard anything about monitoring devices or anything else coming from -- hold on, we've got a conversation going now, I haven't heard anything that ensures that the veterans with -- especially with lung issues which are prevalent in this generation, have that kind of protection.

go and so I'm concerned about the health and welfare of my veterans out there, your veterans also, I don't see how this well principally benefits.

Now, the argument could be, look, Judge, we've got anywhere from 65 to \$160,000, okay. If the Circuit takes that position economically you may have a good appeal. But from my perspective there's got to be some guarantee that this isn't a health hazard because 1956 probably nobody checked and there were no veterans there.

Now, I've got an increasing amount of veterans moving in, so I've got to worry about the 233 and the next 74 and the next 74 and hopefully we get to 1,200 and hopefully we get more veterans out there. That's my concern, okay?

MR. GUADIANA: So let me just respond to that. I mean California is the most highly regulated -- it has the most regulations on oil and gas operations in the entire world. We have permits from the South Coast Air Quality Management District, I mean, there are monitoring devices all over, CalGen regulations, you know, other state agency regulations ensure the health and safety of the drilling operations.

Regarding additional wells, I remember on the last -on the 25th -- on the hearing on September 25th we noted that
we would be fine not drilling any other wells, especially
because both California regulations and Los Angeles County
regulations currently prohibit us from drilling any additional

- 1 evidence regarding the health aspect during the entire trial.
- 2 | I mean, there's nothing shown that there's anything hazardous
- 3 about any of the oil operations.
- 4 THE COURT: How do I know? In other words, are you
- 5 offering to put in monitoring devices around that to show us?
- 6 MR. GUADIANA: I believe that there are monitoring
- 7 devices all around the Sawtel field.
- 8 **THE COURT:** Show me the evidence in my record where
- 9 that was put in my record. No, hold on. You go back and show
- 10 me the page where that was something in front of the Court.
- 11 MR. GUADIANA: I'm sure that there is not, because it
- 12 | did not come up, but we have to comply with all of California's
- 13 regulations and laws and we do.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Okay. And what happens if we continue
- 15 and what's triggered UCLA, I think a filed a request for
- 16 | injunction with the Court's comments about the parking lot.
- 17 And I'm not very bright sometimes, but I'll quarantee you, that
- 18 that stirred an immediacy on UCLA's part.
- And I guarantee you that they don't want 60 or 70
- 20 | temporary structures, which by the way can be easily moved at
- 21 any time on that parking lot. Now, I don't know what the
- 22 hazardous effect is or the non-hazardous effect of this is, but
- 23 I know that that parking lot, so counsel hears, has particular
- 24 | interest to me because it's going to decrease the time and it's
- 25 going to decrease the cost and maybe we can 60 or 70 veterans

with, which takes time, money.

1 in before the rains come, because that parking lot's paved.

And on every other piece of property that we've looked at, I don't know where my chart is, it's all unpaved. So we've got to go in there and spend time to paving to begin

Now, this is the same parking lot so counsel hears that's been represented to me to be the parking lot when the veterans village existed, that the veterans were asking to get inside the VA, asking UCLA to use this parking lot. That was declined. There was nobody on that parking lot at the time, maybe there was some baseball practices going on, but it put the veterans in a very difficult position on San Jacinto.

I don't want to put you out of business. I don't even care if I decrease your profits, but you better balance with the Court how this principally benefits veterans when it's a 3 and a half percent and I know you say we'll go to 5 and a half percent, but even if you did and offered that, I'd tell you tentatively to help your record, I'd probably decline it.

Even if we got there, at over a hundred, \$220 a barrel and I think that's fair to you to know that --

MR. GUADIANA: Of course.

THE COURT: -- for appellate purposes. I've got to get something so substantial that I can truly say, hey, this is principally for the benefit and I'm having a hard time with that two OIG reports, a congressional report, a prior judge

million, the current lease obligation is 1.35, so that's a

24

25

doubling.

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: Now, stop there. I'm having trouble with in kind services because the OIG specifically has stated that some of those are illegal. Number two, they're hard to value. Counsel raised during the trial when you weren't here, look, UCLA is a phenomenal baseball team, but still in the best of times you might have, you know, 4 to 500 empty seats. So what's really being offered, okay? That's their position. For me I'm finding that the highest and best use is land. And let me clear with you, because you weren't here as a courtesy, that the VA has taken the position initially in this case we don't have land for temporary housing and we don't have land for permanent housing and certainly the expansion being asked by the plaintiffs. I have no idea where we would've been if there was land at the beginning of the case where the VA had said, you know we've got 1,800 permanent supportive housing sites, we don't have any problems, we can go ahead. We have up to 750 temporary or some number below that. You're right in the middle of this issue --MR. CARDOZO: Appreciate it. THE COURT: -- and if we don't have those sites from the VA, here we are at Brentwood School, here we are at UCLA and with the OIG saying they're illegal and Judge Otero saying

```
1
    illegal and even your own 30(b)(6) witness who you designated
 2
    got put in a horrific position and a wonderful employee, you
    should be proud of him. Anybody would have had to answer after
 3
    the examination frankly, representing UCLA, no, this doesn't
 4
 5
    principally benefit veterans. It benefits UCLA.
                                                       That's your
 6
    own witness.
 7
              Finally, the most difficult part amongst many is this
    conversation, have you heard that tape yet?
 8
 9
              MR. CARDOZO:
                           No, Your Honor, but I feel like I know
10
    it now.
11
              THE COURT:
                          No, no --
              MR. CARDOZO: I've heard it a few times in this
12
13
    courtroom.
14
              THE COURT:
                         Let me just kind of trace it. Okay.
15
    McKitrick (phonetic) over at the VA talks to another official
16
    in the VA whose names we didn't even know at the time and
17
    there's a FOIA request coming from the Daily Bruin. And the
18
    conversations, in summary, let's not let the veterans know
19
    because they're going to be opposed to the Branca Field and
20
    watch out for this FOIA request and that's my own summary.
21
              Now, you've got a very uncomfortable, very honest
22
    employee, who then phone over to this employee, Tony, who takes
23
    it to the Assistant UCLA Director of Athletics, but then
24
    there's a phone call that goes over to the Department of
25
```

Communications, the Department of Strategic Planning, and guess

everything.

41 1 THE COURT: Okav. 2 MR. CARDOZO: In kind is what Congress was focused That's the test. That's why that's part of the proposal. 3 We thought --4 5 THE COURT: Well, that's your 2.7 million and in kind 6 services. 7 MR. CARDOZO: And then it would have the baseball 8 facilities for 12 months. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. CARDOZO: Again, trying to get beyond the current 11 crisis with the program, it's appropriate to have some 12 stability for the program while we figure out the long term 13 solution here. 14 The next item on the list I wanted to mention just because it's -- people seemed to miss this at this trial, this 15 16 is what Congress was referring to when it -- for the 17 predominant activities, predominant folks of the activities of 18 the regents, they used the phrase at the campus because 19 Congress was --20 THE COURT: And by the way, it should be predominant 21 Sometimes I'll refer to that as the principal benefit, 22 but it's two terms that apply to different entities. 23 MR. CARDOZO: Well, the --24 THE COURT: The predominant focus, okay. 25 MR. CARDOZO: Well, they're actually completely

supportive.

MR. CARDOZO: Understood. That's what -- we just don't think we should decide. You, they should decide the highest best use of its housing, by all means. We're just hoping there would be that transition time of 12 months. If you tell me that won't work, you make the rulings, we have to live by then.

THE COURT: Well, hold on, I haven't gotten to Branca Field yet. You noticed that. I haven't done anything to your stadium yet. I'm -- we're requesting the parties to speed this along and get some units in now before the rains come that can be picked up and moved.

MR. CARDOZO: And that's why I'm here. It wasn't the parking lot, it's the stadium and facilities that are being unused and the trauma that these kids have experienced since the last nine days. We'd like to take them out of that. We'd like to take them out of that. It's not being used, they benefit, and we're giving more benefit to veterans by doing this.

So we do think this injunctive proposal is better than the current state of affairs and the other piece of it, you also have to consider the alternative. With the lock out, UCLA summarily evicted from the lease, it doesn't owe any rent, it has no legal obligation to provide any services, all of the things that Congress valued and said, you get to keep your

lease, you get to keep your baseball stadium, we'll do that if
you do these things. All of the things that UCLA did that the
OIG found made this lease, unlike the other leases, this lease
compliant if you look at its five year leasing report, item 19.
It says, explicitly, the provision of service to veterans is
the predominant focus of the activities of the UCLA at the
campus during the term of the lease.

That's the OIG finding on its website right now.

That's the standard that's in the injunction. The OIG finds

UCLA was meeting that before this trial of which it was absent.

We are adding to our compliant lease these other things so that we're not locked out of it, the facilities that we leased with Congress' explicit approval. That's our request of you today, Judge.

We're hoping we can end the lock out today with a proposal that's better than the current injunction that just lets us go forward temporarily with the status quo that hopefully works best for all and doesn't harm third parties that don't need to be harmed. That's my request to you today, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. If you have a comment, you haven't had time to file an opposition. But if you have a comment, I appreciate hearing that because this was filed last night and I haven't paid enough attention to it yet, I haven't had enough time, so.

MR. SILBERFELD: Well, I think I have several things to say about this, because I'm not sure exactly what we're doing now. We had a settlement meeting at 11 o'clock this morning which went nowhere.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SILBERFELD: The proposal of paying a pittance more in rent not acceptable to the plaintiffs for sure, without much, much more. The idea of two acres coming back in a year doesn't work. As the Court well knows we're talking about what to do with that parking lot in the next 30, 60, 90 days.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SILBERFELD: But I think there's more with regard to the motion that's been filed. You know, Mr. Cardozo and I have had I think a dozen e-mail communications in the last nine days. One of the first ones was he was asking whether we would oppose a motion to intervene, which has never been filed.

We told him within an hour, yeah, we're opposed to a motion to intervene here. For the obvious reasons that UCLA was invited to be here in February to participate in these proceedings. They, for their own strategic reasons, decided not to do that.

And we went on, we had discovery, they were deposed, they still didn't come in. We had a trial, we had a witness here, they still didn't come in. And here we are a month, almost to the day, I think it is a month to the day since the

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor.

Court's opinion issued and now for the first time overnight, they file a motion for a permanent injunction having given no prior notice to us of their intention to do so, having not met and conferred as they're required to do under the Local Rules with us, and having said at the very end of their memorandum that the opportunity to meet and confer wasn't available. Well, I was available all week. No one called me. No one e-mailed me, but I called and e-mailed Mr. Cardozo multiple times to allow him to appear on Wednesday, he couldn't appear on Wednesday and he filed the status report that the Court knows about. But honestly from a pure procedural perspective, from a notice perspective, I couldn't feel more aggrieved on what was filed last night. And we got nowhere this morning in terms of a settlement discussion. So our request is that rather than order a briefing schedule on this motion at all, that the Court not only strike it from the record, but not consider it any further on the merits at all and instead, instruct counsel that if he wants to make a motion, follow the rules, file a proper motion on proper notice, not 12 hours' notice and seek any relief from this Court. I think they've given up their right to seek relief in this Court. MR. ROSENBAUM: I can just add two things briefly,

One is a very similar set of circumstances

1 happened when we were before Judge Otero. UCLA stayed out,

2 knew about the case, not even to the depth that Mr. Silberfeld

3 | has just described. I mean, I spent -- Amanda Savage and I

4 | spent hours with counsel from UCLA obtaining the documents that

5 | then were part of the basis for my deposition of

6 Mr. DeFrancisco.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This was very clearly matters that they were aware of. Your Honor has insisted and Mr. Rosenberg complied with the notice to UCLA, as to all the lessees, that interest might be implicated here. I don't think it was sufficient in terms of meeting an intervention standard because the Government was quite competent in terms of defending those interests, but it's -- in some ways that's beside the point, because UCLA decided to ignore those opportunities. I'm guessing because they didn't want to come under the jurisdiction of this Court, but that's irrelevant. That was part of their determination.

They knew it through every moment, in fact, they, as Your Honor just pointed out, in fact designated Mr. DeFrancisco to be the 30(b)(6) witness. That was obviously a decision that their counsel made.

Secondly, with -- as Your Honor is aware, UCLA has been a very active player here. Your Honor knows that at the height of the pandemic a request was made to use that parking lot area when veterans were sleeping, sitting, dying on San Vincente. And the response of UCLA was, that's going to

interfere with our baseball schedule. UCLA got it, in terms of what the implications were and they made a decision.

Third, Your Honor, I was very disturbed to hear repeated today what is in that proposal. And that is where UCLA says they will cede that land. It's not their land. Cede means I give something that I have that is in my possession to someone else. That's not the way it works here, particularly in light of the Court's order but even before that.

That property belongs to the veterans and the VA. It is not for UCLA, especially after the Court ruled that the lease to be illegal, to make the determination that they will cede that land.

The issue here is precisely the conversation we had with Brentwood and it's precisely the conversation we had during the course of the trial. With respect to that very valuable land, for which UCLA historically has paid nothing close to what that value is, the issue is what is in the interest of the veterans. And that is precisely what Congress meant when it said, the predominant focus of the activities on that property has to be for the veterans and their families.

I can't imagine anything more predominating than to say as Your Honor has said now multiple times today and before, get them off the streets and into available land. The Government has said that there is a need for that land to be made available and on a temporary basis. And we now know that

1 | that can be done very quickly.

I would hope and expect an institution with the integrity, the reputation, and supposedly the sensitivity to veterans would say, we'll do whatever it takes to get veterans into temporary housing as soon as is humanly possible, not a year down the road, not based on their desire as to what is in the best interests of student athletes, but rather to keep those veterans from living and dying on the streets.

And so I strongly agree with Mr. Silberfeld, these are very experienced counsel, they know how to meet and confer. I don't think they have a leg to stand on in terms of intervention. If they want to make their motion, they can make their motion, but for now let's just follow the proper procedures. We can move rapidly with respect to it, but the interest of everybody in this room ought to be to get the veterans off the street and into available land that can give them the security, the safety and the wellbeing that they've too long been denied.

THE COURT: If you have a response, you're welcome to make it, but by the same token, you're entitled to file your opposition or response. I'd like to see that in writing. In other words, if you believe that intervention isn't appropriate, I need a written document. Something that you file with the Court, I don't want to decide that, you know, from the bench.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARDOZO: Just a few points, Your Honor. I think my learned counsel just stated the fundamental legal error that began it all, he said the predominant focus of the use of this property. That's not the language Congress passed. Predominant focus of the activities of the regents at the campus. They knew there was a baseball stadium there and this property would be used for the baseball stadium. They were talking about the world class health services that UCLA delivers at the campus, and then they said, and you have to give these in kind services. So the deal Congress, when they specifically authorized this lease, was not what they fed you at this trial in UCLA's absence. And the fundamental errors baked into everything that's been done, not the misstatement of the law that we just heard, it's the language that's in your court's injunction, activities at the campus. So that's why the OIG found this lease compliant, because it meets that test. We are here on a compliant lease offering much more than our lease obligation to end the harm and give more to veterans, to benefit them, because that's the predominant focus of UCLA. They're offering you a proposal today that's better for the veterans than the situation for them if it is rejected. If this very beneficial proposal to end this lock out

temporarily and we can figure it all out later, if the Court is

not willing to do that, we'd ask you to at least stay the injunction for seven days pending appeal, while we take this to the Ninth Circuit.

But we have to end this lock out, Judge. It's fundamentally unjust and it's not necessary. We are providing something much more to the veterans than the lease requirement, much more than the law requires, and they don't benefit a lick from an empty stadium and a lease where UCLA's evicted and none of this goes to them.

The veterans deserve this proposal. The desire of advocates to kick UCLA in the head does not benefit the veterans, Your Honor. That's not the just outcome here today.

THE COURT: Counsel, your thoughts.

MR. SILBERFELD: So it's curious to hear counsel talk about the world class medical services that UCLA provides on the campus, for which UCLA is paid by the VA. That doesn't count for anything. And in terms of, you know, the desire to kick somebody in the head, how about filing something last night at midnight and demanding a hearing at 1:30 this afternoon with no opportunity to read the document, much less provide a cogent substantive response.

I hear the Court wanting an opposition from us. If the Court is going to leave this motion --

THE COURT: It may not be on the merits. It may be 25 on procedure. In other words --

```
1
    whether UCLA's complaint and so on. So if they want to respond
 2
    and all that in seven days, that's okay. We were just hoping
 3
    we could find a way to end the lock out. That's what the heart
    of this motion is, the proposal, a working solution going
 4
 5
    forward.
 6
              All of those other issues can stay on the table, we
 7
    can do that. You don't need to agree that the lease is
 8
    compliant or not compliant or with anything I'm saying, all you
 9
    need to conclude is that the proposal put forth now is better
10
    than the current injunction because it gives more to veterans
11
    and doesn't harm third parties. And that's all we're looking
12
    for today as a temporary solution.
13
              THE COURT: Any response by any part?
14
              MR. SILBERFELD: No, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
16
              What would you like to discuss next?
17
              Oh, by the way, for both of you and this is -- it's
18
    dawning on me that you must have discussed this effort to keep
19
    the funds local. You don't have to tell me that. But it's
20
    becoming self-evident now.
21
              If a contribution is made by Brentwood School
22
    directly to the 1886 Fund, then doesn't that avoid the problem,
23
    and the problem that we were running into was this seven year
```

string that had funds coming in that is causing a problem for

DOJ, but if that is 3 million directly going from Brentwood to

24

25

the Chapel, I'm throwing it out there, I'll leave that to all of you to discuss.

The other thing is, remember on the Chapel they had a budget of 22 million --

MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

THE COURT: -- they were at 20 million, right? Have you ever seen anything come in on budget yet lately? Now, I'm just joking about that, but remember that they also, and I'm not joking about that, they're going to run into probably some cost overruns.

Number two, they gave up the healing portion that they wanted. When the clergy gathered together of different denominations, apparently they want this healing hall, and that healing hall was put aside in the \$22 million. That's actually \$27 million and I have to --

MR. SILBERFELD: That's about right.

THE COURT: Yeah. And this is a great opportunity to give, you know, inter-denominational chapel and get that healing hall and so I'm just tossing out to you, we may not have a problem, there may be a way of keeping that 5 million local and that we give them 25 million plus their fundraising effort, maybe they can get that healing hall at the same time, that we've got to -- I just toss that out. I'm not saying that the Court understands if that's the best solution, but you might think about that, okay, might avert the whole problem.

1 version.

THE COURT: I see, okay.

MR. SILBERFELD: And the reason for that difference is, we adopt what the Court wrote in its opinion at page 40. It think it's line 1, 2 or 3, I don't have that directly in front of me, but I know it's on page 40 at the very top of the page.

So that's the one difference between the two forms of judgment. The second difference which appears at page 4 it relates to the injunctive relief portions of the judgment and what particular portions of paragraph 251 of the Court's opinion describe injunctive relief.

And the difference between the two versions has to do with whether subparagraph M of paragraph 251 is in or out for injunctive relief purposes.

Now, this takes a moment to explain. Subparagraph M is the subparagraph that described the financing arrangements that pertain to the development of permanent supportive housing. And there was an error in our findings of fact and conclusions of law that we corrected I think two days ago by the filing of a notice of errata.

Originally, that particular subparagraph said that the VA is ordered to use, and I'm paraphrasing, the most efficient and least expensive means of financing and it had the word conventional financing in there.

That was the mistake. Because what we intended and

```
60
 1
    agreement and a motion practice --
 2
              THE COURT: And that's my question, how do --
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- we won't need --
 3
                          -- I find -- how do I sign this final --
 4
              THE COURT:
 5
    this judgment without resolving Brentwood? In other words,
 6
    I've got this blank --
 7
              MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
              THE COURT: -- and why am I doing that now until I
    get a resolution concerning Brentwood. Which I think we're
10
    going to get a lot of feedback Monday and I think that that's
11
    going to give Brad time to go back to DOJ and see what the
12
    opposition is. It sounds to me like really what we're worried
13
    about right now is can we keep this money local and how do we
14
    that if we can --
15
              MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
16
              THE COURT: -- without violating some of the
17
    quidelines.
18
              MR. SILBERFELD: So I do think we need to wait maybe
    a day or two --
19
20
              THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
21
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- what we do with Brentwood and
22
    then we can --
23
              THE COURT: We're going to take this up -- let's make
24
    this easy. Let's take this up Monday at 1:30.
25
              MR. SILBERFELD:
                                Fine.
```

not permanent, it's got utilities, and what kind of problems are we going to run into with just the first 230 that we have to pave and if we can get 70 veterans off the street before the

23

24

25

MR. SILBERFELD: They have not been filed yet.

25

1 both. 2 So as to emergency order number one, the preamble is the same in both orders, by the way. And then over on page 2, 3 we provide in this order, because of the approach of winter and 4 5 the urgent need to get people off the street, that by next Friday, VA provide to the Court, the Court's monitor, and 6 7 plaintiff's expert, the following information with respect to the parcels identified in the attached map. And the Court will see that there is a map attached, and the parcels on that map 10 that are in magenta, the reddish color, are the parcels for 11 which we ask the court to order VA to provide the information 12 that's listed in items A, B, and C under paragraph number one 13 of this proposed order. Essentially, what's being asked for is 14 the infrastructure information about the placement of temporary 15 supportive housing on those magenta parcels that are attached 16 to the order. 17 THE COURT: Now, let me stop, because I'm looking at 18 this for the first time and --19 MR. SILBERFELD: Sure. 20 THE COURT: -- well, if I'm looking at proposal 21 number one --22 MR. SILBERFELD: Yes. 23 THE COURT: -- what you're asking for is an updated 24 infrastructure map. 25 MR. SILBERFELD: Correct.

THE COURT: Which means we wouldn't be dealing with red lines. For instance, we might have a green line for our sewer.

MR. SILBERFELD: Correct.

THE COURT: But the VA represented, Brad, earlier on, that you might not have that. When one of the witnesses testified, I wasn't certain if that pertained to where the locations are concerning 209, 208, 205, and then down to 401 and that new construction, or if that also pertained to South Campus, and now, in particular, the minimally acre-and-a-half parking lot. I don't know that the VA has those.

So when I make a kind of order, I should kind of be able to enforce it. And so I may be asking the impossible, frankly, but at least I need a response to update this. And, Brad, how would we get that without the Court making an onerous order that you might not be able to comply with in good faith? I mean, we're trying to work together on this.

MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, this was actually one of our objections, the very issue that the Court has identified. And maybe I can just start, and I know that the Court has made this clear, but I just want the record to be crystal clear, that we object to the entry of either of these orders in their entirety --

THE COURT: Understood.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: -- in order to preserve any potential

ability to challenge the orders on any appeal that the Solicitor General may authorize.

And we also object to these orders because it seems that we're in a fundamentally different place based on what has occurred in the last couple of days than we were last week.

Last week, we were discussing the development of temporary housing on the South Campus, and there were productive conversations, again, subject to our objections, about a path forward on a time frame, and based on the developments of the last two days, that time frame has been substantially accelerated with different locations.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ROSENBERG: So with those two general objections to the entry of either of these orders, on Paragraph 1, we do have the concern that the Court has identified because that paragraph is vague. We don't -- VA can provide the infrastructure information that it can identify and that it currently has in its possession. But if the paragraph is to be construed that VA needs to, for example, conduct new surveys or updated surveys, that would literally be impossible for VA to comply with.

So at minimum, that language needs to be clarified for VA to only be required to provide the information that it currently has possession of.

THE COURT: It's dangerous for me to say this out

- loud, but if I do, then we've got transparency going, okay, and then push back. Can either one of you tell me any better parcel that is available right now than that acre and a half at
- 4 UCLA or a portion of that, I'm going to say back area that's
- 5 divided between cemetery, because I know I've got power. I
- 6 know I've got sewage and water in there. And every other
- 7 parcel we've looked at, with the exception of that one parcel
- 8 that's paved down by South County, it's all unpaved.
 - And so if we were just trying to get some veterans off the street, however many, if I ignore that parcel, then I've got to go down to the building with limited parking down here, or I've got to tear out the solar panels, which take time. I've got to lay some kind of foundation down. All that's going to take time. And it seems silly if we have a parcel ready to go that we can't get 40, 50, or 60 people off the street.
 - MR. SILBERFELD: There are three parcels that fit that description.
 - THE COURT: Well, okay, now hold on. One of those is the acre and a half at UCLA.
- 21 MR. SILBERFELD: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Another is, I'm going to call it a half parcel because the VA has it divided out, but it's about -- it looks like to be about three acres when I took the photo, another acre and a half back by the cemetery. Now, I haven't

1 THE COURT: And by the way, you should have looked at

2 that.

MR. SOBOROFF: Okay. The reason is you said that we know a lot about the utilities and on 7 and B plus or chartreuse B, and what we're saying is we think we know the same on all those parcels and we don't know what we're going to come up with, also why not do them all and find out which ones pop first?

So what we've done in addition to this, in addition to this -- because to me, it goes -- it is impossible for me to understand that there aren't utility plans at the hospital, at the VA. In those roads are utilities. We can research them. They can research what they have. All we want is what they have, so when we do the rest of the research, we don't have to do the same stuff over again. Number one.

And number two is, again, we're not sure which ones are going to be -- you wanted to do the fastest and the easiest. We felt -- so we are doing, and we have another page. We've already started doing layouts on each of these parcels with the number of homes and how they would be laid out and the footprints, all the things you talked about before. There are people working on those now, but we've already got some of those here. That ordinarily would take a month. And we have them. We want to make sure that our numbers are right.

So if you want 300, which parcels would we use?

```
you want 200, which parcels will we use? And if there are real reasons that we all agree that certain parcels are going to be harder than others, we'll come up with that. But we've already checked as far as we've been talking to the county. We've been talking to processes of self-certification. We've been talking about how they need to be attached to the ground, how they get to be moved.
```

We found out that sometimes the utilities, Your

Honor, can be above the ground instead of below the ground, so

it can move even faster. So what we're trying to do, we felt

in our conversations, which were held -- this was over a period

of yesterday. There is a difference between Yom Kippur and

Rosh Hashanah. You can work on Rosh Hashanah. You can't work

on Yom Kippur.

But we felt, why not examine all of these? And you may come up and say, well, probably -- you know, if -- probably B chartreuse is the first one, but maybe not. We've also started -- we've also started looking at --

THE COURT: Here's why. Because I don't want to slow down the process when I have pavement already down.

MR. SOBOROFF: I'm not so sure it slows down the process. I'm not so sure that in certain cases, pavement may not slow down the process as we got to tear it out. That's my point.

THE COURT: Okay.

```
1
              Number two, I agree with you that the government
 2
    should be able to supply to the Court some update concerning
    the infrastructure around this hospital. It's ridiculous that
 3
    we're undergoing an expansion and we don't know what's there
 4
    because South Campus is newer in a sense. We've got better
 5
 6
    records than North Campus. So I don't see why it's reasonable
 7
    that 1, 2, 4A, and 4 aren't examined at the same time.
 8
              But I don't want to hold the government in contempt.
 9
    I don't want to get you in a box where you're ordered by the
10
    Court to do something that in good faith you're trying to do.
11
              So here's my request, which means an order. You're
    going to look at 7, 8, and right here. With all this
12
13
    infrastructure that I keep pointing.
14
              MR. SOBOROFF: Wait. I don't see the --
15
              THE COURT: See it?
16
              MR. SOBOROFF:
                             4A.
17
              THE COURT: Got it right there? That parking lot
18
    right there that we don't have colored in.
19
              MR. SOBOROFF: Well, but that's not the parking lot.
20
    The parking lot's --
21
              THE COURT:
                         No, that's already paved.
22
              MR. SOBOROFF: Okay.
23
              THE COURT: You're going to look at all of the paved
24
    portions because I'm not accepting that you can move quicker
25
    with unpaved portions and remove solar panels.
                                                     But number two,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hospital.

```
I am at some point talk to Brad after he makes a good faith
effort to look at them, so I'm not making some kind of order at
1, 2, 4A, and 4.
          In other words, you're going to get that information.
I just don't want to write an order to the government that you
must do this by Friday in good faith, Brad.
          So I'm going to request that you look at 1, 2, 4A,
and 4, but I am going to order, and I'll send it out tonight,
that you look at 7, that you look at chartreuse B, and that you
look at this yellow already parking lot because I don't care
what you say. We don't have to remove anything.
                                                  It's there.
And I know that you could tell me that you could do it quicker.
I don't believe it. So if somebody makes a decision, that's
the decision. You're going to look at the paved areas first.
          MR. SILBERFELD: I can redraft the order and resubmit
it.
          THE COURT:
                     Yeah, please.
          MR. SILBERFELD: All right.
          THE COURT: And I'm going to request the government
to take a look at 1, 2, 4A, and 4 out of courtesy, Brad, so
that we're not in a box with the Court, because we do have some
pretty outdated records out there, North Campus. But we -- and
MacArthur Field, we know those red lines are green. But we
have to have some pretty good records down here by the
```

So it's a request.

MR. ROSENBERG: May I?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROSENBERG: I mean, just to be clear, we can collect and provide whatever records we have. And I suspect the records on the South Campus are going to be more recent, because that's where the development is taking place for the new critical care tower. You sometimes don't know exactly what you will find until you search for them. We're willing to search for them. We just want to make sure that there's no expectation that VA do the impossible and go out and update its records in the next short term.

THE COURT: So I'd ask you to update them, I'm asking you to produce them. So the order that I want you to draft is as follows, Roman.

The Court is ordering on all paved parking lots that the Court gets infrastructure from sewer, lighting, water, et al., by -- and then give me a date that you two agree on next time we're in court.

19 MR. SILBERFELD: I said that --

THE COURT: No, you two talk about that.

MR. SILBERFELD: Next Friday.

THE COURT: I'm going to request initially, in good faith from the VA, counsel, listen. I'm requesting on these unpaved areas, so we're going to put you in a box. 1, 2, 4A, and 4, and let's go from there. Okay? Because I know I need

```
1
    foundations for modular, and here's the benefit.
 2
    modulars can be moved. You might come back in the future and
 3
    say, you know what, Judge, we put these down temporarily in
    chartreuse B, but really we'd like that for long-term
 4
 5
    supportive housing.
 6
              MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
 7
              THE COURT: And number two, it fits with what
    Dr. Braverman was saying, because remember he kept saying
 8
    during the trial, I would really like to move my temporary,
10
    Judge, north. I kind of pushed back and said, well, I'd like
```

12 substance abuse or traumatic brain injury, because those folks

some of your temporary near the hospital, especially for acute

13 need the treatment closest to the hospital, but there's a

concern about the construction, et cetera. So this would serve

Dr. Braverman's purpose of moving some north, and if we can't

get 60 structures in here before the rains, something's wrong.

Something's really wrong. We're going to run into problems

18 233, so let's get going.

11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, that requires the VA's cooperation, and I think they're cooperative, so I just don't want you in a box with this order where it appears that you haven't complied. I'm requesting, to be clear, 1, 2, 4A, and 4. That's a request.

I'm ordering 7, chartreuse B, and that yellow blob right there, which is a parking lot.

MR. SILBERFELD: Okay. Can I offer --

```
I think we get the cooperation. We don't have to order the government to do anything. They're going to be in good faith on this, for goodness sakes.
```

MR. SILBERFELD: So I'll redraft the order that all paved lots, and then a request for the non-paved.

THE COURT: Now, the UCLA is here. Thank you for returning. I didn't want any discourtesy. Come on up here.

Join this happy family, although you're not very happy right now.

MR. CARDOZO: And I apologize if it was --

THE COURT: No, no, no. This affects you.

MR. CARDOZO: -- in the business, so to speak.

THE COURT: Remember, we're here because the VA said we didn't have enough land.

MR. CARDOZO: Understood.

THE COURT: I don't know that we ever would have gotten to UCLA. I don't know if we ever would have gotten to Brentwood. I don't know if we would have ignored this, because when Mr. Soboroff came in and Mr. Johnson, they didn't even have this on their radar in terms of Brentwood with our initial presentation. I couldn't figure out why, but you didn't.

This could affect you, and I want this courtesy to you. I'm ordering right now that they look at 7, chartreuse B, and 4A. And although you'll disagree, the reason for that is those parking lots that are already paved. They're paved.

These are modulars going in. I can pick them up and move them
in the future. I don't know if this is going to turn out to be
long-term supportive housing or not, which UCLA would be very
concerned about, even more than modular.

But I know right now, as long as it's represented to me that I've got limited space on this campus, until somebody comes up with enough room for an additional 1,800 and 750, then I'm looking at UCLA and I'm looking at Brentwood and I'm looking at every single piece of property. And I wanted you to hear that.

MR. CARDOZO: Yeah. Because I actually -- keeping this discussion solutions-focused, here's what I would suggest.

need it ahead of the 12 months UCLA is requesting, what I would suggest, again focused on a win/win, that would come as an order from you, not something UCLA agrees or acquiesce, but just take the lot, take the money that UCLA put in its proposal, and say, UCLA, you get back in the stadium. If you pay this additional amount, you pay these services. It's an order of the court, not an agreement from UCLA, but it's a win/win. The veterans get more, we end the lockout --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CARDOZO: -- and you grab your lot back if you need it.

We don't know what is actually needed and whether it

```
81
    needs to happen at 12 months. We are not here to stand in the
1
 2
    way of any of the good things Your Honor is trying to do.
    We're looking for solutions today that end this lockout.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. Okay, now, for all of you,
 4
 5
    remember also, though, the Court's confronted with the
 6
    following. Remember these lay-down lots?
 7
              Well, the VA also took the position initially that we
    needed 1, 2, 4A, safe parking over here, here, as lay-
    down lots. And then you came into the case and said, Judge,
10
    they only need two acres. I mean, if I wanted to, quite
11
    frankly, I could take and recommend to you this, right in front
12
    of the mansion. It's dirt with a bunch of trees. I mean,
13
    there's all sorts of room out here.
14
              Now, I know you don't want that, but there is more
15
    than enough room to construct 1,800 additional, but the VA has
16
    taken the position so far that there's not. It would be
17
    interesting if the lawsuit would have started with, we can do
18
    that, but -- but it hasn't. It's taken now into Brentwood and
19
```

taken the position so far that there's not. It would be interesting if the lawsuit would have started with, we can do that, but -- but it hasn't. It's taken now into Brentwood and into UCLA. So as long as the VA maintains that position. And I want some guarantees if we ever get there that this isn't going to run into a problem with permitting and some other obstacles. And I don't think Brad and Cody are in the position right now that they can say that. They don't know what problems it could run into.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay, now, what else do we need to do?

```
1
              MR. SILBERFELD: So there's one additional friendly
 2
    amendment to the order.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay.
 4
              MR. SILBERFELD: And that is that the Triangle Lot 5
 5
    is a surface-paved parking lot.
              THE COURT: Yeah, it is. But I'm concerned about
 6
 7
    that because it's over here by itself.
              MR. SILBERFELD: It's right next to CTRS. It's right
 8
 9
    next to the tiny sheds. And so we thought that was a suitable
10
    place to put housing because there are services nearby. And
11
    all we're asking in this order is for the infrastructure
12
    information. We're not asking that these actually be built.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. We'll consider 5. Write it into
14
    the order.
15
              MR. SILBERFELD: I will.
16
              THE COURT: But I'm not trying to trap Cody or Brad
    into something if you can't get it, okay?
17
18
              MR. SILBERFELD: Okay.
19
              THE COURT: Now, what are we going to do? Hold on.
20
    You haven't even thought through the following.
21
              Look, we've got all sorts of folks out there in tiny
22
    sheds. And all of a sudden, we get 60 or 70, 400 square foot
23
    modules. If I was in a tiny shed, I'd be saying, you know
24
    what? You want to get a veteran in off of Skid Row or, you
```

Hey, I've been sitting in here for forever.

25

know, Figueroa?

You're used to higher math.

Give me

25

Mr. Kuhn, come back here.

```
87
1
         (Counsel confers)
 2
              THE COURT: How many people can we put into
    chartreuse 7?
 3
         (Counsel confers)
 4
 5
              THE COURT: How many people can we put into
 6
    chartreuse 7?
 7
              MR. JOHNSON: Chartreuse 7, so that's approximately
 8
    40.
 9
              MR. SOBOROFF: 40.
10
              THE COURT: Okay, now, let me hear it again. How
11
    many into chartreuse B? How many people?
12
              MR. JOHNSON: 32, 34.
              THE COURT: Well, chartreuse B is a lot larger than
13
14
    7.
15
              MR. SOBOROFF: It's only 1.6 acres.
16
              THE COURT: Okay, so we're going to have what? For
17
    each parcel then? Just give me a total.
18
              MR. SOBOROFF: Roughly 20, call it 21 per, you know,
19
    21 per acre.
20
              THE COURT: Okay, I want you to give me, once again,
21
    in chartreuse B. I want to hear it one more time. How many
22
    people?
23
              MR. SILBERFELD: 40.
24
              THE COURT: 40, I wrote down 40. How many in
25
    chartreuse 7?
```

what all of you decide in the VA and the plaintiffs, to clear the tiny homes and to get rid of them or to keep the tiny homes, but minimally I know that we could get, minimally, if these lots were used, that are paved. We can get 40 additional people in, can't we? That would be a huge achievement to get people out of the rain, no matter what you did. Or you can make the value choice that you're keeping people inside these tiny homes, and I would hate to be the administrator that had to tell them that, and you could move, quite frankly, about 130 additional.

MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

THE COURT: Okay? So those are opportunities I leave to both of you, but I'm trying to anticipate what Mr. Kuhn and the VA is going to run into in good faith, if we get these modulars up and you've got to go to folks in the tiny homes and say, by the way, we're not going to move you after six months or a year. That's a tough position for you to be in.

MR. KUHN: Your Honor, I think it won't be quite as simple as moving people from CTRS to these new modular temporary structures. We want as many options as we can have based on the clinical needs of those veterans. So for instance, right now we have a number of different options on our campus. This would give us an additional option. We would want to make use of it, but for some people it might be better to be in CTRS than --

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'll leave that to you. You're the professional. You run that hospital. I just need to get modulars up there as quickly as possible, and then you decide where folks go. So I'm ordering 7, chartreuse B, 5, and 4A. Roman, okay? I'm requesting the unpaved portions, 1 and 2, and I think it's, I can't read that, 4, to make your best efforts, Cody, to get me the information, so you're not under an order. I think that's in good faith, and I don't know if I've made the order that you'd do any better with it, so I'm not trying to trap you. And they'll have all that to us by next Friday? MR. SILBERFELD: We hope so. THE COURT: Excellent. I see the enthusiasm. MR. SILBERFELD: There's a second part to this emergency order, and that's paragraph two. The Court will recall that at the trial, the evidence was that there had been no direct interaction between our experts and the civil engineers that are contracted by the VA with respect to this infrastructure. And the second part of this order is an ask that VA be ordered to arrange a meeting by next Friday, arrange it by next Friday, it doesn't have to happen by next Friday, with the civil engineers. We believe we know who they are, but we would ask that that meeting be arranged within one week's time so that we can sit down and better evaluate and understand the

infrastructure.

THE COURT: I would be surprised if the VA wanted you involved. I want you involved. I think you bring a tremendous amount of expertise to this, and if we could work together, it would be appreciated. So I'm inclined to sign that request, okay?

MR. SILBERFELD: I'll revise it as we've discussed.

THE COURT: Well, talk to Brad about that along the way, okay, so he has input. And he can be opposed to it, but at least he ought to see what he agrees with and what he doesn't agree with.

Now, what else are we going to do today?

MR. SILBERFELD: The second emergency order has to do with the beginning of the process of procuring and paying for, frankly, the temporary housing that is going to go on these parcels. So we want to do these things in parallel, and we want to do them immediately.

THE COURT: Absolutely, because you can work simultaneously. The problem is we don't want an over purchase to begin with, and then we have to store them in one of these yards.

MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

THE COURT: So what's a reasonable number that you could suggest to the VA, because you don't want to over purchase? And frankly, any time I can take modular and make it

1 | long-term supportive, I want to get rid of the modular.

MR. SILBERFELD: So the emergency order simply asks not so that a number of units be purchased, but rather that we identify cooperatively with VA a vendor or vendors who can meet the requirement of providing 2 to 300 temporary supportive housing units in short order. That's what the second emergency order is.

THE COURT: Within 90 to 120 days.

MR. SILBERFELD: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SILBERFELD: And I know that Mr. Rosenberg has --

THE COURT: I wouldn't care if this was sequential.

13 Let me talk to the VA for a moment.

I wouldn't care if this was sequential and reasonable along the way, rather than just 300 units. My only request is that we get moving on 60 or 70 of these, or some number immediately in these paved lots to avoid the rain.

By the way, I can show you some pictures of gangrene out there. You don't think people die of hypothermia in Southern California? Well, I won't take the time now, but I can show you gangrene out there on the streets. Okay? And I can show you hypothermia.

So why don't you two talk about a reasonable number for a moment. Just walk over to Brad. Come out with some sequential number, so I'm just not ordering 300. Maybe I parse

- 1 it out over a period of time and we take a look at, you know,
- 2 | two months or something like that, but I'd like to get going
- 3 | with some number.
- 4 MR. SILBERFELD: I'm just trying to identify vendors
- 5 who have the capability.
- 6 THE COURT: Well, but you're also identifying
- 7 | vendors, yeah, that can deliver 200 to 300.
- 8 MR. SILBERFELD: That's all.
- 9 **THE COURT:** Oh, that's it?
- 10 MR. SILBERFELD: We're not at a number yet.
- 11 **THE COURT:** Okay. In other words, you have that
- 12 | capacity.
- 13 MR. SILBERFELD: Correct.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay, fair enough. Fair enough.
- 15 MR. ROSENBERG: I don't know if this is an
- 16 appropriate time, but I do want to make a record regarding what
- 17 has been styled as emergency order number two, because there
- 18 | are some concerns that the government has and objections that
- 19 the government would provide regarding that order.
- 20 **THE COURT:** Sure.
- 21 MR. ROSENBERG: In reading the order, and I realize
- 22 | the Court has only recently had an opportunity to take a look
- 23 at it, but it has referred to the rainy season coming up, the
- 24 | colder weather coming up. The order implies, but does not
- 25 explicitly state that the process for procuring and installing

same vendor.

and talked to the mayor out there in Riverside. I care more about the parcel because the parcel should have like modular on it, so we get 30 or 40 from one vendor and we're not mixing and matching on the parcel.

So you may redraft this and say vendors who are capable of delivering not 2 to 300, but some multiple depending upon our parcels. And that could be either 40 per parcel, which is why I was asking about each parcel. You may have two or three vendors out there. In fact, we may find out who's a good vendor and who's not a real good vendor real quick doing that. Because I don't want to go after one vendor. They can't produce it, it takes too long, and it turns out to be, quite frankly, a piece of junk. Well, we can't work with them, okay?

So just redraft that in terms of multiple vendors, break it down by lot, but keep the lot synonymous with that

Okay. Now, I'm sorry, Brad.

MR. ROSENBERG: Oh, no, of course. So just to be clear, though, it is unclear with paragraph three if it's just a process for identifying a vendor or vendors within 90 to 120 days or whether everything is supposed to be completed within 90 to 120 days, including the installation of modular housing units, which, in light of the Court's comments about securing these mobile units in time for the rainy season, which I'm not a Southern Californian, but I know it's the winter.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's do this. Another 2 suggestion. Been through this before.

rainy season. By the same token, I could make some phone calls for you right now and have vendors identified within seven days. I'm not joking. And we almost put on a show when we were at the hotel down here three or four years ago, ordering Garcetti to produce in a lot a number of vendors and modules. In fact, you weren't around, but we actually had them come over to the hotel and make a presentation. I swear to goodness, you could pick up the phone in seven days and find out. And if you don't, I'll give you some numbers.

Of course I would hope this would be up before the

So this isn't a process that's going to take too long. And I think you should identify those by next Friday, frankly. Pick up the phone. And number two, then I think we should talk about dates, delivery, the kind of modules available, et cetera, and sequence these. So first of all, we're not over purchasing. We know that the vendor can deliver X versus up in Seattle. I can get them for you. Takes transportation time. There's a vendor right out here in Riverside. Easy, less transportation time. Maybe not as good.

Then we could have a thoughtful discussion and fit that, Brad, in so you don't have this 120. But of course I want this. In fact, the one thing I'm going to write is that this is an emergency. No matter what in this order, I'm going

```
1 to deem that this is an emergency, okay?
```

MR. ROSENBERG: Well, one or two more points. And actually, that's a good segue to the next point, both the vendors and the Court's intent to declare this as an emergency. And I'd focus the Court's attention on paragraph two, which reads, "Any procurement rules applicable to VA are hereby suspended by reason of the emergency nature of the action needed to implement this order."

We object to that provision. There are regulations and statutes that apply to the procurement processes that the federal government must comply with, the federal acquisition regulations, for example --

THE COURT: I hear the problem and come back to tell me what the time frame is. In other words, it's not good enough for me to say that there are problems. Tell me in good faith what that procurement time is. It may be absolutely reasonable. It may be unreasonable. But just throwing it out as a procurement problem is --

MR. ROSENBERG: It's not just a -- it's not a timing issue. It's also a process issue. So for example, the VA is required to follow, under the Kingdomware decision and relevant statutes, it's required to use veteran-owned small businesses. And it must obtain bids from two veteran small-owned businesses --

THE COURT: Wait. Tell me the time period. Because

otherwise there's a sufficient on my part, which is unfair to you, Brad, that I'm getting slow walked by bureaucracy. That may not be the case at all. Understood? Give me those time periods so I know what they are.

MR. ROSENBERG: It's not a timing issue is the challenge. It's a process issue. And so what we would -- we would object -- I'll just say this. Paragraph 2 is remarkably broad in scope. And this Court -- let's think about the genesis of this lawsuit, is in the Court's opinion requiring the government to comply with certain statutes, for example, the Rehabilitation Act and the Leasing Act.

THE COURT: Sure. Sure.

MR. ROSENBERG: And the Leasing Act is designed and intended to benefit veterans. Well, some of the procurement statutes that apply to VA, requiring VA, for example, to use veteran-owned small businesses, also benefit veterans. But that statute and the Kingdomware decision could serve as an impediment to the ability to quickly procure the modular units that plaintiffs would have this Court order.

And so I just want to object and make sure that the Court understands that when -- if it issues an order that has paragraph two or anything like paragraph two, it will essentially be sweeping away a large swath of statutes and regulations that apply to VA and that, among other things, are there to ensure that veterans benefit.

```
1
              THE COURT: I might agree with you, Brad, in the long
 2
          In the short run, before the rains come, I would do
    everything in my power on a limited basis to get 60, 70 people
 3
    off the street. Now, that doesn't mean I would sweep all the
 4
 5
    rules and regulations in place. But what's happening now is
    that's why they're asking for an emergency order. They feel
 6
 7
    that the bureaucracy, and not you, Cody, not you folks here,
 8
    thank you, but the bureaucracy has been slow putting it for so
 9
    long that that's why they came into court with, you know,
10
    nothing being built by 2022 and now 233, finally. And that's
    why they're asking for the emergency order.
11
12
              Now, that doesn't mean bad faith on your part.
                                                               That
13
    just means we can work together on that. Okay?
14
              MR. ROSENBERG: I think I've made my record on that
15
    point.
16
              THE COURT: Good. Let's get going with something.
17
              MR. ROSENBERG: One more point on which I'd like to
18
    make a record.
19
              THE COURT: All right.
20
              MR. ROSENBERG: It's my job, Your Honor. Paragraph
21
    number four --
22
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
23
              MR. ROSENBERG: -- which says that VA shall pay the
24
    costs associated with the purchase and installation of modular
25
    housing, site preparation costs, and infrastructure connection
```

Have a seat.

1 costs contemplated by this order from its minor construction
2 funds or other sources within its budget.

And if the Court could indulge me for just one moment. The challenge, as I think the record has indicated at trial, is that notwithstanding what appears to be --

THE COURT: Brentwood, you don't want to leave yet.

I know you think you do, but you really don't want to yet.

MR. ROSENBERG: What appears to be a very large budget, in fact, has all of the money in VA's budget is already accounted for and VA runs in many ways or is facing significant budget shortfalls. And so when plaintiffs suggest, for example, that the funds can be taken from the minor construction fund's budget, you know, the challenge is that — give me one second to just pull up my notes.

THE COURT: While you're looking that up, though, this gives you an opportunity, one, to either appeal me or, number two, to go to Congress and ask for these funds quickly. I know Sherman is trying to contact me and I would prefer to talk to him in court instead of ex parte, but you've just got some congressional people out there and if I'm the bad judge and I order that, in a sense, it may give you leverage to go out and ask for some supplemental funding. I just can't imagine why Congress or the president or anybody else would be opposed to this.

1 | I'd certainly give you more money if I had it.

MR. ROSENBERG: We have two branches of government in this courtroom. The branch to which you've just referred is not here.

THE COURT: Yeah. But what I'm hearing to all -this parade of horribles, once again, is stopping the process.
Nothing's going to start.

MR. ROSENBERG: Let me say, and I think I can wrap this up at this point, Your Honor, but, you know, for example, my understanding is that Congress has authorized \$612 million in the 2025 continuing resolution for minor construction funding. VA currently has 147 projects on its list, you know, for minor construction funding. That totals \$1.92 billion.

So with the 612 million that's been authorized for minor construction, that fund approximately 42 of those projects is funded and 105 is unfunded.

THE COURT: I understand that, but with that argument, we would never get started because the claim would always be that we're always short of funds. We would never get started.

MR. ROSENBERG: And there's one last point on that, though, and this gets into the weeds of government contracting law, and I know that the court sometimes is inclined to see these things as bureaucracies or technicalities, but again, they are the statutes and regulations that bind the government

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that courts are oftentimes called upon to enforce. procure -- my understanding is that to procure something, there needs to be a budgetary item in place in the first instance in order to make that acquisition, which is what's essentially being asked or may soon be ordered of VA. But at this point, this Court might enter an order that would require VA to pay for something, the full scope of which is not yet known, thus making that procurement process at best unorthodox, and that's probably a too soft a way to say it. It would be completely out of the ordinary and probably in violation of all of the federal statutes and regulations. But not if I don't overburden you. THE COURT: if I -- if I don't order 750, if I order a rather modest amount, then I have trouble with that argument. I'm not going to order you to produce 750, probably not even 300, but I can

So Brad, I'm going to kid you a little bit, but I'm going to put up that picture again. I -- why don't we go over there? Why don't we have the Army Corps of Engineers come in?

I mean, Brad, I keep saying this to you and I'll never convince you, okay? But put that picture up there and I watch these go up and you can't tell me my country can't do this, in some place, most Americans can't even find or spell.

certainly get 50 or 75 of these off the ground.

Stalin's birthplace -- Ali, do me a favor, thank you.

1 temporary. Those are in the ground, folks. If USAID can do

2 | that, and the Republic -- or Georgia and Gorey (phonetic), I

3 know that we can do that. I hear all the problems, but, Brad,

4 | I'm watching it. That's only half of the photo.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ali, go put up the other half. That's just half of what was built. And that's why I'm having trouble, Brad. If we can do that in some foreign country, why can't we do it here? I don't get it. And you can toss all the process and procedure out to me, but I will, Roman, I will say that this is an emergency and I will write that into the order.

So, all right, now, what else?

12 MR. SILBERFELD: I will redraft emergency order 13 number one.

THE COURT: Now, you two, I hope, will work together again over the weekend on this, so, Brad, you can disagree, and you're not acquiescing in any way. But if you can get, you know, some reasonableness between the two of you on some of the issues, let's cooperate in that regard.

Now, that's the other half of it, and I actually can splice it together, and I have a spliced together photograph.

There we go. It's the same building. I mean, I kid you not.

We put these up right after the Russians came down through

South Ossetia with people stringing across. Somebody tells me, we can't do this, I'm telling you, we did it. I'll take you to Afghanistan and show you the same thing. Well, I can't go

THE COURT: You see chartreuse B? Let's put that up there on this so you can see Chartreuse B, and what you should be concerned about is number 7, as of today, I'm not sure about

24

25

- 1 B right now, because I certainly don't want to do anything
- 2 | arbitrary. If we can use it, or if there's something else in
- 3 | the future, but those two parking lots are probably what
- 4 stirred you to come in and file this emergency preliminary
- 5 injunction, or I'm sorry, permanent injunction request, because
- 6 you heard my comments last Wednesday.
- 7 MR. CARDOZO: Actually, it's a baseball stadium
- 8 that's not being used right now.
- 9 **THE COURT:** That's right.
- 10 MR. CARDOZO: That is the main reason I came in,
- 11 | since these other things seem to be meeting the objective.
- 12 Again, wondering if maybe we could lift the lockout on the
- 13 | stadium itself?
- 14 **THE COURT:** You tell me that we had 1,800 permanent
- 15 | spaces. You tell me we had 750 temporary spaces, instead of
- 16 being told as a court that we have nothing at the start of this
- 17 | lawsuit, I don't even know if you and Brentwood School would be
- 18 here.
- 19 **MR. CARDOZO:** I --
- 20 **THE COURT:** So you go over and talk to the VA, and
- 21 | you find me 1,800 permanent spaces and 750 temporary, and then
- 22 | let's have another discussion. They're over there.
- 23 MR. CARDOZO: Oh, I know. They haven't really
- 24 stepped up --
- 25 **THE COURT:** And we're making this between the Court

- 106 1 and UCLA. It's not. I need 1,800 long-term supportive housing 2 spaces and 750. And I don't know if we ever would have gotten 3 here with Brentwood. I'm not sure. Maybe we would have, because these are illegal and void leases. 4 5 But I do know when I'm told that we don't have land on South Campus and North Campus, guess what? UCLA is on the 6 7 line, and so is Brentwood. MR. CARDOZO: But I haven't heard that any of those 8 9 are going to go in that baseball stadium in the next 12 months. 10 So could we maybe use it until then? 11 I don't know. You're going to file, THE COURT: 12 because they're going to say you don't even have standing to 13 bring it. So I'm waiting procedurally for all that. I'm not 14 going to wing it from the bench. And certainly not on a 12 15 o'clock filing that I've only read once. So all right. 16 Now, anything else? You need to get on the highway 17 and avoid the traffic. All right. 18 Then we'll see you -- is it next Friday? 19 MR. SILBERFELD: No. 20 THE COURT: No, it's next Monday at 1:30. That's our first one. 21 MR. SILBERFELD: Right. THE COURT: But then all of this is due on Friday,
- 22
- 23 24 and I need to get that. In fact, you can send it to my 25 chambers over the weekend. We're working. Okay?

MR. SILBERFELD: I'll send it tonight. THE COURT: All right. Brad, go ahead. Now, hopefully if I can get you. MR. ROSENBERG: Nothing else on the record. I did want to approach off the record. Nothing else today. I did want to talk to you about something off the record. THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. I need somebody probably maybe with me. If I can get you home, I want to get you home. Now, Brad, you don't necessarily have to be here. (Proceedings concluded at 4:07 p.m.)

CERTIFICATION

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

oin / Julian

October 5, 2024

Signed

Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER